

there are some other reasons, which probably come in the way of the project coming up. What is intriguing is that no official is able to predict with certainty whether the project will get the go-ahead signal or would be pigeonholed altogether. I, therefore, request that the Government should make a statement as to whether the project would come out of wood or is totally shelved.

(ix) *Need for a Railway Over-bridge near Alwar Railway Station, Rajasthan*

SHRI RAM SINGH YADAV (Alwar): There is an urgent need for the construction of a railway over-bridge near the railway station of Alwar, in Rajasthan. The "Matsya" Industrial area of Alwar is situated on the Eastern side of the railway track while the city of Alwar is situated on the Western side. Moreover, the Krishi Upaj Mandi Samiti of Alwar has constructed the shops for commercial agents for foodgrains on the Eastern side of the railway track. There should be a link between the city, the industrial area and the foodgrains market.

Alwar is an industrial town and also a market place for mustard oil and foodgrains. The raw material for the industries is brought to the Industrial area and finished goods are transported to outside. The incoming and outgoing movement of traffic is, therefore, heavy throughout the year.

The road transport from Delhi to Jaipur passes through Alwar and it has to cross the railway track. There is a military cantonment near Alwar on the eastern side of the railway track and military vehicles have to cross the railway line when they go to Alwar city, Jaipur and Delhi.

Alwar is an important railway station. The Pink City Express has a stoppage at this place. Frequency of movement of railway trains at Alwar obstructs the regular route traffic, and the passenger carriers as

well as goods carriers have to wait a long time near the railway crossing.

In view of all these factors, the construction of the railway over-bridge near the railway station of Alwar is urgently needed. The Government is therefore requested to take necessary steps in the matter.

12.14 hrs

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till twenty minutes past Fourteen of the Clock*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at twenty-six minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1981-82—  
—Contd.

*Ministry of External Affairs—Contd.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Eduardo Faleiro.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, for the last about one year and a little more, there has been a deterioration in the international situation to a point unparalleled in recent decades. *Detente* is dead and now the policy-makers of one of the super powers at least, are renewing the old slogan of "peace through strength" which, or all practical purposes, is a call to a renewed arms race and increase of tensions and conflicts everywhere.

We are living in a region which until quite recently was fairly free of major conflicts but which is now turning or has already turned into one of the major theatres of super power confrontation and unless things are arrested before it is too late, it will be the main theatre of super power confrontation.

During the Nixon-Kissinger era the strategy was to contain the Soviet Union with a triangular alliance of Japan, China and, of course, the United States and this was really the purpose of the assistance given for the modernisation of China; that was to enable that country to play what they call, a major defence role in the containment of the Soviet Union.

In recent times, it seems that the strategy has been expanded and revised in view of the fact that possibly China is no more considered a reliable ally in view of its own very divergent world view and Japan has shown that it is not at all interested in a larger military role. The strategy as expounded now is, as the Washington strategists say, to have an equilibrium, country to country equilibrium and maintain a balanced equilibrium throughout Asia. And it is in this context that the arming of Pakistan must be viewed.

Gen. Zia-ul-Huq in an interview recently to an Indian journalist, has made it very clear that the arming of Pakistan is not meant to be used against the Soviet Union.

Therefore, the only alternative is that these arms are to be used against this country and I would like this House to be aware of this and this country to be aware of this, that the only purpose of the arms supply to Pakistan is that they can be used and they are meant as a threat to India and to India directly.

Afghanistan is the reaction of the Soviet Union to this strategy, to encircle that country and one should not live under the illusion that the Russians are going to withdraw from Afghanistan unless they realise, they feel secure, that the strategy to encircle the Soviet Union is not there anymore and security and confidence are restored for, the Soviet Union.

Sir, in the debate, last year, I had an opportunity of quoting in this House, the evidence, given before the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee by top military strategists involved in the Diego Garcia base and they had stated—the records are there; their depositions are there and their statements are there that Diego Garcia was meant to prop up friendly regimes, the regimes which advance or support the American interests in this area. By obvious implication, it proposed to and, if necessary, intervene against regimes which are not friendly. India is one of those countries; the Congress regime is one of the regimes which, successive American Administration have perceived as not friendly and cooperative with the American interests.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in this context, in this global context, it is, not only we ho are saying that we are not secure, it is all the developing countries that are being threatened. Even countries which belong to either of the Blocs, through their leaders again and again have expressed their anxiety at this state of affairs. Statements have been there from the French Leaders. There have been statements of the West German leaders and I should think that the upsurge and the happenings in Eastern Europe cannot at all or cannot altogether be disconnected or removed for dissatisfaction with Great power politics. Therefore, I submit humbly but very firmly, that to-day more than ever before, non-alignment becomes relevant and the non-alignment policy is very relevant; in fact, unless sanity prevails through the forces of the countries which are non-aligned, it appears that the nuclear holocaust is imminent and mankind cannot be saved from this brink of disaster.

Sir, it is one thing to say that non-alignment is very relevant or is more relevant to-day than ever before and

it is quite a different thing to say that the non-aligned movement is strong enough. The non-alignment movement had lost a good deal of direction or the trust and it is comparatively weak movement now. The reason is simply because we have all types of movements and we have all types of countries in the non-aligned movement. We have countries like the Zaire, Egypt or Singapore which are just client States of one of the super powers. We have countries also which cannot at all be said to be non-aligned with the other bloc.

Sir, the people in this country and everywhere still perceive the need for India, in this context, to play an increasingly more aggressive role in the sense that it should play a role of initiative and leadership in bringing all these countries together, in identifying their interests which are also not very remotely the interests of mankind as a whole. I must say that the fact that at the Delhi Conference, a joint declaration, a unanimous declaration, was passed with all its weaknesses does show the tremendous diplomatic initiative and credit for that must go to the Foreign Minister, to his Ministry and to the Government of India for having salvaged this movement at a time when it was riddled with so many crises and inner contradictions.

Of course, the non-aligned conference produced something much more than that. Iraq and Iran could not be brought to the negotiating table either by the United Nations or by the Islamic Conference for the first time, at the Delhi Conference both these countries agreed to at least sit together and to discuss the outstanding issues between them. I shall also mention here that while India should play its pioneering role once again by regaining the initiative which it had in the fifties in bringing these developing countries together, it played a stronger role than the United

Nations, in the interests of the world in general and all the developing countries in particular. But the United Nations, with all its limitations is the only world forum which has any remote semblance of a World Government. Then again, the United Nations is the only forum where the combined strength of the developing countries, the combined strength of the non-aligned countries, can be felt in a very positive and constructive manner. At the United Nations, I think, India and the other developing countries should concentrate, to begin with on two major issues which concern the world today—one is Disarmament and the other is Development. It was India which took the initiative several year ago. In 1954 and as a result of its diplomatic initiatives at the United Nations the Partial Test Ban Treaty was signed in 1963. We did not sign the 1971 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We did not sign it because it was discriminatory. We felt then that the danger was not in horizontal proliferation which was bad enough but it was in—vertical proliferation which was worse in as much as the super power installations would not be inspected under the Treaty. It was only the other countries' installations that could be inspected. That is why we did not sign the Treaty. Today looking at the world it can be seen that we were right in not signing the Treaty. Sir, it has absolutely failed. Proliferation has not come from other countries. It is the Super Powers who are building up their nuclear stocks.

Again, Sir, Disarmament, if it is important to the countries of the world it is particularly important to the developing countries. A large part of our Budgets is spent on armament whereas this money can be saved and spent for development projects. If disarmament becomes effective and if the Super Powers do not arm the neighbours and the smaller countries and if the threat is removed then all this money can be used for

constructive and developmental purposes.

Sir, an issue which is closely connected with disarmament—and also an issue which is a major issue of the day—is the issue of Development. Many of the economies of the developing countries, the smaller countries, are on the brink of collapse and the major reason behind this is the inequity in the present International Economic Order which is the result of the political system which evolved in the colonial days. It is necessary to renew and to put on rails the North-South dialogue and although the Wilsy Brandt Commission Report may not be a radical measure, I have no doubt that it does provide a basis for a discussion. It is the best available document for a dialogue on the North-South problems.

While speaking about the North-South dialogue one cannot fail to mention that there should be a greater South to South dialogue. There should be greater cooperation amongst developing countries themselves. Therefore, the need of the day is to pursue strongly the policies which were those of the Congress Government up to 1977, that is, for collective economic self-reliance. In developing countries we have human skills. India has got so many engineers and doctors who go abroad because of lack of opportunities here. The OPEC countries have got capital and the African countries have natural resources. The capital of the OPEC countries and the human skills of the countries like India can go to strengthen the economies of developing countries, however, go Westwards. Therefore, the need of the day is greater collective self-reliance. So, I strongly plead here today for continuation of the policies which are those of the Government now, namely, for an aggressive role and for taking initiatives so that the non-alignment movement once again becomes strong. Sir, it is only if the non-aligned forces are able to pre-

vail that there will be sanity and peace. It is only if these forces prevail that we will have a better, safer and more equitable World.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK (Kendra-para): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, to begin with I must appreciate the manner in which our Foreign Minister has conducted himself during the difficult time of the last twelve months or so that he has been in office. Nevertheless, I feel, Sir, that it is necessary for us to re-consider the manner of functioning of our foreign policy on the basis of the nations contemporary history. I have no doubt that our able officials in the Foreign Office have made a study of it. But what I would like to point out to the Foreign Minister is this. A closer evaluation of what our nation had done internally (which is reflected from time to time in the framing of our foreign policy) does need a second look. For example, if I have to say that a nation was divided because of British machinations which has landed not only us but our neighbours into a whole lot of trouble including massacre, bloodshed, expense and God knows what, over the last 30 years, it is only quoting from the chapters of History. I have to say that when India was poised after victory in Poonch, the army was poised to move forward and reoccupy our own portion of Kashmir, again, somewhat or considerable. British machinations made us stop there, which has led to the external Kashmir problem which has framed our foreign policy. The question therefore in framing our future foreign policy is whether we were right in taking these decisions or we committed blunders. Our historians will write, I have no doubt. Governments will come and Governments will go, but historians will make their assessments over a period of time. Was Pandit Nehru right in accepting the division of India? Gandhiji did not. Was Prime Minister Nehru correct in ordering the army to stop at Poonch when it could have walked into Rawalpindi; in a matter

[Shri Biju Patnaik]

of a couple of days? We do not know. When the Nepalese King offered the treaty of accession with India after the Ranas were thrown out, Pandit Nehru did not accept that; only he did not accept that, but he sponsored Nepal's case to the United Nations as an independent nation. Was that right or not? Was our action right or not when we took over Sikkim? Only history would write what India's policies were, and where they have landed us. Nevertheless one has to look inwards to our domestic affairs which really determine our foreign policy, which is an extension of our domestic needs on the one hand and the world situation on the other. We in this House, in fact, all sections of the House, have accepted that Russians have been friendly to us and in critical times especially in relation to Kashmir affairs and in other times also. But we would be naïve if we are not to study this situation when Russians were divided between a friend and a brother. Mr. Foreign Minister would agree with me that when the Chinese began their adventure against India in 1962 I remember it was preceded for nearly a decade by their adventurism in other parts of Indian territory, Aksai Chin, etc. We were applauding the Chinese as "Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai". The whole of India was roaring "Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai" when they occupied Aksai Chin. When our border police were murdered, we made heroes out of the Border Police. But they did nothing worthwhile. Now, why does the foreign policy need to be studied? It is not a personal matter, it is the Government's matter, it is a national matter. A great leader like Mr. Nehru must have thought of something when he made that policy. It would be wise for the Foreign Minister perhaps to have an internal study for the knowledge of Parliament or the nation, to make an open study of this subject because these are matters vital to the nation. In 1962, it was a weak army leadership in the North-

### *External Affairs*

West Frontier—I do not name the General incharge nor the Corps Commanders which everybody knows, it is a part of a little history, it is a shameful part of our history which faced only skirmishes not even battles and though our Airforce was poised to strike them behind the lines. Why did the then Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, back out of it? This needs a study. Our Air Force which was stationed at Tejpur, could have attacked behind the lines at Leh, all down the lines where their columns were coming through, we could have saved some of our prestige. But we did not do it and we became the laughing stock of the world, at least for quite sometime and which indeed, if I remember aright, destroyed Pandit Nehru. Yet, why did the Chinese withdraw? The Chinese map showed a large part of India, Burma, Thailand going right up to Kampuchea as part of their territory. Mr. Foreign Minister I would not be incorrect if I stated that their brothers at that time, the Russians also had the same map in Russian language. Only recently they corrected it, I believe, when it was pointed out to them by the Janata Government. But why did they withdraw? It was a part of their global strategy. If I may remind you, Mr. Foreign Minister, when atomic missiles had been planted in Cuba, when Mr. Khrushchev was the Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R. and when Mr. Kennedy threatened an atomic war, the missiles were withdrawn. The Chinese withdrew from India. It was simultaneous. The Chinese are known for their diplomacy. That is why it is called the old game of Chinese chequer. They wanted the two giants the USSR and the USA to fight. When the fight broke off, they knew that their lines were stretched. They could not fight for a long time in India and so they withdrew. In the process, a threat was issued to the effect, "if you misbehave, we will give it back." I would not go through all those rhetorics. Now, in this background you have to operate as the foreign policy maker of this country. Of course, in the

foreign policy of this country, like any other country, the Prime Minister of the Nation has the major say. But collectively, the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister and the Government of India functions as far as the foreign policy is concerned.

I need not repeat the good feelings mentioned by various Members regarding the non-alignment etc. It is a part of the weak nations' rituals because they have really no other option frankly without moralising the need for it for the world peace and so on.

What has been India's role in the world of liberation? Under the able leadership of Gandhiji, India was in the forefront in the world's liberation movement of colonies. India was held on a pedestal of great respect. The world leaders of the colonies used to write and address Gandhiji and Panditji—I know it for a fact—as respected Gandhiji and respected Panditji. Can we today provide that type of leadership when the leaders of the erstwhile countries would write respected, or perhaps dear Comrade, or dear friend, at the best. My friend, Shri Faleiro, suggested that we produce a moral force to lead this kind of movement, but I would not agree with him because, I think, the time has passed. These nations, the erstwhile colonies, have all flexed their muscles and have become powerful and rich nations on their own. It will be interesting if I have to tell you an anecdote on this, where and how we lost the friendship of some of these erstwhile colonies which were not only friendly to us, but had great respect for us. I would give you an instance. In 1960, I happened to be in Jakarta. I was floating around South-East Asia attending the wedding of the daughter of the Air Chief Marshal there; he was my old friend. Dr. Sukarno, the President of Indonesia, was there. He called me and said: "You stay on for three or four days; I have to tell you something."

So, I stayed on and next day went to him and chatted many things. I asked him: "Dr. Sukarno, we were friends and we stood comrades-in-arms in your liberation movement. We have asked nothing from you. Why are you unfriendly to us?" This, and what I tell you now, I wish to go on record, because I told this to Panditji and corrected it and this is a part of the foreign office papers. He said, "Do you know, Biju, in Belgrade we were having a conference of the 14 heads of States and when I was arguing a case, Panditji, whom I respect as my elder brother, treated me in a fashion as if I know nothing. I would not say the words that he used." Panditji often used these kinds of words, when he would tell his colleagues\*\* something like that. Sir, I do not like that to be quoted or recorded. I would not like this part to be recorded.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will go through the proceedings.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: He said: "From that day, I have been hostile to India, because of the big brother attitude that you project not only at our level, but at the official level also." I am sorry to say that whenever our senior civil servants have gone to those countries in those days, they behaved as if they knew everything and their counterparts knew nothing. This indeed created bad blood in the whole of South-East Asia. This much I know for a fact. In other parts I do not know. Somewhere else our officials were exemplary and we have got the desired results. And I mentioned this to Panditji and he remembered it and he immediately wrote a letter of apology to Dr. Sukarno, which corrected the situation. Now, why I mention this is that not deliberately, but even sub-consciously if a big country like India behaves or makes utterances which smack of the big brother attitude, we are not going to make friends with any country, leave alone our neighbours.

\*\*Not recorded.

[Shri Biju Patnaik]

A closer example, Mr. Foreign Minister, is Bangladesh. In re-writing their history of Independence, they did not see it fit to mention the name of the Indian General, who signed the Treaty of Surrender by the Pakistan army. From their point of view it is correct, because they want to build their nation on their own ethos. We must realise that with consideration, understanding and sympathy. Take Ganga waters. We need a certain amount of water at Farakka for Hoogly; they need a certain amount of water which they have been getting during the winter months, when no Farakka was built. They have suggested that Nepal should be involved so that a combined long-term planning can be done for getting not only 44,000 cusecs of water for Farakka, but more than 180,000 cusecs even in the lean months, more than what India needs, more than what they need, more than what Calcutta needs. Have we not been a little sloppy in pursuing that so far, resulting in Bangladesh's fellow-feeling not progressing as we want? Perhaps you have the best answer; I do not know the details.

Similarly, America says they are going to arm Pakistan. Pakistan is a free and independent country, quite free and independent to pursue its own business. If America were to arm India, and Pakistan were to object vehemently, we would have said: mind your own business. But if our Prime Minister says that a few arms, aeroplanes, tanks or missiles or whatever it is, are going to lead to war against India or are dangerous for India or create a war psychosis, is it an act towards winning the hearts and minds of the Pakistanis for friendship towards us?

What should be our policy then? During the 1965 war when we had taken over the Hajipeer Pass, we withdrew from that only to win the friendship of Pakistan. Has it truly yielded any results? It is for us to

study it closely. The Hajipeer Pass was occupied after great bloodshed by the Indian Army and that was done at the instance of the Russians, our friends. We agreed to that.

Then in the Janata Government's time there was no stress or strain between Pakistan and India and in continuation of that state of mind, Pakistan rejected \$400 million of military aid from President Carter calling it peanuts. Should we not have congratulated the Pakistanis for their excellent understanding of the international situation? I want to know whether the Foreign Minister has done it. If he has, I am indeed thankful. I am glad. Pakistan has not accepted the new offer of Mr. Reagan. That is the newspaper report. I do not know. He has not yet accepted. Details are being worked out. The offer is almost the same.

15 hrs.

But the peculiar thing is that India which sponsored the liberation movement of the world's colonies, finds itself in a situation where it has to become equivocal to the occupation of a non-aligned country by foreign forces—in Afghanistan. I have gone through the policy statement of the Foreign Ministry carefully where it says, loud and clear, that India will not tolerate I must repeat 'not'—the foreign occupation of any country. Then it goes on to say, 'But'. This 'But' is the equivocation part of it.

Our young Gwalior, Mr. Scindia says: "We must be practical. We must consign Afghanistan to Finlandization." I only want to tell him through you, Sir, that when India had nothing—not even the power of a single gun, it fought the greatest armour of the earth, the greatest power on earth, viz. the British Empire, under the leadership of a naked fakir. Should India compromise to-day on the liberation of nations, when we stand as an independent nation, having the life, teachings and sacrifices of that naked fakir before us? Instead of

making us strong, it has made us weak—when we compromised. If we see our Prime Minister's statements over the last six months over this occupation of Afghanistan, how many times has she changed her emphasis and words? The need of the time? Yes. Consistency, I am told, is the virtue of asses. If she is inconsistent, she is only telling us, the asses, that she is the ruler, and we are the asses. Perhaps the morals of world liberation movements, the morals of politics and the morals of world affairs have vanished. That is what some of our friends now lament, and they have been sacrificed at the altar of practical politics. Is it not?

There was no practical politics when Gandhiji led this nation against the greatest power on earth. We have lost all that moral force. We have no right to that moral force any more.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur):  
We certainly have.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Prof. Ranga might have that right within himself. But we have no moral right to preach to the other people if we too, as once the leader of the world's liberation movements, become equivocal when similar situations arise in different parts of the world.

When we too once as the leader of the non-aligned movement took a side and others as members of the non-aligned movement took a different side, you, Mr. Foreign Minister, had to play a very difficult role in compromise and counter-compromise in the last Delhi meet of the non-aligned nations. This will always be so. Therefore, what is really our foreign policy aiming at? Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, as I said earlier, domestic needs determine our foreign policy. If we go on buying galore from the world where we have no money to buy, we are bound to beg. Mr. Foreign Minister, could you tell us, even as late in the day, is there any justification for 198 LS—11.

India to buy aeroplanes like air buses worth hundreds and hundreds of crores of rupees to modernise the so-called Indian Airlines so that mostly Indians and a few foreigners can travel? I am only trying to make a point that where India can do without these expensive pieces of foreign apparatus, should we not do that and become less dependent on the foreign countries?

Coming back again to Gandhiji's old teaching, "what you do not produce, do not use", if you cannot produce that but borrow and buy from others, you are dependent on them. You are no longer self-reliant and the nation is no longer strong. Let us look at other countries; let us look at Russia; let us look at Germany; let us look at Japan and other countries. They are strong because they are self-reliant. So, the foreign policy in reverse must also dictate the internal policy of the nation, if I may suggest so. The Foreign Ministry which is again in direct participation with the Prime Minister and the Government must determine the internal needs of the nation where we can avoid dependence on foreign countries.

In 1965 battle with Pakistan, you know Mr. Deputy Speaker, Canada refused to supply us spare-parts for these ordinary transport planes that we had because America asked Canada to stop it. Therefore, when we are dependent for our hardwares, whether on Russia, whether on England, whether on Germany or any other country, your foreign policy in terms of stress is not yours, but is dictated and determined by those supplier-countries. Will you deny this axiomatic truth, Mr. Foreign Minister? If all supplies stop, your whole machine will stop. If the spare-parts stop, your whole aircrafts will stop, your missiles will stop and God knows whatever else we get from them will stop.

For a long time when Mr. Krishna Menon was the Defence Minister, he said that we must produce them in



[Shri Biju Patnaik]

our own country. We were not producing even rifles. There was so much of lobbying from all the armament makers of the world against Mr. Krishna Menon and they were trying to malign him. He was the first Defence Minister who made India produce certain items, critical items. Slowly and slowly, we have departed from it. We make aeroplanes, we do not make the metals. We make engines in foreign lands; we have not developed our own. So, when you tell us that India makes a contract with a foreign country, we are bluffing nobody excepting ourselves. That means that we are going to continue depending on these foreign producers, or foreign nationals—call them multi-nationals. All who deal with different nationals are multi-nationals.

The Trade Ministry in Russia is the biggest multi-national in the world, the single biggest multi-national in the world. They trade with the whole world. They make their bargains. They do not give anything cheap. When once I was—long ago—in Moscow to negotiate with their Planning Ministry about something or other, after a lot of discussions, when I told them that they were no better than the Americans, do you know what their answers was? Their Planning Minister said: "Money has no colours, rouble or dollar is the same." So, we must know here the facts of life. Treat them as friends but let us not be anybody's hang arounds.

Mr. Foreign Minister, India is a poor country. We must remember that all this lauding, or conveniences or comforts for a few like us should not colour our vision of reality. We are finding that our foreign policy is becoming stifling and becoming more and more difficult, because we have to depend on IMF which is getting bankrupt, or the World Bank and the IMF. The shop will be clos-

ed immediately American withdraws its investment there. Europe is not agreeing to reduce the tariffs though beggar countries like us, Group 77 or whatever you may like to call us, are begging with the beggars bowl, telling those people in the developed countries where their own unemployment is rising to cut their national income and give it to the poor countries. If this proposal goes to Gandhiji today, he will turn in his grave. He would say, "What has happened to 60 crore hands that they cannot do their own jobs?" I would, therefore like to tell the Foreign Minister that foreign policy is not merely what has been done by India over the years, or what is being done now, but it must involve these two simple things—close and friendly relations with your immediate neighbours and trying to see that Finlandisation as suggested by one of your colleagues is not extended from Afghanistan through Pakistan to India some day.

Let us not forget the lessons of history. Countries or nations which can divide and sub-divide other countries as spoils of wars have no morals, no compunction. Our moral preaching has no effect on them whatsoever. Today the world is being run by balance of power—no, by balance of terror. If China were to attack India today with their ICBMs or IBMs, India has no defence at all. We take much pleasure in talking about little Pakistan. Let us view our perspectives correctly. Let us deal with policies and not indulge in populism. We have talked about Diego Garcia. And God know, we cried hoarse. Has it stopped the Americans? We said that the Indian Ocean should be left free of terror. Has it stopped the Americans or the Russians from coming to India or the British or the French who have sent a few gunboats or a few destroyers? There our voices do not count, when the total balance of terror is involved. Whether there would be a neutron bomb placement in Europe to counter the Soviet Power within the Warsaw Pact is the big problem of these nations today, not our Group of 77 etc.

So, we must be realistic about these things. In areas where we cannot help, in areas where we have no say, the poorest country like India that we are today, we should pursue our course ploddingly and painstakingly, without making too much fuss or without taking too much on ourselves, where you may falter.

SHRI JAIDEEP SINGH (Godhra): Sir, I have been listening very intently to the eloquent speech made by Shri Biju Patnaik. He certainly painted a picture of a sort of country that would be ideal. I agree there. But the problem is not that. It is almost amounting to wishful thinking on his part, because if he was intending to say that India should kowtow to other countries from where it takes aid, then I think it is wrong. If he was wishing to say that India should be so independent that it should depend on nobody, then also I think it is wrong, because perhaps in this world there are only two countries that can be called truly independent, as independent can be. Every country in this world has to have some sort of dependence in one sphere or another and under the given circumstance, the step that India is taking, I think, is very practical, dignified and desirable. The previous day we heard the speech of Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. He talked about our relationship with the neighbours also. He not only spoke of our relationship with our neighbours, but went on to say how well the Janata Party had done during the three years they were in power. I can only say one thing that the basic thing that we all have to keep in mind in India is the interest of our country. If that is kept in view and with that in view we build our relationship with all countries without sacrificing our interest, I can understand that it is desirable and we all want it. But like in the Janata regime, if we are supposed to bend backwards, given in to everything demanded by people around us and thereby have good relationship. I am afraid that is not the right way of going about doing things. (*Interruptions*). Talking about Farakka, you

said that the waters can be divided between Bangladesh, Nepal and India.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I did not say that; I am being quoted wrongly.

SHRI JAIDEEP SINGH: As far as I understand, the Minister of External Affairs will certainly answer this. But I am saying that it is in the interest of India to keep its interest in these affairs which are bilateral, strictly bilateral. For example, there is a demand made that Nepal be included as a third country in this matter of Farakka. This, I presume, is not a very desirable thing because in future many of our bilateral problems will have to be internationalised like this. That is not in our interest. After all Dr. Swamy cited the instance of Salal Dam. I was really surprised. In fact, I had not heard about it. So, I have made a little study of it. The negotiations of it were completed in 1976 and the matter came up in the routine course of time. When the signatures were attested, it happened to be the Janata regime. Can a credit of this sort be taken? After all, in this system of ours, Government come and Governments go but negotiations last over years and no one party or Government can take credit for such matters. But I am really surprised that he really tried to do it.

Talking of other neighbouring countries, I personally think that we have done all that we could and we are doing all that we can. But the basic thing that we all have to remember is to have our interest first. That is something that we cannot sacrifice at all because we want to appease or please somebody.

Dr. Swamy talked about the non-aligned conference and the draft which had to be drafted and India had to be humiliated about it. It is not true. I am surprised how he does not even know the procedure. Normally in such meetings or conferences a certain draft is prepared as a talking point, as a discussion matter and it is not expected that the draft in

[Shri Jaideep Singh]

toto would be the draft that would be accepted. Obviously that becomes a matter of discussion and a consensus is arrived at the end of a discussion, which is finally approved by everybody. In fact, even the Foreign Minister of Singapore which is one of the hawkish countries in the non-aligned group, very recently in an interview said that India conducted itself very well and it was a very good thing that this draft was unanimously adopted by everybody. So the attempt to denigrate the situation, I think, is rather deplorable. And it is not even true.

I would like to talk about Pakistan getting aid from the United States. I would like to ask a question. What is the reason for providing the aid to Pakistan? Everybody says that India should not be worried nothing is going to happen to India. But what is the reason for giving aid to Pakistan of a huge cache of arms? If it is to fight Russia, then it is not sufficient. Pakistan cannot fight Russia even with the arms given to it. Is it to supply these arms to insurgents to overthrow the Government in Afghanistan? That is not admitted openly by Pakistan either. Then I have not understood what the problem is, because India has openly declared that it does not desire to fight with Pakistan. I remember that very soon after the Congress Government came into power the Foreign Secretary was sent to Islamabad. He declared in Islamabad that India wanted to maintain the friendliest relations with Pakistan. Then where was the question of our *bona fide* being doubted? The question of supplying arms to Pakistan has certainly created a certain amount of fear in our mind because our past experience is such. In the past, it was also said that the arms were being supplied to Pakistan not to fight India but to fight Russia through the CENTO Pact of which Pakistan was a member. But every time we have seen that whenever Pakistan and India had to unfortunately, fight with one another,

those arms have been used. So, our experience is of this type. Therefore, it is not surprising that we have to be wary about it, and that is why we are talking to them, we are telling them, we are reminding them that "each time you supply arms, this sort of thing happens" and yet America, at that time quite blatantly said that it has no control over it, it does not know what to do. Last time during the war not only arms that were supplied to Pakistan, but the arms that were supplied to other countries which were in treaty with it, like Iran and Turkey, were also sent to Pakistan so that it could re-furnish it to fight with India. At that time the United States did not say that they should not use those arms; it just stood as a by-stander watching this *tamasha*. Therefore, it is natural that we are wary of this fact that arms have been supplied to Pakistan.

Dr. Swamy said that the period of the Janata Raj in India was the golden period for Pakistan in its relationship with India. But what I would like to say is this. We should not worry about what is the golden period for Pakistan *vis-a-vis* India. We should worry about what is the golden period for India and Pakistan together, or the golden period for India in its relationship with other countries. Why should we worry about what is the golden period for some other countries?

Therefore, I think that this is a situation which does require a little thinking. Because, since Mr. Reagan has been elected, they have taken a stance which is somewhat hawkish. At one time they even made a reference to the report of the Rand Corporation which said where they think there is danger of some countries going to harm the interests of America, they must arm them. Under that pretext also there is the possibility that they will be armed.

Now with these dangers, India is certainly going to be careful, because what do we have to face, what are the situations that are facing us? We

have a dictatorship in Pakistan, which is a little shaky. One does not know really what is its future. Then there is the problem with Afghanistan for them and its outcome can be a desperate decision. There is conflagration in Afghanistan itself. There is instability there with the possibility of world powers coming into clash with one another. Then, there is, unfortunately, the Iran-Iraq conflagration which, to my mind, is a very serious one. Because, just like in history we read of a series of wars, for one reason or another, I think this is the beginning perhaps, of a series of oil wars. These were old feelings which were pent up for years, and now they are opening up, and there is a possibility that these conflicts are coming to surface and if something is not done at the diplomatic level, it will soon become a very serious conflict in the vicinity of India. Then there is the precarious position of the States in the Gulf region. That is also a problem that we are going to face.

Then there is the Super-Power presence in the Indian Ocean. It is for the first time in India that now our coastal areas have also become sensitive. Previously we always thought that these were areas far away from any skirmishes, from any borders where there could be any trouble. Now with the Indian Ocean becoming activated in a rather belligerent move recently, our coasts will have to be guarded. Therefore, we are going to face in the next two or three years a rather difficult period and we will have to be very cautious. This is a point which I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister and I would request him to say what we are doing in that region.

15.29 hrs.

[SHR] SOMNATH CHATTERJEE *in the Chair*]

Coming to Kampuchea, it is constantly mentioned that after we recognised Kampuchea, no other nation has recognised it. Firstly, it is not a correct statement because Algeria recognised Kampuchea after the recognised Kampuchea. So, I would say

that Members should arm themselves a little better with information. But apart from that we had recognised Kampuchea after nearly two dozen countries already recognised Kampuchea. But I am not worried about the business of recognition. What I would like to put forward here is that as regards Kampuchea *vis-a-vis* India, what is it that we wanted? Did we want not to recognise this Government and support Pol Pot, who probably in history would compare with Chengiz Khan? Do you want to support that man? Dr. Swamy unfortunately is not sitting here. But whom does he want to support? The thing is that even the nations which are not supporting Heng Samrin are wanting to bring back Sihanouk or at least they want to create an atmosphere that Sihanouk should come back. Indirectly they admit that Pol Pot is not their horse any way. Somebody other than Pol Pot should be there, if not Heng Samrin. But the fact of the matter is that Heng Samrin is there, his Government is there but they are friendly with Vietnam. That is the important point. The allegation that this Kampuchea is a stooge of Russia is not correct. Yes, it is friendly with USSR, and it is friendly with Vietnam. Vietnam has helped them to get themselves rid of Pol Pot. Now, this is the equation before us. What do we want? If Vietnam had not done that and if Pol Pot had not been got rid of, whose presence would have been there? It will be Chinese presence. Would we prefer China to have their presence and influence over all these areas or would we prefer these countries to remain Independent? The Government may be a little friendly with Russia, but then we are friendly with Russia too. It is not a crime being friendly with Russia. If it is friendly with Russia, at least no direct intervention is possible, whereas in the case of China because they have been directly involved in that area, they would occupy these areas and create difficulties for us because we have not yet been able to normalise our relations with China. That is why we should do one thing. The

role that India should play is to see if we could bring about the Indo-Chinese States come closer in trade and economic relationship with the ASEAN nations, and that would in some way or the other make them a little closer to each other. In this way the tension in the whole area can be eliminated.

[Shri Jaideep Singh]

I feel that there are two or three things which I must mention here. Everybody has talked about various parts of the world. But the main thing that we all want to do is to see that we have a good, efficient Foreign Service, a good and efficient External Affairs Ministry. Nobody has suggested here that the External Affairs Ministry should be properly provided. Looking at the provisions made for the Ministry in the Budget, I notice that the expenditure we incur on the External Affairs Ministry annually is reduced and the expenses that have been incurred in all other countries on the Foreign Affairs Ministry are increasing. Now there is a situation. I have travelled to many parts of the world and I have seen that there is a situation where our diplomats are unable to match with the sort of work they are supposed to do in their area. Even a country like Pakistan spends per official twice as much as we do and therefore we are finding it very difficult, I personally think, it is necessary to provide more for our missions abroad at such a crucial time when we want extreme efficiency. Unless funds are provided, we are not going to be able to meet the challenge. Therefore, I would request the Minister to see and luckily the Finance Minister is also sitting here, that the Ministry is provided with more funds. I would finally wind up by saying, really speaking I feel that we should have more political clout. We are not having political clout. Many of our embassies are run abroad merely because they have to be there. Some sort of connection and trade has to be maintained. I think India should take positive stand, should have more efficient service, work with political clout and make India's

presence felt and establish its credentials in all parts of the world especially with West Africa and South America where I think we are rather very weak.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): I had the privilege to listen with rapt attention the speeches made by many hon. Members to-day. I listened to the speech of hon. Shri Biju Patnaik. I must say that it was really very amusing when the hon. Member Shri Patnaik in the concluding part of his speech said: 'you have been talking all along about Diego-Garcia and others, all along protesting against this and that. Nobody has listened to you. Therefore, be practical and do not bother about it.' I have all respect for him. But I could never believe that a former Minister supposed to be a capable man, who has been fortunately or unfortunately with us for a long time could say that and at the same time quote Gandhiji. He was quoting Mahatama Gandhi at the same time and saying if Gandhiji was there he would have said this, he would have done that. Do we not know what is happening in the Indian ocean and he himself said that this is happening? The situation there is not as it was two years ago. It is not there which was there one year ago. It is not so what it was six months ago. Every day greater tensions are developing there and that too openly. Not that secret affairs are going on there or somebody is doing something secretly. Even nuclear armaments are being taken there. My friend says, because nobody is listening to you, therefore, forget it. At the same time when he talks of Afganistan it is more amusing. He said, well this present Government has said that we do not like foreign troops in Afganistan. But he says, no, this is not enough and you have been changing positions and you have been inconsistent and so on and so forth. He said Mrs. Gandhi is not consistent and she has changed position. On the Afghan issue he said whatever you have said is not enough, be bold, be Gandhi, outrightly condemn it. But on Diego Garcia he says please keep quiet. I do not

know why he is blowing hot and cold at the same time. I do not say that there are parallels. The whole thing cannot be seen in isolation. What I respectfully want to say is, he appears to me to be confused and inconsistent on the foreign policy issue. Now we cannot see Afghan issue in isolation. Similarly we cannot see developments on our borders, Pakistan borders, Pakistan-Afghan borders in isolation. He made the issue over simplified. It is very interesting as he said if a few tanks are given or if a few missiles are given what is going to happen? Why do you say this? Why do you say that? What is the objection to you if U.S.A. is giving arms to Pakistan? Well, if we were to be armed by the U.S.A. what will Pakistan do? Is it not arming of neighbouring country with whom we had wars? This is not my opinion. This is the opinion of this nation. This was not an opinion of one party or the other. This was not an opinion of Mr. Biju Patnaik. This was the opinion of the whole nation that two wars were foisted on India by Pakistan.

Now, Pakistan is being armed for whatever reasons, may be adequately armed or inadequately armed, whether it is 400 million dollars or whether it is 800 million dollars. He said, "That is not of any concern to us. We should not say anything. You forget it and have friendly relations with Pakistan." It was the present Government and the party to which I have the honour and privilege to belong which had the Simla Agreement. The best possible steps were taken to normalise relations with Pakistan. We want normalisation of relations with Pakistan. But if America is offering arms to Pakistan, we have a natural fear that these arms would be used against us. If we express those fears and apprehensions, Mr. Biju Patnaik says, "This is wrong, please do not do it."

As I see the situation—I am expressing my own views—I do see, and I know there are some contradictions, that there is some kind of a link existing and it is some kind of an axis where America comes in, where China comes in, where Pindi

comes in, whatever their different motives may be, whatever their different intentions may be. Therefore, India has to see the situation in a correct perspective, in a proper perspective.

Then, Mr. Biju Patnaik said, "Take stands on principles." But he says, if it is a principled stand, inference by inference, he meant, it cannot be a practical stand. Every day, all of us belonging to different parties which talk of principles, we say, in principle, we are for this, but we can go so far and no further. India's stand, I wish to submit, both on Afghan issue and on the issue of Indian Ocean and in our relations to Pakistan, in our relations to Bangladesh, in our relations to other neighbours, and the world has been both principled and practical. This is what should have been done.

I take this opportunity to very warmly congratulate the Foreign Minister, Mr. Narasimha Rao, who recently had the privilege to chair the Non-Aligned Conference as the Foreign Minister of the host country and previously the UNIDO Conference where India's role as a peace builder, as a moderator, as a country trying to strengthen non-alignment movement, closer cooperation, trying to avoid confrontation and trying to ease tensions, was acclaimed not only by these nations but by and large all the world over. It is a matter of great honour for all of us in this House. There are leaders sitting on this side of the House also who have acclaimed that. I have read their statements. Therefore, I was rather surprised to hear the hon. Member, Mr. Biju Patnaik, accusing the Government of a big-brother attitude towards our neighbours.

What were the instances quoted? He said, in regard to Bangladesh, Farakka waters. Don't we need water for our Calcutta Port? If we say, we need it, does it mean we have a big-brother attitude? In regard to Pakistan, he said the same thing. We do not want to interfere nor our present Government want to interfere in the affairs of Pakistan. We wish Pakistan people well. We all know that even Pakistan people—

(Shri H. K. L. Bhagat)

I do not know whether I should say or not—I wish to say very clearly, today are not the masters of their destiny. They want complete peace in India as the people in India want complete peace in Pakistan. But you have a military dictatorship. He is having his own way. He is taking recourse to certain things.

That apart, what I wish to submit is that our present Government has been doing its best and a lot of behind-the-scene work was done. Our officers went from place to place. I must say, they did extremely well. We have some very capable officers in the Foreign Service who did their job extremely well and their job was appreciated. And I think India is playing a role which is worthy of this great nation. Running a country in foreign affairs, is not just like mathematics. It is like moving in very rough high seas particularly now when the world is developing new tensions in turbulent waters, in tumultuous times, people swimming across you, swimming against you in this direction, and that direction. Keeping the direction in view, you have to proceed and, I believe, that in conduct of foreign affairs, India has done extremely well and India could do better and nicely I am not going to compare this government's functioning in foreign affairs with the Janata. I just do not wish to compare it because I think that would be minimising the performance of this Government. I do not wish to compare. There is no comparison and the reason is obvious. Very rightly Shri Biju Patnaik said that for proper conducting of external affairs, you have to be internally strong and so on. You have to give an image. Our worthy Prime Minister has said more than once that India is not interested in becoming a leader of the world or becoming a leader of Asia, leading or becoming leader of this or that part of the world. She has very rightly said it. India certainly believes in the fundamentals of the policy of non-alignment, co-existence and all these

principles which we have cherished and for that India has to come forward and India can come forward with that strength, with that courage, that conviction which my friends may not like it. Mrs. Gandhi does not need any certificates. (*Interruptions*). I do not think Mrs. Gandhi needs those certificates. It was Dr. Henry Kissinger who said something. I do not count on a certificate. It was he who said, who gave his impressions about the strength, self-respect, dignity and courage and clarity with which Mrs. Gandhi dealt with when she had a meeting with the President of India in Kissinger's presence. (*Interruptions*). Whatever he might have written, it might suit you.

I am saying it because we have a capable, dynamic leadership which is clear about the purpose, clear about the direction of our foreign policy.

Now my friend was telling us about self-reliance. We are 60 million people. I asked: What are you doing? You did not answer this. What to do about them? And I do not want to remind him about what they did about them during three years.

Lastly, I support my friend Mr. Jaideep Singh who talked about the foreign service. I have a feeling that our foreign service, its recruitment, its curriculum and various other things need a second look so that we have very eminent people. I do not wish to minimise them at all. But I feel that it does need a second look so that you have people who have that special training and knowledge. It is not just Indian Administrative Service to take the same test and different papers and put one in the IFS and straightaway send them to the countries.

I feel the curriculum should be different. The test should be different and they should also be given some training at the base in India so that they are attuned to the Indian conditions. A foreign service consisting mainly the elite only, governed by Western traditions, thinking in

the old way. I do not think that they can wholly or even substantially deliver the goods. Then our staff which goes to our Missions, they must be adequately trained. Now we learn here German, we learn here French and so many other languages. Why not learn other languages more adequately? The Japanese. We have a complex and we cannot avoid it, the super-power complex between them, between Russia and America. So, they are there. But there are other countries which have progressed, which are very important, countries like France, Japan, Germany and various other countries. Our Government has improved relations with them, strengthened relations with them. Our emphasis should shift more on them, more on their languages, more on relations with them and so on.

With regard to Africa also, we have given greater attention and we need to give still more greater attention and so also to the countries of South-East Asia.

I personally feel that the foreign policy is under no attack, nothing can attack it nor does it need any defence. It is the correct policy. It is being run in the correct manner. It is giving strength to the country. It is helping the other nations to the extent possible. India's image is going high. But we are not interested in merely our image going high, we are interested in the solution of problems. On the Afghan issue, the stand which we had taken helped in avoiding confrontation, if we had taken a stand which would have added to confrontation and tension, naturally the situation would have been worse.

With these words, I very strongly support the conduct of foreign policy by the Ministry of External Affairs.

\*SHRI T. NAGARATNAM (Sri-perumbudur): Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to participate in the discussion on the Demands for Grants

of the Ministry of External Affairs for the year 1981-82.

Sir, when I was going through the Annual Report of the Ministry for 1980-81, I got the feeling that this Report was just a chronicle of foreign visitors, dignitaries and other officials of foreign governments coming to India and in reciprocation our dignitaries visiting those countries, as a continuation of our efforts to build up mutual relations. It is axiomatic that as a country wedded to democracy we should exchange such visits in the interests of our country. But that is not all. The success of a foreign policy of any country is not merely in enunciating the basic tenets and not merely in exchanging such visits. The success of the foreign policy is judged by the concrete results that such a foreign policy yields.

On page 21 of the Annual Report there is reference to the continuing happy relations with Arab countries. But, the Arab countries are assiduously assisting Pakistan in making 'Islamic Bomb'. Similarly, on another page of the Report there is reference to cordial relations with Sri Lanka. But it has come in the newspapers that Sri Lanka is giving a naval base for American warships. When confronted with this question, Sri Lanka is wriggling out of the situation that it is giving place for a rest and recreation centre for the American Naval fleet in the Indian Ocean. We are frequently talking about our sticking scrupulously to the policy of non-alignment. But, what is happening in the countries belonging to the non-aligned Group? In Singapore and Malaysia, the people of Indian origin are being treated in a callous manner. The places of workshop of Indians have become the victims of the vandalism of the local people.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR (Gorakhpur): Sir, on a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the bell be rung . . . Now there is quorum.

\*The Original Speech was delivered in Tamil.



The hon. Member, Shri Nagaratnam, may continue.

**SHRI T. NAGARATNAM:** As I was saying, the places of worship of the Indians have been destroyed in a calculated manner. Just three days before, the Singapore Government hanged to death a young man aged about 30 years hailing from U.P., in spite of our Government's pleas for the reconsideration of such a punishment for a petty crime. The Government of Singapore did not pay heed to the request of the Government of India and the young boy was hanged to death for a small crime. The people of Indian origin in other countries should be assured of security to their life and property. In the beginning of Iraq-Iran conflict, many Indians were caught unawares and it was reported in the Press that some had died in this clash. But the unfortunate part of this sordid conflict is, that our own Ambassadors failed miserably to protect the lives of Indians living there. There was a graphic account in a leading Tamil Weekly about the hardships undergone by four families hailing from Tamil Nadu who wanted to come away from Iraq on their own, without any help from our Ambassador there. It should be the primary duty of our Ambassadors that they give protection and security to the lives of Indians living in those countries.

I would like to refer to the American-Chinese axis which poses a serious threat to the sovereignty of our country. One side Pakistan is being armed with sophisticated weaponry worth several hundreds of billions of dollars. On the other sides, it is reported that Bangla Desh is getting arms and war machines from China, which is the major trading partner. In October 1980 our Commerce Minister was in Dacca for negotiating foreign trade. We could not buy all the jute produced in Bangla Desh. But China is buying all the jute produced in Bangla Desh. When trade relations are strengthened, it is concomitant that

political influence gets the upper hand.

Probably these developments have compelled our Prime Minister to warn the country of impending dangers from unexpected quarters.

16 hrs.

On page 34 of the Annual Report a mention is made about our growing relations with Yugoslavia. But it is strange that Yugoslavia should go back on its contractual obligations and refuse to supply ships to India because of escalation of costs. This does not redound to the credit of the successful foreign policy of our country. Again on page 36 the visits of American dignitaries to India and the return visits of our own dignitaries to the USA as a mark of understanding of the mutual needs. The visits have proved to be an exercise in futility because America is arming our neighbour Pakistan with modern weapons worth several billions of dollars, which may endanger nation's security any day.

Only the other day there was a discussion about the pitiable plight of refugees from Pakistan who are settled in Jammu. There was a Calling Attention Motion about the sufferings of 3000 families, who continue to be stateless even after 33 years. Here I would like to refer to the indignities and innumerable difficulties being faced by 5.5 lakhs of stateless people of Tamil origin in Sri Lanka. The 1964 Srimavo-Shastri Pact has expired on 31st October, 1979. The supplementary agreement between Mrs. Gandhi and Mrs. Bhandaranaike entered into in 1974 is also expiring on 31st October, 1981. After this day, what is going to happen to these 5.5 lakhs of stateless people of Tamil origin living for decades in Sri Lanka?

When we are seized of the pressing need for recognising the new Kampuchean Government, we do not seem to be interested in this human problem of gigantic proportions. In my constituency there are refugees

from Burma and Sri Lanka who have been reduced to beggary in the absence of alternative rehabilitation schemes for their livelihood. The hon. Minister of External Affairs should take personal interest not only in the repatriation of these people but also in the rehabilitation of lakhs of people.

In the interest of improving our relations and in our large-heartedness, we surrendered the sovereignty of Kachchathivu to Sri Lanka. Emboldened by this, the Naval forces of Sri Lanka harass the fishermen of Rameshwaram who go into the sea for fishing. They not only take their boats to the shores of Sri Lanka, offload them of the catches but also give a thrashing to these poor people and ask them to go back. The hon. Minister of External Affairs should take it up with Sri Lanka and ensure the safety and honour of our fishermen.

We have sent about 110 Hindi books to Mauritius. India is a nation of diverse cultures and is known for giving to the world the concept of unity in diversity. We have the federal set up also. We should send books in Tamil to Mauritius and Fiji Islands where there are any number of people of Tamil origin and knowing Tamil. Tamil is the oldest language in the country with a rich heritage, as has been acknowledged by our hon. Prime Minister in the Tamil Conference. Tamil Books should be sent to our Embassies in those countries where a sizeable section of the population knows Tamil. Similarly, books in Tamil about Buddha and Buddhism should be sent to our Embassy in Sri Lanka whose official religion is Buddhism. The people of Sri Lanka know Tamil and they should know about Buddha born in India and the sacred places of Buddhism in India. In the Embassies of our country abroad, at least one Officer should know the language of the people of Indian origin living in that country. It should also be their foremost duty to give protection

and security to the life and property of people of Indian origin living in those countries.

With these words I conclude my speech.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, after two and a half years of drift, distrotion and some spectacular buffoonery, our foreign policy has been nursed back to vitality. It has got the position it occupied before the Janata aberration in our political history. It is rather surprising that whenever opposition people start speaking, the one aim and the only aim perhaps is to find fault with all that has been done and, perhaps, they are not aware of the fact that our foreign policy is not based on *ad hoc* measures or expediency. It has emerged from our long struggle for Independence and through our experience of struggling against colonial rule. Therefore, our perception evolved according to our overall security needs, needs of the poor struggling people in the country and also as our Prime Minister has rightly pointed out on several occasions our foreign policy is inextricably, inevitably linked with our regional questions and also the global questions.

Sir, the global question, the international scenario, as we look at it, appears frightening. We are living at a time of nuclear balance of terror. It is strange world where we are face to face with thermo-nuclear annihilation. We have heard very powerful leaders in the world—the leader of the most powerful country today in the world—only about fifteen days back he was talking about world security and while talking about another superpower he used words like 'cheats' 'liars' and 'criminals'. The threat was that this verbal aggression will be backed by, if necessary, tactical nuclear weapons and a concept has been evolved, namely, limited nuclear warfare. We live in such a situation and when we look at our foreign policy percep-

[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

tions and formulations, then we become more and more convinced that in a world like today's our foreign policy stands the test of time because our foreign policy is based on non-alignment. Our foreign policy is not based on any short-term gains.

Sir, the names of Gandhiji and Jawahar Lal Nehru have been mentioned by Mr. Patnaik and other speakers who have preceded me. Sir, if you looked at our Freedom Struggle's history then you will find our basic principles of keeping clear of group alignments and a desire and yearning for peace all round and greater cooperation among the people of the world, constituted the very bedrock of our policy programmes. With your permission I would like to mention a few things in this Connection.

For example, Sir, as far back as 1922, Indian National Congress passed Resolution supporting the victory of Turkey on Joint-Anglo Greek intervention in their affairs. In 1924 we supported the Egyptian people in their struggle. In 1927 Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru, the maker of modern foreign policy of India went to Brussels to attend an International Congress against Imperialism and if you read his statements—against the backdrop of his statements—then India's foreign policy in relation to the world as a whole and regional question. I think, we will be able to put the present questions in correct perspective. With your permission, Sir, I will read out a portion of the statement which Pandit Nehru made on this occasion. I quote:

'India is a world problem. And, as in the past, so in the future, other countries and peoples—will be vitally affected by the condition of India. Both Egypt and other parts of Africa have suffered domination because British imperialism wanted to strengthen its hold in India and to protect its sea-routes to that country.'

So, the explanation that we seek today and the riddle that we want to solve, namely, the Indian Ocean, will be clear from this statement of

Pandit Nehru in 1927 when he said about this. Indian ocean was sought to be made a safe zone. It was called a 'Chief Zone', 'Chief Lane' of Imperial Britain. I will come to that later. But there is another statement of Pandit Nehru, and that too, on a very historic occasion. It was the occasion of the Congress session held at Lahore in 1929.

Pandit Nehru made a prophetic statement and said:—I quote:

'India was a part of the world movement. We cannot in our own interests and in the interests of the rest of the world afford to remain isolated from the great movements and forces which are shaping the future.'

'India's role as a non-aligned country has emerged from these perceptions of our great leaders. As the hon. Members of the House know, non-alignment has got four parameters. The first is *detente* development, disarmament and decolonisation. On all these fronts we have always struggled relentlessly. On de-colonisation I wish to say this. Mr. Patnaik is not here. He was saying that we have developed some cold-feet vis-a-vis this question. Right from our independence, and in fact even before that, we have been fighting against colonialism.

I can cite a few cases in support of my contention. In the matter of regional good-neighbourly relations, in 1947, Pandit Nehru called an Asian Relations Conference. Pandit Nehru was conscious of the advantages which would accrue and the advantages which India needed at that time through regional cooperation. In 1947 we whole-heartedly supported the struggle of the Indonesian people for freedom. In respect of the struggle of the people of Indo-China, we took a principled stand; and we lent muscle into the fighting arms of the Indo-Chinese people in their fight against colonialism and imperial domination. In the crisis of Korea also we took a principled stand and also in the Suez Crisis. On all these occasions we always took a principled stand. We

K K TEWARY

External Affairs

always took consistently principled stand against colonialism.

Mention has been made of our relations with our neighbours. I think it is proper that we go into what the Congress Government has done, before the interregnum or deviation in our political history from 1977 till 1979. It was under Mrs. Gandhi's leadership that Congress Government reached agreements on some basic questions, regarding citizens and border issue with Burma. In 1972 we had an agreement with Sri Lanka.

Sir, with Pakistan also from time to time we have been trying to improve our relations. With China in 1954 we entered into good-neighbourly relationship because we believed in the unity of the Asian people. Therefore in 1954 we extended our hand of friendship on the basis of the principle of *Panchsheel*. This principle of *Panchsheel* was chalked out or evolved, at that time. We know what China did subsequently. Even then, Sir, Mrs. Gandhi's Government has always tried to have cordial relations with China. That is also a part of history.

Within the short time at my disposal I will now concentrate on our relations with Pakistan. Why our relation with Pakistan is proving intractable? To me it seems right from the Fifties, to the present time, we are reminded of the Dullesian era, the era of global confrontation. Now it seems that in America Dulles's ghost is hovering on almost every roof-top. It was an attempt to divide people of the sub-continent that Pakistan was sought to be included as a member of the multi-national group, or a sort of Pact, which was called SENTO and SEATO subsequently. So, Sir, Pakistan from 1950 was sought to be delinked from India and Pakistan under pressure and brandishment was not allowed to have a proper perception of the reality of the defence or the foreign affairs policies or the economic development of the sub-continent as a unit. Sir, they are talking about the question of massive aid to Pakistan. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy was talking about the golden period

ushered in during Janata rule. I agree with him that Pakistan and India had become friendly during the Janata rule. Do you know the secret of it? I believe that this speaks volumes about the so-called golden period. Mr. Morarji Desai, the then Prime Minister of India, was as friendly with Mr. Zia as he was friendly with Mr. Carter. This explains that the Janata Party had accepted the perception of America *vis-a-vis* the subcontinent and they had made our perceptions, our long-term programmes and policies at international level subservient to the American designs in this region.

Now, Dr. Swamy was again talking about Pakistan being a small country, a weak country. He said that during Janata Government nothing happened in Pakistan. Perhaps he forgets very conveniently that it was during the Janata Government that about 2-1/2 billion dollars worth military aid was extended to Pakistan. It was during their regime that Pakistan acquired arms and ammunitions worth 2 billion dollars from America and other Western countries. It was during that period that Pakistan developed its nuclear capability and from the Western sources machines and material pilloined. Now, in the present circumstances, arming of Pakistan is a dangerous game and with this is related the question of Persian Gulf which has been converted into a Private fishing pond of America. If we are to look at the geography of Persian Gulf, the professed objective of America is a containment of Soviet Russia. Fortunately, it is not the containment of communism but it is the containment of Soviet Russia only and in the same breath they say that they are there to protect the interests of the Western powers and I think these two things are synonymous. But nothing has been mentioned about the interests of the local powers. The natural resources of the Gulf countries have been plundered by the imperialist countries.

Another aspect of this problem which arises to my mind is the question of Palestine. Now, a sort of alliance is sought to be propped up

[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

among the countries of this region led by Saudi Arabia. So, America thinks that in this region with the petrodollar country of Saudi Arabia the American arms and the well trained armies of Pakistan, they will be able to prepare a surrogate as they did in Iran. But unfortunately this is a tragic product of a very simplistic view of world history, a naivety which has absolutely no defence, it is indefensible. What they did in Iran is known to all of us. The Shah crashed. It was a part of an interventionist syndrome which led to many complications, led to their intervention in Vietnam where the longest and the most barbarous of war of human history was fought and the Americans were defeated there and they were thrown out of Vietnam and the same fate awaits them on this side also. They are talking about the defence of Persian Gulf. Tell me and I put the question to this House: what is the position of Persian Gulf and what is the position of Soviet Russia? Even from trans-caucasus region, if Soviet Russia tries to dominate over Persian Gulf. (*Interruption*). . . . If the attack is air-borne, they will have to cross a distance of about a thousand miles and with surveillance and espionage facilities of America, they will be vulnerable to air attack. If they come through Iran, the distance is a thousand miles again, with difficult terrain and insurmountable mountains. Only then they can go to oil-fields of Iran. Through Afghanistan, they have the same problem. If you look at the scenario, it seems that Russia does not make any military sense so far as Persian Gulf is concerned. The real intention of America and western countries, in so far as Persian Gulf is concerned, is to further subjugate the local countries. As it was done during the Kissinger's time, the plan has always been ready: their intention is to seize the oil-fields ultimately. Otherwise if America and for that matter other western countries want stability in the Middle-East, they would first address themselves to the question of Palestine the struggling people of Palestine. Without a solution to the Pales-

tinian question, there can be no stability in the Gulf region and that they are trying to push under the carpet.

I would now say a few words about the Indian Ocean. As I was telling you, the Indian Ocean has been a bone of contention, and it became a bone of contention not only recently, as someone was telling that it was only after the oil crisis that it has become a bone of contention. In fact if one goes through the history of this region, the Indian Ocean has been a matter of primary concern right from renaissance; right from the 16th century, the Great Powers had their eyes on the Indian Ocean. As I mentioned, it was the central lake, chief lake of British imperialism in India and in order to strengthen this imperialism in India, many littoral countries were subjugated. The Indian Ocean now poses a problem for peace. Because of Diego Garcia and the militarization of the Indian Ocean India feels concerned. India is the only country perhaps in this region with the longest coastline and now we feel very much vulnerable from naval threat.

Then, we have developed adequate technology to exploit all the sea resources, the resources which lie embedded in the floor of the sea. The hon. Foreign Minister and other hon. Members of the House know how Americans and their friends have sabotaged the law of the sea. It was promised earlier that the resources of the sea will be treated as the heritage of mankind. They have sabotaged it and they are passing legislation in their individual countries to go in for exploitation of these resources. This is the world scenario.

So far as the Third World countries are concerned, you can very well remember that now the famous democratic laboratories for the western world are Chile, Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil, Pakistan, Elsalvador and South Korea, etc. These are the modern democratic laboratories for the western countries. They supported Sygmund Rhee of South Korea. Col. Batista of Guba and Yahia Khan of Pakistan. For them, the freedom means this.

Before I conclude, I would quote one statement of Mr. Reagan. This is how, the free world is sought to be bolstered up and defended. This is a very famous speech about South Africa, the racist, apartheid regime which has been decimating the people of Namibia and Mozambique and has killed thousands of freedom fighters in South Africa. Mr. Reagan says:

"Can we abandon a country (South Africa) that has stood by us in every war we have fought, a country that is strategically essential to the free world."

This is the statement of leader of the so-called free world. In these circumstances, as my friend suggested earlier, our strength lies in protecting the interest of the third world countries, whether they are countries of Africa, or of Asia or Latin America. There should be greater cooperation, greater interdependence in terms of economic development, in terms of transfer of resources, in terms of transfer of technology etc.

Shri Patnaik just now mentioned that the World Bank and International Monetary Fund assistance is getting depleted. Why? Let him answer. Recently, America is encouraging that these institutions will not give assistance to the developing countries and they are withdrawing their support and encouraging bilateral relationship so that political pressure may be put on developing countries.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA (Amritsar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the main thrust of arguments of Mr. Swamy and Mr. Biju Patnaik was that India's foreign policy is no good, Janata policy was a golden policy and specially with regard to Afghanistan and Kampuchea they were very critical.

Sir, with regard to Afghanistan our position is very clear. The Prime Minister has said a number of times that we are against all kinds of foreign troops in other countries. That is very clear. But we were also against the pressures on those countries. They would have been very happy if we would have condemned the Army of Soviet Russia entering Afghanistan, but they do not want us

to also say about the pressures on Afghanistan which had created conditions because of which Russian forces have gone there.

Sir, the main question is what is in the interest of India? Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has very clearly said we are neither pro-East, nor pro-West. We are pro-India. What is in the interest of India so far as Afghanistan is concerned. It is the secular and socialist Afghanistan which is friendly to India, not the theocratic, extremist Afghanistan. This is in our national interest.

SHRI MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Sovereign Afghanistan.

SHRI R. L. BHATIA: Yes, sovereign, without outside interference of any kind. Sir, we have got traditional relations with Afghanistan. We want that Afghanistan should decide its own future in the manner that they want. Mr. Dost Mohammad has also said that the Russian forces will go the next day when all these pressures against Afghanistan are withdrawn.

Similarly, Sir, with regard to Kampuchea our position is very clear that we wanted stability in Kampuchea. Pol Pot regime was killing people. Genocide was there and the foreign countries were aiding and abetting that situation. By recognising Kampuchea, now there is no massacre. The Government has stabilised and the same situation arises as that of Afghanistan. Kampuchea under the present set up of Heng Samrin is a friend of India and Kampuchea under other regimes, would have been the extension of hegemony and extension of colonialism against which India has fought throughout.

Sir, with regard to situation in this region every nation has its problems and prospects either based on history or on heritage or the location in the globe.

The late Prime Minister Nehru's dream was to break out of the limitation of heritage and the colonial rule and create for India a situation in Asia as well as in the world where it could play a prominent role in the

comity of nations. How much India could achieve is a matter of opinion, but what India could not achieve was significantly a factor of its environment. India had to live with aggressive China with a border of 2,500 miles and on the other side, hostile Pakistan. And now a new dimension has been added to this situation—the Diego Garcia. America is building up Diego Garcia into the biggest nuclear naval base in the world posing a direct threat to our country. Sir, this is a situation which is prevailing around us.

Now coming to China, I would like to say that China has always been mocking at our philosophy of peace and non-alignment. They have been directly or indirectly interfering in our affairs. They have in many ways interfered in our affairs in the Eastern direction. In 1962 they directly attacked us, and they have always been posing a threat to our internal security. So long as China believes in revolution as a way to freedom, and believes in aggression in the case of disagreement, there is no possibility of having normal relations with it. China believes in pressurizing; and they have always been threatening their neighbours. The example of Vietnam is there before us, as also the invasion of India in 1962, and the threatening attitude against India in 1965 and 1971.

The dramatic posture of threatening us is the instrument of foreign policy of China. They have always been posing a threat to others, and have been pressurizing others. That has been the foreign policy instrument of China. So long as China has this kind of a posture towards its neighbours, there is no possibility of having any kind of normal relations with it whatsoever, their ping-pong diplomacy or sending acrobatic teams is not enough indication that they want friendship with India. If they are sincere, and if they want friendship with us sincerely, they must remove the impediments which stand in the way of a good friendship. But we don't see any such indication. That is why Mr. Vajpayee also fell into their trap. He looked at the situation casually, and

he jumped to a conclusion; and the result was that India got a bad name. I think, he was also sorry for it.

Coming to Pakistan, it is unfortunate that after the Simla and Delhi agreements under which an atmosphere of friendship between the two countries developed, and normalization had taken place, Pakistan has again started acquiring arms on a big scale. While a normal acquisition of arms needed for their requirements can be understood, the size of arms which Pakistan is acquiring is a matter of concern to us. They have been getting arms from China and from America; and getting a sizeable amount of money from the Middle East countries, to purchase those arms.

This acquisition of arms has to be seen in the context of a situation where Mr. Haig says that they are arming countries right from Pakistan to Egypt. So, Pakistan will be acting as a stooge of America. If Pakistan had acquired arms by its normal requirement, it is a different matter; but its acquiring of arms exceeding its requirements and acting as a stooge of America, and as a part of America's global strategy, is a point which we should take into consideration. It is a matter of concern to us.

Pakistan argues that it is acquiring arms for three reasons. Firstly, Pakistan has a responsibility in the Middle East. They have to act as a police man in case of emergency, to Saudi Arabia. Secondly, because India is acquiring arms, they are also acquiring them. Thirdly, they cite the situation in the Afghan frontier. For these reasons they want to have arms.

With regard to Afghanistan, it was discussed when Mr. Inderjit of INFA went to Pakistan and had an interview with Gen. Zia. The answer given by the latter was very clear. They are unable to fight Russian forces. Gen. Zia also mentioned India as the enemy of Pakistan. So, it is in this context that we are considering the acquisition of arms by Pakistan; and it is a matter of grave concern to us. In the past, whenever Pakistan got arms, they inflicted ag-

gression on India. Every time, it was inflicted by Pakistan on India. Therefore, the acquisition of arms by Pakistan is a serious matter; and the Prime Minister is right when she expresses concern on this.

The role of China and Pakistan and the situation that has developed in the Indian Ocean, this regional and global situation is before us, and India has to find out a solution of the situation. I am confident that the quality of leadership that we have in India will certainly play its role in the foreign policy because foreign policy is also connected with our defence system and is a part of the defence policy.

This leadership was under challenge during the non-aligned movement recently in Delhi. I am glad to say that Indian leadership had proved matching to the situation that was before us. There were 93 countries with divergent views, with diverse problems and all that. There was a fear and it was the desire of some big powers also that this Conference should not succeed. I congratulate the Foreign Minister—he was the Chairman of that Conference—because he was able to display his skill, his leadership and the result was that there was a joint declaration. I appreciate that our officers who went from Capital to Capital to make a ground for that; and it was also the contribution of their labour which has resulted in the success of the Conference that was being held in Delhi.

In this complex situation and the global situation which is before us which has been explained by my friends earlier what India has to do? What are the options of India and what policy India should adopt to steer clear out of this situation? We are a non-aligned country and we have to make this movement a very strong movement. Among the non-aligned countries there should be a greater cooperation. In the non-aligned movement, we have got many countries which have got surplus in raw-material, skills in machine and

in capital. So, it is all that we must share with each other and try to make each one of us self-reliant. It is with this spirit if India moves forward, I am sure, India's geographical position and India's quality of leadership is in a position to give a lead to this movement.

Secondly, I would like to say that we must cooperate with the countries which believe in peace and in detente. We had seen in the past that Russia had been trying to bring about a situation of peace and normalcy in dealing with other countries. They were successfully able to bring about a treaty of peace in Europe. They tried to have an agreement with America in SALT I; they had also an agreement with SALT II which unfortunately could not be satisfied by America.

Again Mr. Brezhnev while he was here in Delhi said about 5 point peace programmes for Gulf area. He had also said that they were ready to talk about Afghanistan. To the new regime in the White House, they invited them and they were ready for talks and no conditions have been insisted. So, here is a situation which we must watch, and India with its great influence must assist in this co-operation between the two Super Powers. They must try to bring about a condition and try to put their mite and help and see that the area of peace expands.

America is trying hard to bring tension to the world. Their intention is to see that the war does not take place in Europe; their intention is to see that the war does not take place in Pacific; they are concentrating on Gulf and Indian Ocean. It is this situation which we must watch; it is this situation which we must take into consideration and find a solution in cooperation with the socialist countries and other countries who want to have peace.

Lastly, it had been quoted by some of our friends like Mr. Biju Patnaik about India's geographical position and others had also said that our neigh-



[Shri R. L. Bhatia]

bours are afraid of India. He was talking about big brokerly treatment. But what can we do if India is huge in size? What can we do if we have a terrific population of 68 crores? It is a natural situation in which we are placed.

The idea to have cooperation with our neighbours is there. We are already doing it on a bilateral basis. It is a bilateral system which we may adopt with our neighbours. We must give them economic aid. We must give them confidence that we are friendly to them. But, I am afraid, they were supporting Pakistan and condemning India. This is what Mr. Swamy on the other day and our ex-Prime Minister were saying, that Pakistani tensions have been there and we have dealt with them for the last 32 years satisfactorily. It is due to their internal compulsions that they are opposed to us. It is the Government, Government after Government, one General after the other, they come, and they do not come by ballot. They are not elected by the people. The people of Pakistan like us. The people of Pakistan have no quarrel with India. It is the leaders due to their internal compulsions they are pointing towards India. They are enemical towards India.

Therefore, I request the hon. Minister that India must play its part in the non-aligned world. You should make this movement strong. India will feel stronger if the non-aligned movement is strong and secondly we must have cooperation with other countries, the socialist countries, and the countries who believe in peace and detente. In this regard I would say we need greater cooperation with Viet Nam, with Kampuchea, Russia and the socialist bloc.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Bombay North West): Mr. Chairman, speaking even on a subject as delicate as foreign policy, I cannot persuade myself to use the ambiguous and deceptive language of diplomacy. I must in accord with my nature call a spade a spade.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): You can use legal language.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In that case you will not follow.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I would like to summarise my speech at the outset before I dilate on what I am going to say. It is my firm conviction which I wish to share with this House and support it by evidence that our foreign policy is morally bankrupt. It is contrary and wholly contrary to international law. It is a betrayal of enlightened national interest and it is a frustration of the dreams of Gandhiji and the early promptings of Nehru's conscience that (*Interruptions*). To talk of morality in the context of foreign policy is to act stupidly at least so far as my friends on the opposite side are concerned. But let me recall for their benefit that as far back as 1924 Mahatma Gandhi laid down his conception, the dream which he had of the role of India in international affairs. He told us that India will be a medium through which international relations will be placed on a moral basis. India, he predicted will be the voice of a powerful nation seeking to keep under restraint all violent forces in the world and his spiritual heir Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in more sense than one, the architect of our foreign policy. (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: He was the political heir also.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I am talking of Nehru when he still was Nehru—and before the idealist, the vibrant idealist in him was supplanted by the realist in accordance with the teachings of the realist school of international diplomacy which came to be fashionable. Speaking as early as 1949 before the U.S. Congress, these are the words which he uttered:

'The objectives of our foreign policy are the preservation of world peace and the enlargement of human freedom.'

Speaking of the basis and the goal of our foreign policy he said: "We do not propose to acquiesce"—and these are words which I wish the Foreign Minister were here and he heard them, and heard them again and again:

"We do not propose to acquiesce in any challenge to man's freedom, from whatever quarter it may come. Where freedom is menaced or justice is threatened, or where aggression takes place we cannot be and shall not be neutral."

He told the Americans assembled through their representatives in the US Congress:

"Friendship and cooperation between our two countries are, therefore, natural. I stand here to offer both in the pursuit of justice, liberty and peace."

We have travelled a long way from the time when those words were uttered and I wish to judge the performance of the present Government in the context of what Gandhiji said in 1924 and what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said in 1949. Sir, there is an intimate relationship between the goals of domestic policy and the pursuit of foreign policy. What are our proclaimed domestic ideals? Our proclaimed domestic ideals are—if our pronouncements have any credibility and have any value or truth—democracy, secularism and socialism. Writing recently in the latest issue of a publication which the External Affairs Ministry brings out for our benefit a jurist, a distinguished representative from Sri Lanka, Shri Shahul Hameed, says:

"In Sri Lanka, where the teachings of the Buddha have profoundly influenced our history and culture, we have today evolved a political philosophy which seeks to build a fair and just society—a Dharmista Society. Our foreign policy is a reflection of this concept."

If we proclaim democracy as the goal of our domestic policy, I want to

ask the Minister, and I do not wish to have the answer because the answer will embarrass him, I want to ask, in the pursuit of our foreign policy, to what extent have we tried to cultivate democracy and to increase and extend the frontiers of democracy? The answer is a depressing 'No'. We have done nothing to cultivate the democratic countries of the World. We have never proclaimed our international commitment to the furtherance of democracy and the free way of life. By constantly trampling upon the interest of democratic countries, we have turned all democratic countries today into at best lukewarm friends and at worst sulking ex-friends, who perhaps would enjoy our discomfiture.

Is it or is it not true that our best friends are those countries whose Governments are based upon religion and whose internal policies disclose nothing but religious intolerance and hatred? We have done nothing to single out those countries which practise the secular way of life and cultivate warm friendship with them. We proclaim historic ties of friendship with ruling cliques which are primitive and feudal in character. In fact, we feel ill at ease in the company of those countries and Governments which practise democratic socialism.

My friend, Shri Banatwalla, has tabled a few cut motions. Mr. Foreign Minister, I am only anticipating. He will advise you to take some more despicable steps in that direction. I hope you will do nothing to make your contribution to the destruction of civilised centres of socialism and free voluntary socialism, the bibbutz and moshavs. He will advise you to keep company with petty chieftains and petty profligates, their prolific progeny, both legitimate and illegitimate and some day, if you follow his advice, you may end up by building harems for the chieftains of that area.

Sir, the Janata Government may not have done anything in the field of foreign policy. But I want to ask

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

one question. At least the Janata Government ratified the UN Covenants dealing with political and civil rights, economic and cultural rights—covenants which were crying for ratification from 1966. The United Nations brought them into effect in 1966. And 1966 was the tragic year of Mrs. Gandhi's advent to power in this country. Until the time the Janata Government came into power nobody was courageous enough to open up our society to international inspection. A free society has nothing to hide. And not one word has either Mrs. Gandhi or her distinguished Foreign Minister ever said by way of praise by way of acknowledgment. Whatever else the Janata did or did not do, at least we signed those covenants and we have made the democracy and human rights a little more safe or a little less unsafe than they were before the Janata Government came into power. I now deal with our friendship with the Soviets. I recognise the tremendous advantages of that relationship. I know that we have to be grateful to the Soviets for a few things that they have done in the past. If our friendship is genuine and if our friendship is not that of a sycophant I hope, occasionally the Foreign Minister will pick up the moral courage to remind the Soviets of the obligations of the Helsinki Accord, of the constant breaches of the Helsinki Accord the constant persecution of dissenters in that area and the perfection of new and subtle methods of psycho-physiological torture which are developed and deployed behind the iron curtain. At least I believe that Pandit Nehru would be proud of the Janata performance if he had heard that we had signed the UN covenants relating to human rights. But these gentlemen are at liberty to praise themselves or what they have achieved. I am afraid, I at least, do not share that praise which they have for themselves.

Coming to Pakistan, for long years since 1947 Pakistan was an aligned country, not a non-aligned country. Pakistan was squarely with the Western Bloc. Yet, only the blind and dishonest can deny the performance of the Janata Government that during the Janata regime Pakistan applied for and obtained admission to the non-aligned movement. For the first time, Pakistan saw the horror of being in the CENTO and SEATO. It is during the Janata's cultivation of Pakistan that it saw the benefits of being non-aligned and it became a member of the non-aligned movement which it continues to be till today. We realised that if Pakistan has to be non-aligned, its fears may be illegitimate, maybe irrational, maybe unjustified, are a reality which have to be taken care of. You cannot blame Pakistan for not being as stupid as we are. If a super power comes and masses its troops and armaments upon our borders, I think, only a fool will say that he sees no danger in massing of these troops across the frontier. I am not a great admirer of General Zia. But you do not have to be his admirer to appreciate that even General Zia can entertain legitimate fears, "look, this super power is now ensconced very comfortably only a few miles away from my border; there is danger." Everybody says that Pakistan is unable militarily to cope with the Soviet menace. Nor is India militarily capable of beating the Soviet menace. What then is the cause or the basis of this unconscious assumption that Russia will not some day decide to walk through the sub-continent? Is it or is it not true that to walk from Kabul to Colombo is much easier then to start your walk across the Afghan frontier? You have made things easy, and now things are easy. Whereas the dangers of Pakistan being armed by the United States cannot be overlooked, cannot be over-rated, yet my grievance is, by our immoral conduct we have forfeited the moral right to complain

about Pakistan arming itself and the United States arming Pakistan. If we had told Pakistan that "we recognise the legitimacy of your fears, and you and we together will exert our moral influence in this sub-continent and at least ask the Russians to withdraw" it would have meant something. But I have never heard a more stinking nonsense than this that nobody can get Russia out of Afghanistan; therefore, let us not tell them to get out of Afghanistan.

A man who depends upon the Gandhian moral force should at least have the moral courage to stand by his spine and on his two legs and say "this is wrong". Let the consequences be what they are. That is what Gandhiji taught us, and that is what Biju said; I do not consider him to be a great heir of Gandhiji, but at least in his own way he was saying exactly what Gandhiji said. We do not have to worry about the military weakness; we have to exert our moral and spiritual authority on the aggressor and call a spade a spade and want the aggression to be vacated with all the spiritual and moral vigour that we are capable of.

It is no secret that while we were courting Pakistan, we dinned into Pakistan's ears the need for satisfying three conditions; the conditions were that the General must lift press censorship, he must legitimatise the political activity and hold parliamentary elections, even on a limited franchise, but hold them by next year. The policy which we have now followed is, that we have driven back Pakistan into her old ways. It may be wrong, it may be a tragic error but, nevertheless, it is an understandable behaviour on the part of Pakistan, and it is our stinking immorality and moral cowardice that are responsible for the action which Pakistan is either compelled to take, or perhaps it was wanting to take, and we have now given it a justification.

16.58 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The third point which I wanted to make is that our policy towards the Soviet Union is terribly short-sighted, it is almost suicidal. I have already mentioned it, and all that I have to add is: imagine a scenario in which the other Super-power develops a new Monroe Doctrine of its own and says "to hell with the Asians; we are not going to participate in their quarrels; let them be over-run; let the whole of Asia become Communist. But we will stick to our own American sub-continent". At that stage, in that mood, when the other Super-Power retires into its own shell, if it is decided by Russia to walk through the sub-continent, what is there to prevent it? The only satisfaction that Mrs. Gandhi will have is that she will not be on the scene any longer to witness that tragedy, to which India is being exposed.

The fourth point which I wish to talk about is that today the Russians are about to suppress the human freedom by moving their tanks and other armaments into Poland. In the past such things have happened. Hungary and Czechoslovakia are conspicuous illustrations of what happened in the past. And they are not only conspicuous illustrations of the Soviet aggression, but they are also conspicuous illustrations of the moral cowardice which this country has not yet been able to live down; the infamy of these incidents we have not yet been able to live down. Today thousands and thousands of workers in Poland have got up and they are trying to flex their muscles and achieve a little bit of autonomy and freedom from the heel of the aggressor; achieve a little bit of autonomy and betraying the same immoral attitude, which we had in 1958, and thereafter we had in 1968?

I hope that the Foreign Minister, if he calls himself a Gandhian, will pick up at least some courage and once again call a halt to this diminution

of the frontiers of freedom, for Gandhiji taught us about the expansion of the frontiers of freedom and Nehru had taught commitment to human dignity.

Our distinguished young friend from Guna has told us: let us now recapture the spirit of *detente*. When a panther, lion or tiger, or any carnivorous animal has enough in its belly, and it settles down in the corner, while it is trying to digest what it has swallowed up, it always talks of peace, because that is the time when peace is vital to the person's digestion.

17 hrs.

And, Sir, we are witnessing peace offensives and calls for revival of *detente* only because these are intervals between two acts of ignominious aggression and the world is slowly *acquiescing* in aggression. (Interruptions). Let us not forget the lessons of 1962. Let us not forget that your great architect of foreign policy for whom I have respect despite his failures at least confessed publicly that his foreign policy was in shambles, and he confessed publicly that he had been living in a world of illusions. The trouble is that your foreign policy is again in shambles, but there are no people as great as Nehru to acknowledge that the foreign policy has failed. The trouble is that Nehru was not surrounded by too many cyclophants. This is an age of cyclophancy. Nobody is prepared to get up and speak the truth and say that the foreign policy is in shambles and if you want to know, the most conclusive evidence of the foreign policy of yours being in total shambles is the very event of which you proudly boast of and that is the recent Non-aligned Conference. Is it or is it not true that at this Non-aligned Conference you wanted to condemn, and one-sidedly condemn, Diego Garcia, but you were prevented by lesser powers than you and you had to drop that allusion? Is it or is it not true that you were not prepared

to speak one word about withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan but you were compelled by smaller powers to do so in the final Declaration that you issued? And, Sir, is it or is it not true that today India has alienated itself from the two other co-founders of the Non-aligned movement? Yugoslavia, a smaller country, has the moral courage to stand up to the giant and say that 'you have no business to be in Afghanistan and you will go', and we do not show even that much moral courage. Egypt is another co-founder of the Non-aligned movement. Today our relations with that one single great Arab country which is the seat of culture and learning and which is the most civilised Arab country in the world, are at the lowest bottom and at the lowest ebb and we are tied up with petty chieftains because we feel uncomfortable in better company and we feel comfortable only in this company about which I have described.

I say, therefore, that today our foreign policy is a betrayal of the people of Pakistan, it is a betrayal of the people of Afghanistan, it is a betrayal of all our commitments which are essential to our policy of non-alignment and, Sir, the national interest of India is being sacrificed, the long-range national interests of India are being sacrificed to the machinations and the aggressive designs of one super power which somehow has ingratiated itself with the present Government and the Prime Minister.

Sir, on the occasion of Mr. Brezhnev's visit, speaking on the floor of this Lok Sabha, Mrs. Gandhi uttered a sentence which I think everybody must sit down and ponder over. She told this august assembly that 'we believe in the value of Indo-Soviet friendship and therefore, in the pursuit of good neighbourly relations we ensure that those relationships are never jeopardised'. Sir, this is a confession, a stinking confession, a cowardly confession that our friendship

with our neighbouring countries is subject to the Soviet veto. So much have we travelled from the times of Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru that we have today mortgaged the independence of this large nation, this mighty nation of Gandhi and Jawaharlal, to the whims of one supreme power, the Soviet power. And for what? One has to analyse and investigate these causes. The short time which my party gets is not enough for this probe. It is not enough for investigation and exposure. But it will be very interesting exposure.

श्री एम. राम गोपाल रेड्डी (निजामाबाद): डिप्टी स्पीकर सर, अभी हमारे जेठमलानी जी को जो भाषण हुआ है वह बहुत अच्छी अंग्रेजी में हुआ है। वह ऐसा अंग्रेजी में हुआ है कि अंग्रेज और अमेरिकन दोनों के कान काट सकते हैं। ऐसी भाषा में हुआ है। उन्होंने जिस भाषा का इस्तेमाल किया है वह अग्रमानजनक है और उसमें इस देश का अग्रमान हुआ है, इट्रेस्ट को नुकसान पहुंचा है। आज तक किसी ने भी इस हाउस में इस किस्म का भाषण नहीं दिया। इसके बारे में ज्यादा कहना अच्छा नहीं है क्योंकि यह देश के अग्रमान की बातें हैं और उन तरह की बातें हवा में घूमती रहती हैं।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:  
Nation is higher than the Prime  
Minister. (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: 'Desh'  
is higher than you or all of you to-  
gether.

श्री ए० राम गोपाल रेड्डी : आप दो मिनिट बैठिए। हमारे चत्वारण जी भी शुरू में आब्रिदर तक यहाँ बैठे रहे हैं। वे हमारे फाइनेंस के मिनिस्टर रहे हैं, एक्म-टर्नल के मिनिस्टर रहे हैं। उनमें भी ऐसे अपशब्द इस्तेमाल करने की शक्ति नहीं है।

(अध्वधान) दंडवते जी और मिसिज दंडवते जी को ऐसा नहीं कहना चाहिए, और कइँ तो कोई बात नहीं है। मैं उनकी परवाह नहीं करता। (अध्वधान)।

हमारे वीजू पटनायक जी ने जो भाषण दिया, उसमें एक बहुत अच्छा नुस्खा दिया कि बंगलादेश की फरकवादी का पानी दे दो पाकिस्तान जी मांगता है वह उनको दे दो। फिर आब्रिदर में क्या रह आयेगा? जिस तरह में जनता पार्टी के जितने टुकड़े हो गए हैं। उसी तरह में देश के टुकड़े हो जायेंगे। इस वास्ते जरा साव समझ कर बोलना चाहिए। अगर उन्होंने इस तरह का भाषण यहाँ देने के बजाय उड़ीसा में दिया होता, हुगली नदी के किनारे पर जा कर दिया होता तो वे किनारे पर होने के बजाय नदी के अन्दर होते। इसलिए इस किस्म की बातें नहीं करनी चाहिए।

एक्मटर्नल की जितनी पालिसी इन्दिरा जी ने हमारे देश के सामने रखी है वे सब सही हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि 1971 की जंग में अमेरिका के खिलाफ और दूसरे मुल्कों के खिलाफ उन्होंने जो हिम्मत दिखाई वह आज तक किसी ने नहीं दिखाई। अमेरिका ने हमारे खिलाफ सेवन्थ फ्रीट भेजा तो भी इन्दिरा जी डरी नहीं। उन्होंने उस समय का कि अगर सारे मुल्क भी एक हो जाएं तो भी परवाह करने वाले नहीं हैं। उनकी पालिसी की वजह से उस समय हिन्दुस्तान की जंग में जीत हुई और बंगलादेश मुक्त हुआ।

अब तक पाकिस्तान में डिक्टेटरशिप से क्या फायदा हुआ है? अगर उस जमाने में याहिया खान रहते तो पाकिस्तान का सात

हजार मुरब्बा मील एरिया हमारे पास रहता और उसके एक लाख कैदी हमारे पास रहते । लेकिन हमने वहाँ के इलेक्ट्रिक प्राइम मिनिस्टर से नेगोशियेशन कर के हमने उनकी जमीन को छोड़ा और उनके प्रिजनर्स को लौटा दिया । यह बात हमारे अपोजिशन के मेम्बर क्यों भूल जाते हैं ? एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मन्जेक्ट पर बात जरा सोच समझ कर करना चाहिए ।

चह्वाण जी भी बोलने में कोई कम नहीं हैं । वे भी बोलने वाले हैं । हमारे एक्सटर्नल मिनिस्टर साहब जी यहाँ पर रिपोर्ट दिये हैं, उस रिपोर्ट में बहुत अच्छी अच्छी बातें कहीं गई हैं । उन्होंने कहा है कि हमारे दूतावास के उपर 41 करोड़ रुपया खर्च हो रहा है जो कि रिजनेवल हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि इसको रिजनेवल नहीं कहना चाहिए । अगर हमारे दूतावासों को आपको रिजनेवल बनाना है तो उन पर कम से कम हुए सो करोड़ रुपया खर्च करना चाहिए । उपाध्यक्ष जी, आप भी देखें, हमारे दूतावास में लोग कितनी मेहनत से काम करते हैं । वहाँ के बच्चों के मुताबिक हमारे लोग थोड़ा खर्चा करते हैं । आपको मालूम है कि महंगाई को वहाँ पर क्या हालत है । एक हेयर-कटिंग का 50 से 80 रुपया तक लगता है । बहुत से बच्चों ने तो सेलून तक नहीं देखा है —

Young wives are doing hair-cut for their husbands.

बूढ़े लोगों का क्या होगा । एक कप चाय के 15 से 30 रुपये लगते हैं । एक बार विदेश में एक मित्र के साथ चाय पी, वहाँ

पर चाय के 12 रुपये लगे तो मित्र ने कहा कि यहाँ चाय बहुत सस्ती है । मैंने कहा कि मैं जमींदार आदमी हूँ, 12 रुपये में मेरे यहाँ हफ्ते भर चाय बनती है और यहाँ एक कप का 12 रुपया लगा है, फिर भी कह रहे हैं कि सस्ती है । इन कठिनाइयों में हमारे कर्मचारी वहाँ पर जीवन-यापन कर रहे हैं । इसके लिए मैं विदेश मंत्री जी को लिख चुका हूँ, इन बातों पर ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए । वहाँ पर कर्मचारियों को हर देश की भाषा सीखनी पड़ती है । अगर पेरिस में जाते हैं तो फ्रेंच सीखनी पड़ती है, ईजिप्ट आते हैं तो अरेबिक सीखनी पड़ती है, स्पेन में स्पेनिश सीखनी पड़ती है, दुनिया को जितनी जगहों हैं, उनको वे सीखना पड़ती हैं । हमारे नौजवान अफसर साखते हैं, ठीक हैं, लेकिन उनके बच्चों का क्या होगा । तीन साल कुवैत में, तीन साल पेरिस में, तीन साल इंग्लैंड में रहे तो उन बच्चों के बारे में सरकार का सोचना चाहिए । बच्चे अगर बड़े हों तो कहीं भी होस्टल में रखा जा सकता है, लेकिन जो यंग आफिसर्स हैं, उनके छोटे बच्चों के लिए कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है । आज हमारे कर्मचारी वह पर संगठन बना रहे हैं, यहाँ तक कि बंगलादेश और पाकिस्तान एग्जिम्प्ल के लोग भी उनके सदस्य बन रहे हैं, वे सब लोग आपस में मिल कर बैठते हैं और हिन्दी में बोलते हैं । पिछली बार हम लोग जेनेवा में गए थे तो वहाँ पर "द्वीणाचार्य" नाटक उन लोगों द्वारा पेश किया गया, वह नाटक इतनी अच्छी तरह से पेश किया गया था कि अगर वही नाटक यहाँ पर पेश किया जाता तो 6 महीने तक उसका टिकट ही नहीं मिलता । इतनी मोहब्बत से वे लोग पेश आते हैं । इस तरह से हमारे दूतावासी देश की इज्जत बढ़ा रहे हैं; देश का नाम ऊंचा कर रहे हैं । जब कभी हमने उनसे बात की हमने उनसे कहा —

We are the representatives of the people. हमारा तो

कुछ नहीं होने वाला, ज्यादा से ज्यादा क्या होगा कि उनका हार जाएंगे, लेकिन अगर आप लोग नहीं गलती करते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर बर्खा लग जाएगा। हमारे विदेश मंत्री महाशय को उनकी मुसीबतों की ओर ध्यान देना चाहिए। पैस का क्या है, जहाँ 20 हजार करोड़ रुपये का बजट है, बढ़ता ही जा रहा है, वहीं इस मद में 0.40 परसेंट से घटकर 0.25 परसेंट हो गया है। यह क्यों हो गया है? मेरा निवेदन है कि वहाँ पर हमारे कर्मचारियों के बच्चों को पढ़ाई के लिए सेंट्रल स्कूलों में जाने चाहिए, इसमें उन देशों में बसे हुए दूसरे भारतीयों को भी लाभ होगा।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You went to foreign Embassies to see how Hindi can be used. But it seems you went there to collect grievances of the staff.

श्री एम० रामगोपाल रेड्डी : दूसरी बात यह है कि वहाँ पर हिन्दी को उन्नति के लिए कुछ विशेष नहीं कुछ किया जा रहा है। पूरा सुविधाएँ उपलब्ध नहीं कराई जाती हैं। टाइपराइटर है तो टायपिस्ट नहीं हैं, ये चीजें तो ऐसी हैं कि स्प्लॉट की जा सकती हैं। इतने लोगों को भेजते हैं तो एक हिन्दी स्टेनोग्राफर और टायपिस्ट की नेमिंग में क्या संभव है।

श्री मधु दण्डवते : कुछ लोग तो टाइपराइटर और टायपिस्ट का एक ही चीज समझते हैं।

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY: In the Report, it is stated:

"A proposal to introduce a new legislation on emigration has reached its final stages. The Bill is likely

to be introduced in Parliament shortly.

Another proposal to set up a manpower corporation in the public sector at the Central level to assist Indian job seekers in obtaining jobs abroad is also under active consideration of the Government."

Somebody wanted to prepare Ganapathy statue. By the time he has finished, it has become a monkey!

ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। इसमें कोई रिस्क नहीं लेना चाहिए।

एक्सटर्नल एफयर्स मिनिस्ट्री का न इकॉनॉमिक मिनिस्ट्री कहता हूँ।

The External Affairs Ministry, I like to call it as Economic Ministry. It is earning over Rs. 4,000 crores. They say it is invisible income. Why? In this great light, our Shri Venkataraman is not seeing that it is the money that is being sent by workers. It is not the agents that are doing this mischief. I have seen, I got several people arrested. I have written to External Affairs Ministry. I have written to Home Ministry, to the Police and to the External Affairs Ministry officers. They have taken very strong action. Immediately they arrested some people and one man was cheating from Kabul. By Interpol, I got him arrested. But, unfortunately that fellow had only a passport of Britain. That fellow could not be brought to this country. All of them, the unscrupulous people, they are not agents. Quietly they are doing. All such people should be immediately booked and brought under law and kept in jail under National Security Bill. National Security Bill is mainly intended for this purpose. I want Mr. Makwana to look into this aspect and see that justice is done. Our earnings would go up. During the last 3 or 4 months, our income has gone up tremendously. Over Rs. 300 crores we have touched, in this short period. He



[Shri M. Ram Gopal Reddy]

has got all these figures in this book. I want that those should go up. Our Finance Minister is assured of Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000 crores. If it is properly implemented, I am sure this amount will go up to Rs. 6,000 crores and we should have very few restrictions. There are so many restrictions. That is why the people are going to such unscrupulous people. The External Affairs Minister has stated in his statement that he is going to simplify, he has already simplified many cases, but it has further to be simplified so that people can easily go there and our Ambassadors and other staff should be kept informed.

Regarding functioning of our ambassadors, I cite only one example. In Kuwait, the war started. Our ambassador stood there and he arranged food for all the refugees that were coming to Iran and Iraq. Not only he had given food to our people but also he has arranged food even to Bangladesh and Pakistan people also. They are all grateful to us. In several countries like Bangladesh and Pakistan, people think they are Indian, they take pride that they are Indians. Our people have earned respect and prestige for our country and that is why I congratulate our External Affairs Minister. He has done brilliant work.

In his school days, I know that he had never thought of his examinations. He never studied his textbook. But he always stood first in his district. I was wondering at that time how he passed and mastered so many languages. By the time this Parliament is over, I am sure that he will learn all the languages of the world and will be helpful to this country.

I congratulate him and also congratulate Mrs. Gandhi for having selected such an eminent person for this job.

**SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN** (Satara): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am speaking at the end of the day

but there is one advantage that I am speaking after many people placed their points of view before this hon. House and I will have my share of putting my point of view.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** All is well that ends well.

**SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:** As far as the day is concerned, what Mr. Dandavate says is correct, all is well that ends well. That apart, I think that when we discussed this demand last year and when we are discussing this demand today, my mind goes back to the last one year, to what has happened in the world, in the neighbouring countries and in India itself. And there we see a considerable change of situation, in the world situation, in the regional situation and in the Indian neighbourhood. Things are getting troublesome. I would like to use some stronger terms for it, but I am using rather very soft term. It is a dangerous situation that we are facing today. Therefore, Mr. Foreign Minister, you have got a very tough job, and I must say at the beginning that it is the duty of this House and every one of us to support you and sustain you in this troublesome and difficult job. I am sorry, my friend, Mr. Ram Jethmalani, is not here. When I was hearing his speech, I left that I was hearing a speech of the Republican Senator of the USA. We have always considered the foreign policy of India to be a sort of policy of national consensus, and it has been so. I think, the House, last year, by and large, supported this point of view—when I also spoke on this and the House welcomed this. Now, what has happened in one year that the situation has so changed? Let us go into the whole matter.

Let us take the question of Afghanistan. I am not going to pay any compliments to an individual; I am trying to pay compliments to the country as a whole, as a national policy. Have we departed from our basic approach on non-alignment in this particular matter? No, we have

not justified the Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan. My Party has asked for its early withdrawal. I was seeing the Annual Report of this Ministry; as far as Afghanistan is concerned, he has said the same thing there. We do not want the intervention of any country in any other country. We want a sovereign Afghanistan, a Socialist Afghanistan, a friendly Afghanistan. Mark the word 'friendly' also. When we want a friendly Afghanistan, naturally the Soviet Russia also would expect that they should have a friendly Afghanistan. That is a different matter. We have not justified the Russian intervention. We have not also created a row, a meaningless row, about it. That is where the skill of running the foreign policy of a country comes in. Had we just merely joined the chorus of 'withdraw the Army' of some of the Western countries who, for the sake of formality, go on saying but who in private agree with what we are doing; this is my impression; the Foreign Minister may, perhaps, confirm it. Some of the Western countries except the U.S.A. and perhaps the U.K. also—I really do not know—understand this position. Our position is that, as there should not be the intervention of the Soviet Army, there should not be the intervention of other political powers also in Afghanistan, so that it can give a reason for provocation to Soviet Russia. I think, the credit goes to India that they initiated this proposition, that the Afghanistan problem can be only solved by political methods and no other method. The initiative was taken by India—'India' as a country, I am saying; I do not want to say 'Government'; I am talking in the name of India; they have taken the initiative in this matter, and this has been generally accepted by all; even in the Non-Aligned Conference, they have accepted that. There is no military solution to this problem. If anybody tries to find a military solution to this, there will be a regional war, if not World War. This is the reality of the situation

that we are facing today. It is no use using very brave words and taking very brave positions. You have to live through a very dangerous period, and every second has to be lived through very carefully, very cautiously, at the same time keeping our principles in fact. I do not say, 'Compromise with your principles'. Never compromise with your principles. The Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference was held after many years, perhaps for the first time, in India; and I can say this from my personal experience. I was rather a little worried about the position India had taken; I had a fear that there would be some sort of a pressure on India in this Conference. Well, I am glad that this Non-Aligned Conference was held in India; it was held in India and that is the only reason why we could keep the unity of the non-aligned countries. This is the greatest achievement. Because I feel personally that non-alignment has been for quite some time—I have got experience during my time—under some sort of a pressure for the dilution of the principles of non-alignment, if not division in the movement of non-alignment. Therefore, there was a great danger of disunity at this non-aligned Conference, but I must say that some how India's efforts succeeded.

Some Members mentioned about the draft. The Foreign Minister was good enough to send his original draft to some of the Members who were the Members of the Consultative Committee. I had seen that draft. Nobody had felt that this draft was going to be accepted as a whole. Not only in this Conference but in all conferences, the host country always prepares the draft. The only thing is that it prepares a draft according to its own inclinations and it tries to persuade the other countries to accept it. But it does not mean that they are always accepted. More than a couple of dozens of amendments are always made. I remember the previous Foreign Ministers' Conference held in South America . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: In Havana.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: It was held in one of the South American countries. I forget the name of the country at the present moment. There also we saw that amendments had to be accepted. We did move certain amendments and they had to be accepted by the other people. So it always happens this way. Only because some amendments are passed, therefore, we cannot say that India has lost any ground or India was isolated. I do not consider that sort of thing. Even if we are isolated on certain principles, we should prefer isolation also if it comes to that. But there was no isolation. You did not allow ourselves to be isolated. That was a good thing.

Only one point rather troubles me which I must mention. We had mentioned Diego Garcia in the original draft and ultimately in the negotiations you had to drop that. I know the reason for it. Possibly Sri Lanka pleaded, 'If you mentioned Diego Garcia, the Conference which was going to be held, America may not attend'. I think this is diplomatic wisdom. Sometimes you agree to that. But for those who had the two drafts compared, India dropping the reference to Diego Garcia was rather disturbing. It was disturbing to me. I must confess this thing and this was one point which we noted in the final draft.

Ultimately, what are the principles on which the foreign policy of a country is to depend? According to me, there are two criteria. One is the enlightened national interests. Second is the geo-political realities. If any country is not consistent with these two principles, if they do not keep the national interests in mind and if they forget the geo-political realities, it cannot survive in the present world. This is a very cruel and complicated world. It is not a so easy and simple world to be explained away in simple moral terms.

We inherit Gandhiji's principles, we respect Gandhiji and we still call ourselves the children of Gandhiji. But Gandhiji was a wise man and a very practical man. He was against the use of arms. He was the most peaceful man. But when army had to be sent for the protection of Kashmir, he said, 'Go and send army.' He was a practical man who knew how the nation was to be led.

If there are any moral issues in the world to-day, there are two issues. One is the peace and war issue and the second is the issue of poverty in the world. These two issues are moral issues. Ultimately, what we do for our internal policies and what we do for international policies, on these two moral issues, I think Gandhiji would come and certainly bless us if we try for these two moral issues. And I think, through our non-alignment movement, we are doing that, through our non-alignment movement, we are serving the cause of peace and, through our new economic order, we are trying to meet the other ones.

As far as the factual situation is concerned, one must say that. It is no use merely talking that had Gandhiji been here, what he would have done? It is very difficult for anyone to tell. So, if Gandhiji had been here, perhaps, the world would not be in that bad condition as it is to-day. Possibly, that would have happened. We cannot say about it. Gandhiji was a very practical man. He never said that India should not have army. He was against any violence. But he never said that we should not have army for India. He said that independent India should have the army to protect its borders.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan was telling some of us when we met privately and personally that Gandhiji had promised him that if there was any trouble or any persecution against the Pakhtoon people, he would advise the Government of India to send army across Pakistan, not that he had lived to do that. Nor are we going to do that. We would never have done it. His complaint was that we did not do what Gandhiji wanted us to do. This

was the complaint of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan which he publicly made in this country. That is not the issue. If at all you have to judge the foreign policy, it has to be judged on the basic two moral issues. These are the two issues on which you can judge our foreign policy. If our foreign policy serves the interests on these two moral issues very perfectly and very legitimately and within the limitation of the country in one's power, it is well and good. This can work wonders. That is very true.

Last year I said that the decade of detente had disappeared and an era of coldwar was round the corner. Now, I find things are still bad—rather worse to-day. Not only the detente has disappeared completely but confrontation has also started. The important thing that has happened in between the last debate and this debate was the election of President Reagan. I have nothing against anybody or against America or the American people as such. We want friendly relations with United States also as we want friendly relations with U.S.S.R. The position is that the manner in which they are talking is not in the interest of world peace. One must accept this because what they are doing in our region is what frightens me. In the last two days, more disturbing news has appeared in the newspapers. First of all, we were told that Pakistan was not willing to accept the arms from the United States of America as a conduit to Afghanistan. We have seen the news; since yesterday we are reading news that Pakistan is saying that 'we will not do that until we are given enough'. So, it is a bargaining point. It was not a moral standard that they had taken that they would not accept arms to be sent through Pakistan to Afghanistan to fight the resistance there. They say that 'we will not do that until we are given enough'. This is a sort of bargaining. Mr. Foreign Minister, you should take note of one thing—there is an arms base in Diego Garcia. Unfortunately, there is going to be an arms base in Pakistan. This is a dangerous position that we are facing

to-day. I am not panicky about it. We want friendship with Pakistan, I think we should take all possible initiatives to develop friendship with Pakistan but the reality also should not be forgotten. Our own experience about the last ten or twenty years must not be forgotten. In the garb of these friendly talks, preparations go on and when preparations go on and when there is enough arms, these have a bad tendency of tempting the persons to act aggressively.

I remember in 1965 when we met in Tashkent, we were talking socially with some of the Pakistani friends there. Naturally, the people were rather free after taking two or three pegs. I am a tea-totaller. One man rather made a very interesting joke. I could not forget it. I asked him: 'how, then you miscalculated and started this war.' He said: 'the difficulty with the Army Commanders is that sometimes they act first and think afterwards.' Well, you please keep this in mind that such miscalculations will not take place, again these miscalculations must not take place in an international situation, in military matters, in starting of wars—maybe phoney short wars, small wars, local wars. There is not going to be a big war, nuclear war, because both the Super Power are wise enough. They know that it is not possible for anyone of them to win the war. If anybody goes for the nuclear war the whole humanity is going to perish. So, they are wise and will never do that. They may talk about it. They are conscious of the nuclear power but at the same time afraid of the nuclear power. They want to make use of the other smaller countries in the world and use them as tools to have their own strength and power safe in their own sphere of interest. This is what they are trying to do.

Sir, there is one psychological weakness in America's position. America has fought wars. They have fought war in Vietnam and lost it. They have fought war in Korea and learned their bad lesson there. During the Second

World War they fought wars on the Continent of Europe and, of course, got the credit.

It is good that they tried to save Democracy at that time and defeated Fascism. We are grateful to them. But it was not only Americans. It was Britons, French and Russians who had their major share. Sir, there is a weak point about American position, they have not fought war on their own land for the last 200 years. The only war they fought was a civil war and that too 200 years ago when there were conventional weapons. What war means is understood by the nations on the Continent. We know what war means. Let us go to Punjab and ask people what war means. Do they want war or peace? Soviet Russia has seen. Therefore, one is inclined to believe if they say that they believe in world peace. I have got all the respect for Mr. Brezhnev when he responded to the hawkish language of the United States by the offer of further talk of detente. That was a Statesmanlike, wise, thing. Certainly we also want that some solution of Afghanistan should be found out but what about El Salvador. What Americans are doing there? What is the theory of Carter doctrine? For the sake of their security of America they must be there in Indian ocean; vested interests must be protected in the Indian Ocean and Gulf countries. This is ten thousand miles away. If they are justifiable in doing this what about any other country being careful to see that their neighbourhood is safe from them. We want to be careful about our safety and peaceful situation in all the neighbourhood, not only in Pakistan.

Sir, some discussion took place about the relationship with our neighbouring countries. Some people tried to take credit for what was done by the previous Government. I am willing to give it. I am not against it. I have always said that with one or two exceptions Janata Party tried to carry on by and large the foreign policy of friendship with Soviet Russia. But I must say their approach to

neighbouring countries was wrong. I have said it before on the Floor of the House as the Leader of the Opposition that there was some sort of feeling that neighbouring countries had to be over-pleased and India had taken a position of a sychophant to them. Be friendly with them. Be just to them. Try to be careful about the mutuality of interests. Respect them, which we have been doing all along, but don't get yourself in a position where you have to be all the while attending on them as to what they wish and like and do not like and fear about. This is not consistent with the standing of India. How can you justify the agreement on Farrakka in view of the dangers to Calcutta? We were a party to negotiations and discussions. I know the position that Bangladesh takes. We have got all the goodwill for Bangladesh. And in future also we will have it. Mr. Minister, but I would like you also to be very careful about our mutual national interests. It has been mentioned that there is going to be some sort of a Regional Conference of the Secretaries of the neighbouring countries in Sri Lanka or some other place. Well and good. Such efforts are always welcome. We shall always welcome those efforts. Go and meet them; talk to them; find out if they have got any legitimate grievances; and accommodate them. It is not that I am against these. But I must tell you that there is one danger in this thing. They have so much tried to internationalise bilateral issues. This is the game behind these small neighbours; they have this psychology that India is a big country, a big nation. Now we cannot help it. Can we? In order to please some of the neighbouring countries, can we become another small country? We cannot do it. (*Interruptions*) We are a big country. We are a fertile country both intellectually and in terms of manpower, in terms of population, as well. This is all right. But there has always been an effort by some of these neighbours—I don't want to mention nations,—who have always wanted to internationalise some issues. Whenever they found

that they could not succeed in internationalising them, they wanted to regionalise them. This is another way of doing the same thing! So, be careful about these things. Go and give them help. If you want to have the next conference in Delhi, you have it by all means. But about this one thing you have to be careful because some of these countries play this game against India. The long-term interests of India sometimes are in danger as far as these issues are concerned. Therefore, I would like you to be careful about these things.

The other issue that we will have to think more particularly is the North-South dialogue. This is a very important issue, if you do not find any answer to problem of poverty. I do not think the internal policies that we are declaring also are likely to succeed. We are talking that we are fighting against this problem of poverty in India; we are committed as a nation for this; but how can we do it, unless, those who had the advantage of having empires in the world, and who had the advantage of having a technological revolution 200 years ahead of us, try to share and transfer the resources to us?

Now, we read news about the World Bank's troubles. The Retiring President of the World Bank was in India just a couple of days ago and he has very liberally said something about aid. I am not inclined to believe completely in that. It is a polite way of saying it. There is a polite way of listening to it! I have one fear and somebody mentioned that in his speech—I think it was Prof. Tewary who mentioned it. Now the American policy is to try to bilateralise financial cooperation and not do these things through multilateral organisations like the IMF and the World Bank. These are the new trends there. Therefore we will have to remain very alert. Naturally we have got our own limitations. We are one of those who want to 'receive'. We are not in a position to 'give'. Therefore, naturally, people are likely to misunderstand. But at the same time we must create a favourable atmosphere

in the countries,—particularly some western countries,—who seem to be in some sort of a reasonable mood nowadays. But please move them from their political position to the economic field. I have found this, because, I have attended some conferences wherein these talks had their early beginning about the New Economic Order and I found that two countries were rather difficult for us to manage: One was West Germany. The other was U.S.A. Regarding West Germany, I find, there can be some hope because Mr. Brandt himself, as Chairman of a Commission, has produced a useful Report. Even if it is accepted as a minimum, it will mean some progress for the future. But I am very much doubtful whether the present USA administration will be willing to accept any part of it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:  
Also England.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:  
Well, England is not a first rank country from that point of view; it has its own economic limitations. So, we have to think about these things.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Sitamarhi):  
It is good if the US President attends the Mexico Conference.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:  
Quite right; but merely attending the Mexico Conference is not quite enough. Possibly by mere attending, they may create more troubles.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Are they not willing to attend the Conference?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:  
They are not willing to attend it naturally. Because they do not want to commit themselves directly or indirectly about this to the third world. This is the basic trouble so far as this matter is concerned. Therefore, Mr. Foreign Minister, there is another way of doing it. The Non-aligned Conference had accepted this position long time ago. And if the North does not want to come forward and share their advantages with us, shall we not at least, the Third World countries, collectively try to work for cooperation and set ourselves for self-reliance. And certainly we can if we

begin that. I think the Northern industrialised countries, rich countries, will have to think twice about it if we show our strength. But unfortunately I am afraid that we are at the beginning of a period wherein there is going to be a ruthless pressure on the Third World countries and the non-aligned countries. I am afraid that there will be further attempts at dilution of the non-aligned movement. And these are the dangers I am mainly mentioning. I do not say that they are likely to happen tomorrow. But these dangers are there. I think if we have to retain our leadership of the non-aligned movement, whatever happens we must take a strong position; even if we are isolated, it does not matter. We should stand by the principles of non-alignment and this is the basic position that we have to take care of.

Well, Mr. Foreign Minister, I wish you well. I do not want to flatter you because I have nothing to get from you. You have done well, the Government of India has done well in the field of foreign policy and our basic position should be maintained in these difficult times. I think what the Prime Minister said in one sentence, sums up the Indian foreign policy. We are not pro-Soviet Russia, we are not pro-United States but we are pro-India. That is a compact sort of a little thing that she has said and that really speaking, sums up both our internal policy and the international policy. Let us stand by it.

श्री बापू लाल मिश्र (सलेमपुर) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सर्वप्रथम तो मैं आपको अभ्यवाच देना हूँ कि आपने मुझे इतने महत्वपूर्ण विचार पर हमारे जैसे उपाध्यक्ष आदमी को बोलने का मौका दिया। पहले तो मैं इतने महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बोलने के लिए तैयार ही नहीं था, किन्तु विरोधी दल के कुछ चन्द नेताओं के लैक्चर सुनने के बाद मेरे मन में यह उमंग आई है कि मैं भी अपने कुछ विचार इस सदन के सामने रखूँ।

अभी अभी हमारे देश के नेता रहे हैं, श्री चह्माण साहब, उनका लैक्चर सुनने के बाद हमको बड़ी शान्ति मिली, लेकिन इस के पहले तो हमारे मन में एक प्रकार का बेहद जोश और रोष था, लेकिन जो ब्यान आया, उससे हमें संतोष हुआ कि देश में ऐसा लोग हैं जो राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर एक मामला आया तो निष्पक्षता को बात कर सकते हैं। इसके पूर्व मैंने देखा कि सदन में फॉरेन-पॉलिसी पर बहस हो रही थी, तो हमें ऐसा आभास हुआ कि यहाँ पर कुछ वकील अमरीका के बैठे हुए हैं, कुछ वकील रूस के बैठे हुए हैं और कुछ वकील चाइना के बैठे हुए हैं और तीनों बतला कर रहे हैं कि भारतवर्ष को किम के जिम्मे गिरवी रख दिया जाए। ऐसा हमें आभास हुआ। हमें तो यहाँ तक आश्चर्य हुआ—अभी धोड़ी देर पहले एक स्वामी जी लैक्चर देकर गये, ऐसा लगता था कि वह हमारे भारत के रहने वाले नहीं थे... (अध्यावधान) ... मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि वह जेटमलानी साहब थे। बहुत बड़ा नाम है, लेकिन लैक्चर ऐसा सुना जैसे वह भारत के रहने वाले नहीं थे, जीवन भर विदेश में ही रहे हों। हमारे देश के बड़े लोगों, पॉलिटीकल लोगों का यह हाथ है।

हमारे भारत का कुछ परम्परायें नहीं हैं, कुछ रीति-नीति नहीं है। भगवान राम जब अत्याचार को बरदाश्त नहीं कर पाएँ तो उन्होंने लंका पर विजय प्राप्त की और विजय प्राप्त करने के बाद लंका वालों का कहा—अच्छा अब तुम राज्य करो, राज्य का इन्तजाम खराब था, इन तरह से वह राज्य उन्होंने वही के लोगों का वापस कर दिया। वही परम्परा अभी भी इस देश में कायम रही—श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री थे। बहुत आर्जुमिन्त पाकिस्तान की की, लेकिन फिर भी पाकिस्तान ने आक्रमण किया। भारत ने उस आक्रमण का मुकाबला किया और हमारी सेनाओं ने पाकिस्तान की सरहद में घुस कर

कब्जा किया। उस समय अमरीका और दूसरी बड़ी शक्तियाँ बीच-बचाव करने लगीं, हमने पाकिस्तान की उस भूमि को जिस पर हमने कब्जा किया था, सहर्ष वापस कर दिया। हम को यह सन्तोष था कि शायद पाकिस्तान अब ऐसी शलती नहीं करेगा, लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने फिर वही शलती दोबारा की। एक कराड़ रिफ्यूजी हमारे देश में आये। कमजोर का कोई भी साथ नहीं देता है—उस समय हमारी नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जी ने समूचे विश्व का दौरा किया—10 राष्ट्र भी उस समय हमारे पक्ष में नहीं थे—आखिर उन को मजबूत हो कर देश की हिफाजत के लिए खुद कहना पड़ा कि ये जो एक कराड़ लोग आये हैं, इनकी हिफाजत हम करेंगे। इसी बीच में पाकिस्तान ने फिर भारत पर हमला कर दिया। देश की रक्षा करने के लिए हमारी सेनायें फिर आगे बढ़ीं और यह कितनी आश्चर्य-जनक चीज है कि हमारी सेनाओं ने न केवल पश्चिमी भाग में कब्जा किया, बल्कि पूर्वी बंगाल पर भी कब्जा किया और उन को 1 लाख सेना हमारी गिरफ्त में आई। लेकिन उस के बाद भी यह देश कितना उदार है—हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बड़ी उदारता के साथ उस जाति हुई जमान को फिर से वापस कर दिया। दो-दो बार हमने पाकिस्तान को अजमाया, लेकिन धोखा खाया।

चाइना का जब आक्रमण हुआ—वह दिन भी हमें याद है। यहां पर नारा लगता था—“हिन्दी-चीनी भाई-भाई।” हमने उस पर विश्वास किया था, लेकिन उस ने भी हमें धोखा दिया। पाकिस्तान की दो बार आजमाइश हो चुकी है, चाइना की आजमाइश हो चुकी है—मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हूँ कि बार-बार आजमाइश करने

से देश का नुकसान होगा। इस लिए हम को इन राष्ट्रों से सचेत रहना चाहिए। आज की परिस्थितियाँ ऐसी हैं कि गुटनिपेक्षता की बात तो जरूर होती है लेकिन वास्तविकता यह है कि यह देश दो गुटों में बटा हुआ है। आज हम अपने दोस्त और दुश्मन को नहीं पहचानेंगे तो इससे हमारा नुकसान होगा। जिस वक्त पाकिस्तान ने हम पर दूसरी बार हमला किया था—उस समय अमरीका का सातवां बंडा चल रहा था। उस समय जो स्वामी जी अभी भाषण कर के चले गये—शायद एक बार भी उन्होंने ऐसा भाषण नहीं दिया होगा कि अमरावावालों क्यों सातवें बंडे को इस तरफ भेज रहे हैं। उस वक्त उस सातवें बंडे का जवाब किसने दिया था? विपत्ति के दिनों में जिसने हमारा साथ दिया—उस को साथी कहने में हिचक नहीं हानी चाहिए। हम को स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहिए कि अमरीका ने हमारे साथ धोखा दिया, चाइना ने धोखा किया। मुझे वह दिन याद है कि जब चाइना ने हम पर हमला किया था—चह्वाण साहब को विशेष रूप से महाराष्ट्र से बुला कर रक्षा मंत्री बनाया गया था। जब वह हमारे हवाई अड्डे पर आये तो हम लोग उनके स्वागत के लिए वहां गये थे, हमने नारे लगाये थे—“राम रावण मारे थे चह्वाण चाऊ मारेंगे।” जब तक हम चाइना से अपनी भूमि को वापस नहीं लेंगे—चैन से नहीं बैठेंगे—इस तरह का जोश उस समय हमारे अन्दर था।

उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहा कि जनता पार्टी की हुकूमत ने बहुत अच्छा काम किया। यह अच्छा काम किया—कि जिस दुश्मन ने हमारी सरहद को जीत कर हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा किया हुआ है उनके विदेश मंत्री बिना बात किये हुए चैन के दोरे पर गये। हमारे उस समय के विदेश मंत्री जब चाइना गये थे, तो उन के वहां रहते ही उस देश ने वियतनाम पर हमला कर



[श्री रामनगिना मिश्र]

दिया। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज विश्व में कोई ऐसा देश नहीं है जो किसी को गुलाम बना सके किन्तु यह बात ठीक है कि अगर हम मजबूत नहीं रहेंगे, तो अपनी हिकाजत खुद नहीं कर सकते। मैं यहाँ पर यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे श्री मोरारजी भाई जब अमेरिका गये थे तो वहाँ पर हाथ-पैर जोड़ कर यह कह आए कि हम अपने यहाँ एटम बम नहीं बनायेंगे। इसके पहले हमने एटम बम इसलिए बनाया था, जिससे हम अपने देश का विकास कर सकें। वह एटम बम इन्सान के विनाश के लिए नहीं बनाया गया था। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि अमेरिका ने यह वायदा किया था कि जो एटम बम बनाएगा, उसकी हम सहायता नहीं करेंगे लेकिन आज क्या हो रहा है। हमारे बिल्कुल नजदीक में पाकिस्तान एटम बम बना रहा है और उसकी पूरी सहायता करने के लिए अमेरिका लगा हुआ है। वह बम किसके लिए इस्तेमाल किया जाएगा। जब ऐसी स्थिति है, तो क्या हम हाथ पर हाथ रख कर बैठ जाएं? अगर हम भी अपने यहाँ एटम बम या परमाणु बम नहीं बनाते हैं, तो हमारे देश के लिए खतरा बढ़ जाएगा। हमारी हिकाजत उसी समय हो सकती है जब कि हम स्वयं मजबूत हों। इसलिए मेरा यह निवेदन है कि हमारे यहाँ के जो साइंटिस्ट्स हैं, उनको हमें मदद करनी चाहिए और उनको प्रशिक्षण दिया जाना चाहिए ताकि वे ऐसी चीजें अपने यहाँ बना सकें। अगर हम ऐसा नहीं कर पाते हैं, तो यह हमारी कायरता होगी और आने वाली पीढ़ियाँ हमें कोसेगी। हमारे बगल में पाकिस्तान एटम बम बनाने जा रहा है, जिससे हमारे देश को भी खतरा है। हमने यह एलान किया हुआ है और हम हमेशा से यह कहते आए हैं कि हम किसी भी देश को एक इंच भूमि नहीं लेंगे और न ही किसी देश को अपने दहाँ की

एक इंच भूमि लेने देंगे। आप यह देखिए कि हमारे पड़ोस में एक दिनाल देश है, चीन। उसने हम पर हमला किया है और पाकिस्तान ने भी कई बार हम पर हमला किया। उनको क्या नीति है, यह हमने देख लिया है। ये दोनों मुल्क हमारे बॉर्डर पर ही हैं। अमेरिका की हालत हमने देख ली है। उसकी हालत यह है कि वह किसी को जो सहायता देता है, वह इसलिए देता है कि वह उससे फायदा उठाए। रूस भी हमको सहायता देता है और उसकी मित्रता को भी हमने देखा है। श्री चह्माण ने जो बात कही, वह ठीक बात ही है कि जो भी युद्ध हुआ है, वह अमेरिका की भूमि पर नहीं हुआ है और रूस की भूमि पर युद्ध हुआ है। इसलिए रूस वालों ने युद्ध की विनाश लीला को देखा है और वे इस कारण शान्ति चाहते हैं।

मुझसे पहले बोलने वाले माननीय सदस्य पांच-पांच बार घंटों बजाने पर भी अपनी बात कहते रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं भी अपने मन की बात कह लूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are 22 Members from your Party. You are wasting their time.

श्री रामनगिना मिश्र: अभी तो मैंने अपनी मैन बातें कही भी शुरू नहीं की हैं। मैं कल कण्टिन्यू कर लूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can conclude within 5 O'Clock. I can give you two or three minutes. There are many Hon. Members from your Party.

श्री रामनगिना मिश्र: सब से मुख्य बात मैंने अभी नहीं कही है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Every hon. Member from a Party need not touch all points. One advantage to the ruling Party is if certain points are left out by your own colleagues, you can say that point and some other

point you must leave for other Members also. Why do you touch all the points and take the time of other Members also. I am only helping you. It is left to you.

श्री रामनगीना मिश्र : जो आप हुबम देंगे, मैं वैसे ही करूंगा। पहली बात तो यह है कि जो बड़े एक्सपर्ट नेता हैं, वे घंटी बजने पर भी अपनी बात कहते रहते हैं लेकिन हम जैसे जो सीधे-साधे लोग हैं, जब घंटी बजती है, तो दिमाग से मुख्य बात हट जाती है और वह भटक जाता है।

मैं यह कहने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि आज जो गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति है, उस की सब लोग तारीफ़ करते हैं परन्तु मैं इस में एक संशोधन और चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति जो हम चला रहे हैं, उस में थोड़ा सा परिवर्तन हमें करना चाहिए। मान्यवर, एक शेर हमारे सामने खड़ा हुआ है, उसके सामने हाथ जाड़ कर हम कहें कि हम तो बहुत सीधे-साधे आदमी हैं और आप को नुकसान पहुंचाने वाले नहीं हैं लेकिन हमें यह भी साबना चाहिए कि वह जो शेर है, उस का मुकाबला करने के लिए हम में शक्ति होनी चाहिए। उसके लिए आप शक्ति अर्जित कीजिए। एक बात और इस सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ कि दोस्त और दुश्मन को अगर आप बराबर तोलेंगे, तो हमारे साथ कौन रहेगा? कोई आप का साथ नहीं देगा, यह मेरा निश्चित मत है। अभी अफगानिस्तान की बात चल रही थी। क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि हमारी सरहदों पर पाकिस्तान से मिल कर चीनी सेनाएं जमी हुई हैं? और क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान को आज चीन से बहुत ज्यादा मदद मिल रहा है? अमेरिका से मदद मिल रही है। अगर वहां के लोगों की अमेरिका और चीन मदद न करें तो यह बात सत्य है कि रूस का सेनाएं अफगानिस्तान से तुरन्त

वापस हो जाएं। अमेरिका और चीन ने अपनी सारी शक्ति लगा कर वहां पर बंधावत करा रखी है। अपनी रक्षा के लिए भी रूस यह जरूरी समझता है कि उसकी सेनाएं भी वहां रहें। इसलिए हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी यह बात ठीक कहती हैं कि वहां से पहले अमेरिका और चीन दोनों का हस्तक्षेप बन्द हो।

भारत की हमेशा यही पालिसी रही है कि हम किसी देश की न तो एक इंच भूमि लेना चाहते हैं और न किसी भी देश से लड़ाई चाहते हैं। हम किसी देश के आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप भी नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन हमारे यहां जब भी कोई झगड़ा होता है तो उसके बारे में सब से पहले पाकिस्तान से आवाज उठती है। अभी हम अखबारों में देख रहे हैं कि बंगलादेश से हजारों अल्पसंख्यक वर्ग के आदमी भगाये जा रहे हैं। यही बात पाकिस्तान की भी है। मैं अपने मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे जो विदेशों में हमारे जो लोग हैं उनकी हिराजत करें।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have to conclude. You have said many points. You have said many good points.

श्री रामनगीना मिश्र : मैं आपका णक्रगुजार हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now Mr. Barot.

18 hrs

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

—contd.

NOTIFICATIONS ENHANCING IMPORT DUTY ALUMINIUM SCRAP

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI