

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prof. Dilip Chakravarty—not present.

When we select, they are not present. When we do not select, they come and complain. Shri Amat. Only the approved text to be recorded.

(ii) REPORTED ACQUISITION OF LAND FORM ADIVASIS IN ROURKELA.

**SHRI D. AMAT (Sundargarh):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, under rule 377, I want to draw the attention of Government, through you, to a strange case of gross injustice towards constantly exploited Adivasis. The original Adivasi inhabitants of Rourkela in Orissa have been deprived of their land in the name of public interest at nominal prices. I submit that this is sheer exploitation of Adivasis and they have been deceived thereby. Their land should either be returned to them or it should be utilised in public interest as was declared while acquiring their land or the profit accruing therefrom should be distributed amongst them.

I hope that Government will intervene and see that justice is done in this regard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Dr. Saradish Roy. He is not present.

12.50 hrs.

**RE. DEMANDS FOR GRANTS OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING FOR 1979-80.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Planning were taken up for discussion on Wednesday, the 28th March, 1979. Discussion on these Demands was not concluded on that day.

The item regarding further discussion on these Demands was again included in the Revised List of Business

for 29th March, 1979. As the House was adjourned for the day on account of the demise of a sitting Member, Shri H. L. Patwary, the discussion on these Demands could not be concluded on that day.

The Prime Minister had informed me earlier that he would not be available in New Delhi on the 30th March, 1979 and as such, this part-discussed item has not been included in the Revised List of Business for today.

12.51 hrs.

**\*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS. 1970-80—Contd.**

**MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No. 31 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which six hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members whose Cut Motions to the Demand for Grant have been circulated may, if they desire to move their Cut Motions, send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the Cut Motions they would like to move.

Motion moved.

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts of Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the Fourth Column of the Order Paper be granted to the President out of the consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1980, in respect of the head of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 31 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

*Demand for Grant, 1979-80, in respect of the Ministry to External Affairs submitted to the vote of Lok Sabha.*

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for Grant on account voted by the House on 16-3-1979		Amount of Demand for Grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
31	Ministry of External Affairs	20,83,29,000	2,77,52,000	104,16,46,000	13,87,61,000

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki):  
Sir, the House is now proceeding to discuss an issue of a very very vital importance and on which, normally, there must be a national consensus. The external affairs policy of the Government has, fortunately for our country, been all along, broadly, a matter of national consensus with, of course, some dissenting voices here and here.

Unfortunately it so happens that, of late, this matter has not been receiving the attention of the Parliament in the measure it should have been. Developments have been taking place in various areas, but apart from some occasional statement from the Minister for External Affairs, the House as such very rarely went into this matter. I would plead with you now that, hereafter, this attitude of the House must change. The internal progress of the country will never be strong unless the external affairs are sound, and the external affairs will not be sound unless and until the internal affairs are also fairly strong. These are interlinked.

In the turbulent situation in which we are living, in the international setting, every move, every change, will affect the fortunes of our country, the fortunes of the region where we are living. It should not be that these matters are carried on by the officers. They are very well-informed

of course, very knowledgeable, of course, very experienced, and patriotic but it should not be carried on by them only, nor is it to be left entirely to the wisdom of the Minister of External Affairs. The collective wisdom of this House must come to bear upon any development, however big or small, because in the international affairs there is nothing like a small development. Any small development can become big, and that can affect us vitally. Anyway, it was very good of you that you found the necessity for this and you took the initiative this year to ensure that this subject got the highest priority in the matter of discussion this year.

Now, let me say at the very outset that, while we are prepared to sit with the External Affairs Minister to discuss this matter and to come to a consensus, I have got the feeling that, deliberately or otherwise, there has been a drift from the time-honoured policy that we have been pursuing to the ultimate detriment of the interests of this country. My purpose is to only elaborate as to how I consider this is taking place.

Let us look behind. How was the policy moulded? I need not tell the House. I need not tell anybody that this is a continuation of the Independence movement and the freedom struggle of our country. We had

our freedom struggle as part of the anti-imperialist struggle which was fought on the international plane. We got our freedom but the freedom was not consolidated and when we got our freedom, the situation internationally was the development of the two blocs and the attempt of the two major powers to gang up smaller powers within their camps with the aim of an ultimate confrontation. Now, as far as the small powers which got liberated, for them the question was how to retain their freedom and how to carry on.

Pandit Nehru referring to the Bloc formation, said, 'I just cannot understand how this can be block. A giant coming into a partnership with a small pygmy—how can it be an alignment? It can only be an arrangement for service and no independent country, big or small, must be prepared to enter into this alignment of serving one because he has got some power.' It is in this desperate situation that the new idea was put forward, not on the basis of ganging up but on the basis of saying, 'You preserve your independence, you carry on your struggle against imperialism, you carry on your struggle against the colonial powers.' We must carry this forward and whoever will make a common cause on this matter of continued and persistent anti-imperialist struggle, we must welcome and join hands and carry on our struggle. It is in that sense that the non-aligned movement took its birth. Therefore, as Indians, we must take pride in the fact that weak though India was, militarily and economically and every man knew that India was weak but because we made common cause with the struggling masses of the world seeking liberation and independence, our voice had a ring of authenticity and a ring of acceptability. Pandit Nehru, along with his other friends in different countries, took the lead to create a platform against this attempt of the two super powers to further subjugate the newly liberated countries.

We find different movements, developing. As far as the South-East Asia was concerned, Pandit Nehru along with Indonesia and Burma coming together and developing a particular sort of alignment which became the focus of the call of anti-imperialist struggle in this Asian area and Pandit Nehru Naser and Tito coming together and raising a platform of an international struggle—we find it there, which made a common cause and beckons the newly emerging African countries to be conscious of their strength, to be conscious of their power and to carry on their struggle.

This anti-imperialist struggle goes on. The non-alignment movement is built up. South East Asian Conference was held. An Asian Conference for liberation of Indonesia was held here in Delhi itself. This was not a matter of giving the lead. This is a matter of India getting itself completely identified and continuing that identification that way. They are seeking new directions of development. India put this on the basis of identification with the people. He always spoke of the new Asian personality coming. He spoke of the African personality emerging. He spoke of the emergence of the Arab nationalism. He looked at that and determined all the policies and whether the new emerging nations' personality elsewhere in the world will be in accord with the role of the new Asian personality. Any move, whether it will be in accordance with the urge of the newly emerging national personality, whether our move will be in accordance with the Arab Nationalism which was emerging—it was, on this basis, that our whole approach was built up and, therefore, we had no difficulty to spell out our policies when this confrontation arose.

13.30 hrs.

Non-alignment does not mean smiling to everybody, saying goody-goody things to everybody and saying that

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

they are equally friends to us. This is not non-alignment because non-alignment has got a definite, positive aspect. It can be that we will have to be more friendly to one country. It may also be that we will be less friendly to another country. It may also mean that because of our friendliness, we might get into the hostility with a certain other country. It has been spelt out umpteen times that our policy is based upon how best to serve our interest which is the same as the preservation of the world peace, which is the same as the liberation of countries from the stranglehold of colonial hold. This is the way we have got to approach. Sir, in 1964 Panditji—I found that this was the last speech which Panditji made in the Lok Sabha on non-alignment. He made the following remarks:

“Non-alignment is not a basic policy of ours or any country. It is our reaction to events and, more particularly, our desire to maintain our independence of thought and action. It arose chiefly because of the two Power Blocs headed by the United States of America and the Soviet Union and our desire not to get entangled with them. To some extent that continues, but many changes have taken place in these alignments.

“The U.S.A. and the Soviet Union are not so bitterly opposed to each other as they were, and they are going closer to each other. Among the two power blocs internal differences have arisen and in some cases, they amount almost to a split. Thus, the Soviet Union and China, the two Communist powers have practically separated from each other, and are bitterly opposed to each other. In the Western bloc, some differences have also arisen. Meanwhile a large number of newly independent countries have come into existence, and most of them adhere to the policy of non-alignment.

“From any point of view, it would appear that non-alignment has not

only succeeded in the past but is even desirable to-day.”  
He goes on to say:

“In the light of the changing situation, how exactly our non-alignment must be adjusted with the changing events is a matter of consideration”.

This was the last pronouncement which he made. After that, many changes have taken place. What exactly is the attitude of the Government with respect to these changes is my question which has got to be answered and which I would like to put across. After that, many countries have become free. And the new situation is that that these imperialist countries which left Africa are coming back now with open arms not with barefaced domination but subtly, covertly, much more dangerously, they are coming back in a big way. Belgium is coming back; France, in certain areas, is coming back; Germany is coming back in a big way. In each country these imperialist forces who had left away, are coming back. In Africa, the new African personality which, we thought, arose, is not setting its tone, one against the other. This is the situation that we are finding in Africa. African countries have become free but the people are not involved in that freedom in different countries, this is the situation. Other elements and other arms are coming into that. They are certainly the African people—of African conscience and African personality. Of course, I am aware that the Minister of External Affairs is repeatedly saying the same phrase, about our identity of interests in South Africa; our identity of interests with the coloured people in Zimbabwe and all those countries. He has repeatedly been saying or coming forward with the same phraseology. But the question is whether the formulation of our policy with respect to Africa continues as it has been which will have the reaction among the people in the sense that we are

part of the anti-imperialist movement. I am not saying that you are doing anything wrong or in discordance with our time. I am not saying that. I am also not saying that we are moving against the people's interests in Africa. I do not see how can we be too much more assertive. But, can we not take a posture which will give those people this idea that here is a great country which we can look up to and which will assist us and put us forward? Is it not possible? I do not say that we must follow the example of Cuba or some thing like that. It does not mean that you must send for arms. That is not what I am saying. But, Sir, on certain occasions, of course, with the consent of the international community we had.... (*Interruptions*).

The point I am making is that inspite of this anti-colonial movement struggle by the people in Africa is there any doubt that freedom in Africa has not come in; is there any doubt that those colonial powers are returning and trying to create a stronghold in Africa? In view of this my point is whether our voice is ringing out against this new emergent force which is coming. We were happy when after the black period of colonialism the African people, one after the other, were becoming free but again the same thing is returning.

Now, look at West Asia! Our policy on West Asia is based not merely on the question of Palestine. There our policy is based on Arab nationalism, the Arab unity and the united Arab nationalism. It is in this context that the Camp David Agreement and the Agreement that was signed yesterday must be evaluated. When the Camp David agreement was signed the Government of India only took note of the reactions taking place in that area and reiterated that we will not be satisfied till the Palestinians are given their homeland. The question is—there is difference of opinion—whether this agreement which is signed will be

conducive to the advance of the Palestinians; whether this is in tune with the aspirations of the Arab nationalism. Excepting for Egypt all other countries have combined together and are saying that they do not approve of this agreement at all. No doubt, we are a different country. It is not our business to examine this agreement and decide whether it will bring about the desired result or not but it is in our interest and it is in consonance with the policy that we are pursuing to see that anything that is done which is against the interests of Arab nationalism or which would divide the united personality of the Arab nationalism or anything which would take one away from the other is a move which we will not approve. If that is done, then our reaction to this new Agreement is clear and must be clear. There you are hesitating. You are not coming forward at all. You are taking note of the reactions in that area. I do not know what do you mean by taking note of the reactions. The development is that the Arab nations get divided; the development is Arab solidarity gets meshed up; the development is United States' greater hold in that area; the development is United States sends its fleet and armaments to Egypt and to Israel. And against that the entire Arab world is up and they are afraid that they are going to be attacked or their freedom is in danger. In this development what is the Government of India's attitude. It must be spelt out clearly. Any man who has got eyes and ears will take note of the development.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is your suggestion?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Let me hear what the External Affairs Minister has to say. I am not satisfied with this. Anybody who has got eyes and ears will take note of the development. What is your evaluation about it? All the Arab countries have condemned this agreement. This is a betrayal, they say. It is abundantly clear that

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

the Arab nations are not approving that. What is your attitude to that? Don't you think that this new development of free entry of America with all their forces with a base very much near, next to Iran, next to Pakistan coming up and developing it can be a positive danger to India? Don't you see that; don't you analyse that? Against whom is this? They are supplying arms to Israel and Egypt; they are building up their own armament there; they come in a big way in Suez Canal; they come in a big way in the Red Sea. For whom? For what purpose and against whom? Against whose interest? This is a matter which any Government must immediately consider. Certainly, it can be against us; it can be against the Arab nations. It is certainly consolidation of the whole thing that is taking place. Let us remember the great long line which is being built up—America, Western Europe and Japan. Now, the missing link is added on—China. Next to them is Pakistan, now the western Asia and the entire thing is there; this link-up is there. Against whom is this link up made up? The question is, you cannot rival them with an atom bomb and I do not want you to do that, but you can link up against this development by making common cause with the people in those entire areas. You can bring a common cause with their national aspirations. Are you doing that? This is a vital question on which the Government's attitude is rather too dithering and absolutely unsatisfactory. The accent on the 'genuine' non-alignment has prompted you to be sucked into the American aspirations and—I do not want to say betray, but I would say—soft-shoulder, the resurgent Arab nationalism. This is how I am looking at it.

Then, is there no change in Asia? Are there no developments? Is Asia the same as it was ten years back? What are the developments? We backed up China, we wanted their entry into the United Nations, we vouchsafed their cause, we found them

as part of the anti-imperialist struggle which was going on Asian history, as we know, was a period of colonial domination, struggle for freedom from colonial domination and free from power politics. Today the struggle of international power politics has shifted, if I may say so, from Europe to Asia. This is the picture that is today emerging. China has never been, and is not, emotionally prepared to be just equal with anybody. The old fable goes that some Roman emperor sent a token present to China. They had nothing to do with it and the Chinese emperor declared; "Convey to him that we are placed that we have received this from our vassal." That is the way. They do not know Europe, but still that is their attitude. There is the fourth century Chinese strategy which says. "As against your neighbouring countries, the countries away from you are your friends. Attack your neighbouring country, because your immediate fellow is always your enemy; the fellow away from you need not be your enemy." This principle, it appears, they are now implementing. They have now gone on to this axis; what was a triangular build-up has now become a quadrilateral link-up; they are now trying to add other countries to it.

The United States is coming up to Japan. Is it not a matter of great significance? Then there is the treaty between Japan and China and between United States and China; immediately after that comes the open attack against countries all round. China is now at the throat of those countries which were struggling against the imperialist forces. It is in this manner that this has got to be taken note of. China thinks it is a Colossus, but you are also a Colossus. They are 700 or 800 million; we are also 800 million. We have got certain capabilities; we are not the same old India as it was. But China wants to demonstrate that you are nothing in the world; and that they

have managed to do, deliberately or non-deliberately, by the glorious visit of Mr. Vajpayee, at a crucial moment in the history of the world. I say that that visit has done irreparable damage to the Indian interests and to the interests of the small nations in this Asian and South-East Asian area.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Stephen, your party has 47 minutes. You have taken 22 minutes already.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I will take only 5 more minutes. All these small countries do want protection. Not that we will be able to give protection; but certainly with this domineering personality of China coming in, with this international link-up, cutting away Soviet Union, cutting India out and making it manifest that China is the force that counts in this area—this is the picture which has emerged. As against it, what can we do? It is from this point of view that we will have to approach the question of Vietnam, Kampuchea, Laos and of the developments in those areas, and not looking to small, small areas and seeing whether somebody is holding it, or somebody is in control of it.

When the question of Kampuchean recognition comes, you take the stand that you are not satisfied that Kampuchea is completely under the control of the present Government. Well, if that attitude had been taken by the Soviet Union when Bangladesh was liberated they could also have said, "We don't recognise. We are not satisfied." I am saying that it is not the way to approach it. If you accept the Kampuchean country and the Kampuchean people as part of the struggle which is going on, then all out you will have to lend your hand, and lend your mighty weight and support, so that they may get confidence in their hearts. All these small countries in South Asia are not unanimous in their attitude towards China. Certain countries are with Vietnam. Certain countries are with China. Although in all these countries, there is a considerable population, they are not unanimous about it. Everybody

and every small country in this area is fending for itself, without any common platform being made available.

On the other hand, China with its great build-up is coming upon to dominate the whole thing. The Minister of External Affairs went to China. I do not know on what advice he went. There was the Ambassador—Mr. Narayanan was there. Did you consult him? He had left that post by that time. He came away. You were ill after he came away. He was certainly one of the persons who could give you advice. What exactly was the advice that you got? What exactly were your calculations? You said, "I wanted to have exploratory talks." Exploratory talk is not done generally at the Ministerial level. Exploratory talk is done at the lower level. How is it that nobody of a ministerial rank came here? You made a statement, "I am prepared to accept an invitation if it is given." Through whom? Through the chief of the cultural delegation. The chief of the cultural delegation brings an invitation to the Foreign Minister to the Foreign Ministry. You jump at it and decide to go to China, without thinking of the consequences—even after you are told about their attitude to Kashmir; even after you were told, and it came to your knowledge, that China has said that India is weaker than Vietnam. Your reply is that you have protested about it. But you are going to a country which considers you weaker than Vietnam. And which treated you as a country weaker than Vietnam. You went there. Questions were asked. May I ask you about Kashmir, what is their attitude? The same attitude. On the differences over border, the same attitude. On the question of Nagaland, the attitude is the same. Nothing positive was forthcoming. They are where they were. They kept you there, and when you were there, they attacked Vietnam, showing people, "India is weaker. China cared two hoots for it. India cannot do anything against us. Therefore, don't look up to India. We are the

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

force which counts in this area." That way they established it very cleverly and very magnificently. It is a pity that we became a party to this ugly demonstration of their contempt for us, and to the demonstration of their concept of our weakness.

Now about evaluation. Wherever American interests are involved, you become jittery. Iranian developments took place. The Shah left. Everybody knew that the leaving by Shah was leaving for good. No embassy is necessary for it. Everybody knew that leaving by Shah was for good. He left somebody behind. Everybody know that Khomeni is the man who counts. But you immediately go and recognise the person left behind, without seeing whether he was in control or not. In Kampuchea you say you want to know whether they are in complete control. That is the consideration. But here, the monarch names somebody and you say; we are recognising him, he is the wellow we recognise.

Report says that Bhutto is going to be hanged. All these developments are part of the whole thing in the American interest. You are asked to lodge your protest but you say; we will not interfere in the internal affairs of another country. But the President of India interevened. President of India is supposed to be part of India. Prime Minister will not intervene; President of India interevned; he sent a message. What sort of picture we have given? President of India asking; the Prime Minister protesting. Is it a proper picture of India to project? Though your attitude is that the President of India must not protest, the President of India did, because he knew what should be done in these matters.

Vietnam—we are doubting whether it is aggression or attack. What is your explanation for suppressing that news? On the day of Chinese attack All India Radio and television did not carry a single word about the

attack on Vietnam. The whole night everybody knew that the attack took place; but in the All India Radio there was no mention at all about the attack. Subsequently comes the news: it is an attack; it is aggression; it is attack. Why this dithering? Laos is today under attack. Laos territory has been violated. Massive protests are taking place. Small country, going about, knocking at every door. What is your attitude? What is the attitude with respect to developments which are taking place? America is here. You say America is your friend. It is arming Pakistan. You call them your friend. America which is in Asia with such great force, you call friend. America, with respect to even implementing the agreement for giving uranium it wanted to carry on negotiations, you call that your friend. America which is having a stranglehold on everybody, you call them friend. Is it part of our international outlook, I do not know?

I do not want indictment of America. I do not want indictment of anybody. But I want complete identification of India with the national aspirations of people all over the world. I want India to go ahead and lead and to become emotionally part of the people of the small countries who are now under real fear.

One more word and I am closing. You said about good neighbourly policy. Where are we today in our good neighbourly policy in Nepal? We have two agreements. Wonderful. Are the two agreements in your favour? Were it a matter on which India was firm, it will never be two agreements on trade and transit, one solid agreement, because it is part of the trade agreement. But you say the right of transit on land area is now given. The result is they are the sovereign authority under international law to get transit to their country; it is today recognised and is established. This is just the thing they are wanting; you are giving.



Farakka is good for your country. There are so many things. What is happening in these areas? Small countries, the news is, they are linking up. On Sikkim has China given up its position inspite of your glorious visit on no matter it has happened.

These countries are between you and them. They know who is mighty; that way that has taken place. All I say is: Indian security is in danger. We have got danger from the south; our North has become vulnerable. The west has become vulnerable, by the great link up that is taking place through West Asia, all those areas. Wherever any country does not toe the line there is uprising and insecurity. India's position is absolutely in danger. Unless we make a common cause with the small countries in South East Asia and in Asia and challenge the domineering attitude of China and unless we build ourselves up, we will be in for trouble. In the international affairs you cannot make your position felt unless there is unity in this country. But the unity is now under stress and strain. They want us to be divided. All sorts of fissiparous tendencies are developing. The conflicts are developing in South and North and North and North East and all that. Over and above that you are carrying on your political campaign and political vendetta which will create emotional tensions and alienations which will not be good. In a situation like this united action and united position is necessary.

My charge against you is that you are allowing yourself to be scuttled into, with China dominating over here, a process of emotional tension and alienation. The Soviet Union and other countries which have been with us through thick and thin are deliberately going away with all your hisping slogans about non-alignment scuttling it, going on to play a second fiddle in the international conspiracy. That is the decisive position that is coming on now. Let us now at this stage try to evolve a national con-

sensus on the policy and renew our pledge to be a part of the international community, struggling for liberation against imperialism, against exploitation. We have nothing to lose there but everything to gain. That is the only salvation. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI P. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU  
(Chittoor): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to improve the image of India abroad (15)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to recognise Kampuchea (16)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Shift of the Government's policy of non-alignment (17)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure in giving better consular services abroad (18)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to have our own buildings for our Embassies at least in important countries (19)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Filling up posts in our Embassies abroad with the persons of low calibre and with one group of the Ruling Party (26)].

**SHRI KUMARI ANANTHAN** (Nager-coll): I beg to move:—

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to review Sirimavo-Shastri agreement and delay in its implementation which has led to phenomenal increase in the number of Stateless persons in Sri Lanka 34].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to activate and energise the Indian High Commission in Sri Lanka so that long queues of Stateless people seeking passports are minimised (35)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure of the Indian Embassy in U.S.A. to apprise the External Affairs Minister about US-Sino understanding before his visit to China (36)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to give more representation to the personnel of the Ministry coming from Southern States in the matter of postings abroad (37)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to train I.F.S. Personnel in Indian History, Culture and civilization before being posted abroad (38)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to end discrimination between I.F.S.—A and I.F.S.—B cadres (39)].

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE** (Howrah): I beg to move:—

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to recognise the Kampuchean Government (40)]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to effectively meet the situation arising out of establishment of U.S. naval base at Diego Garcia in Indian Ocean and its further moves to strengthen (41)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to support the demand for withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Korea (42)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to protect the interest of Indian immigrants in U.K., Canada and other countries on the issue of racial discrimination (43)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to take firm stand in support of Arab people and P.L.O. against the U.S.-Egypt-Israel understanding (44)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to check the influx of refugees from Bangladesh in West

Bengal, Tripura, Assam and other States in Eastern Region (45)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to protect Indian workers from economic exploitation in Gulf countries (46)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to condemn U.S. attitude severely in regard to supply of uranium for Tarapur Atomic Energy Plant as per agreements (47)].

SHRI A. ASOKARAJ (Perambalur): I beg to move:—

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to impress upon Sri Lanka Government the need to assist the coconut tappers of Indian origin in coming to India and in sending money to their relatives (86)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure of Cultural Attaches in foreign missions to present a positive picture of India abroad (87)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to re-assess the implementation of Srimavo-Shastri Agreement (88)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to expedite the repatriation of Stateless people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka (89)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to strengthen the Indian High Commission in Sri Lanka with Tamil-knowing staff (90)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to impress upon Sri Lanka Government the need to expedite the issuance of citizenship rights to Stateless people of the Indian origin (91)].

SHRI DHIRENDRANATH BASU (Katwa): I beg to move:—

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to protect liberty and interests of Indian immigrants in United Kingdom, Canada and African countries on the issue of discrimination (92)].

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to condemn the attitude of U.S.A. in respect of delaying tactics for supply of uranium for Tarapur Atomic Energy Plant (94)].

MR. SPEAKER: The cut motions are also before the House.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT (Dum Dum): I am very happy to support the demand that has been made by the Minister Incharge for External Affairs. I had been very keenly listening to the speech of Shri Stephen.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You have always been listening very carefully.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT: I always keep on listening and I was listening to-day too.

[Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt]

13.27 hrs.

[SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR in the Chair]

The speech, as usual, was very effective, very emotional. Shri Stephen tried to criticise the external affairs policy of the Government of India with lot of rhetoric and lot of historicities. But in substance he basically supported the policy that is going on.

We all agree that in external affairs there should be a national consensus. The national consensus demands the projection of our enlightened national interests. Our policy, ever since independence, has been to carry on the policy of non-alignment, trying to be friendly with everybody. It is not a question of smiling with everybody. But there is no question of going out of the way to be hostile with others and take a pose which we cannot match with our resources and our military strength. This policy of nonalignment was once upon a time supported by both the bigger power blocs but ultimately this policy is being supported by the largest number of nations in the world and we are still continuing this policy. While basically supporting the policy of non-alignment and the policy that is now being followed, I would like to draw the attention of the External Affairs Minister to certain aspects and I would like to give certain suggestions. I believe that the External Affairs Minister has taken keen notice of the very fine 29th Report of the Estimates Committee that has recently been placed on the Table of the House. In that Report the matters about our diplomatic missions abroad have been dealt with in extensive detail. In the very short time allotted to me I would not like to go through any of them because there are several points which I would like to emphasise. But I think the External Affairs Ministry will take a keen note of this and try to re-orientate their administration in the manner suggested therein.

One particular matter I would like to draw the attention of the External

Affairs Minister to which has not been dealt with in that Report, is the dealings of our diplomatic missions abroad with our nationals in many countries. In many countries now, a large number of Indian nationals are staying on a permanent or semi-permanent basis. Unfortunately the attitude of our diplomatic missions in those countries towards our nationals are not always uniform and sometimes we find that our diplomatic missions donot keep close contact with large sections of the Indian community. We have gained experience in our visits abroad that in certain cases the officially recognised representative bodies of Indian nationals abroad are being neglected and certain organisations which do not really represent the Indian community abroad are often pampered by the diplomatic missions. abroad. If the External Affairs Minister is interested about it, I will furnish him with details. I would not like to name anybody over here.

The report of the External Affairs Ministry has dealt with China in a rather short space. He had recently been to China and this was publicised throughout the world. History books are full of accounts by explorers. When an explorer goes to a certain country, he comes back and gives a detailed, clear and explicit report. The report about China is just the opposite. It is vague, full of smoke and fog and I do not know what has really been meant to be said over here. It is said that China will treat the question of support given to rebels from Nagaland, Mizoram and Manipur as a thing of the past. But some of us who had been to those areas in north-eastern India recently on official mission found evidence from the local people that though there was no direct evidence of insurgencies going on, still a large number of rebels from these areas are still in China and there is evidence that military training is still going on training them for guerilla warfare, so that they may come back and create nuisance in our country. These things ought to be taken notice of.

I am not one of those who are against an attempt to make a better friendly relationship with China, but this is a very delicate issue, which must be tackled with very great care. I appreciate the External Affairs Minister going to China, completely forgetting about pride, to make friends with them, but are the Chinese responding to it? While he was still over there it is mentioned in this report also—he had to cut short his visit and come back because the Chinese openly gave an affront, slapped us on the face; while he was staying there and enjoying their hospitality, they were invading one of the small nations which has always been consistently one of our friendliest nations. These things ought to be borne in mind. I would remind the External Affairs Minister that often when we try to chase an illusion forgetting about reality, the reality is also lost. I would like to remind him of a saying of one of the greatest diplomats India has produced in history:

यद्यथाणि परिच्यक्ष्य

अद्यथाणि निवेदतः ॥

धृवाणि तस्य तस्यन्ति

अद्यथा न नष्टमत्र हि ॥

"Somebody who chases after an unreal thing forgetting about reality, loses the reality; the unreal is already lost." By trying to be friend China, we have created an atmosphere where the Soviet Union, which has consistently been one of our most sincere friends, has some suspicion. We have had our differences with the Soviet Union. They have also criticised some of us; when we were in jail during the emergency, Soviet Union had affronted us by trying to divide Indians as progressives and reactionaries. We did not like it. We have also openly criticised the Soviet Union in regard to Hungary, Czechoslovakia and other issues. But forgetting these matters, basically on all major questions, the Soviet Union has consistently stood by us. In the far-away days when the

Kashmir issue came up, the Soviet Union steadfastly used their veto in the Security Council to protect us. Very recently during the Bangla Desh issue when there was an attempt to corner us and to create world opinion against us, it was the Soviet Union which not only helped us militarily but also diplomatically, strongly supported us.

Certain mention has been made about our relationship with different countries. Because of shortage of time I shall mention two or three of them specifically.

It is a fact that our relations today with our neighbours are far better than it was during the last regime. In fact, our relationship with the Soviet Union and the United States is much better than it was during the last regime. The last regime went out of its way to antagonise the United States and it went out of its way to be subservient to the Soviet Union. But now the relationship with the Soviet Union stands on the basis of mutual respect and firmer friendship on equal terms. We both are now looking at each other with renewed cordiality and respect. The recent visit of the Soviet Prime Minister to our country proved that point.

So far as our immediate neighbours are concerned, I come from the border of Bangla Desh. Last year, when we had this debate, the Government in Bangla Desh itself was rather nervous and shaky because their political footing was not sound enough. The present regime in Bangla Desh recently won a major election and is naturally feeling more confident and they can cope with us in a much more matured manner. Whatever may be the view with Bangla Desh it must be remembered that the Ganga water issue will always come up and that affects the constituency that I represent, because, unless we make a definite decision about having a minimum flow throughout the year, the entire port of Calcutta will ultimately completely be destroyed. It is significant that this

[Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt]

time of the year is the exact time of the year when the Ganga water problem becomes the most serious. The real problem comes up four weeks in a year i.e. last two weeks of March and first two weeks of April. During these four weeks the water flow through the main river comes to a level where if they take more than 30,000 cusecs, we are starved and if we take more than 30,000 cusecs, they get annoyed. It must be explained to them that it is a life and death question for the Calcutta Port. So far as flowing of water through Bangla Desh is concerned, none of their ports are hampered if the flow is a little less during this period. But if the flow through the Calcutta Port is not maintained at a minimum of 35,000 cusecs during these lean four weeks, then the silt that is gathered, damages the Port for the entire year. This matter must be thrashed out with Bangla Desh. In the Report in the very first page the Foreign Minister has dealt with this point but there was little progress towards this end. This affects our long term relationship with Bangla Desh and this matter must be taken up and it must be dealt with in detail.

I should also like to bring in the matter about keeping the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. This is a matter which affects us vitally. If we take a lead and try to mobilise public opinion amongst all the littoral nations, it is essential for us at the same time that we must remember the recent publications that we have received from Bangla Desh and other neighbouring countries which show that there is constant fear amongst all these countries about India again taking a 'big brotherly' attitude. But this is not a genuine fear on their part. Interested super powers may be trying to force this propaganda on them. But this must be borne in mind and India, however delicate the issue may be, has to take a lead about keeping the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Another matter I would like to draw the attention of the Foreign

Minister, before concluding, is our relationship with the EEC countries. Our trade with England has been one of the biggest for a long time. Our relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany today is very good. But our long-term relationship with Federal Germany, with England, with other EEC countries depends very much on what economic policy the EEC takes. At present the European Economic Community is considering very seriously about protectionism. If they pursue this line of protectionism, we have got to remember that while we were previously a commodity-exporting country, today we are exporting finished and semi-finished goods, and the EEC, particularly Germany, France, England, Holland and other countries are large buyers of our finished and semi-finished products; if this policy of protectionism goes on, then there is a grave danger of our relationship with these western European countries getting worse in future. This matter must also be borne in mind.

The countries of South East Asia, Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand they are all growing countries and they have great economic potentialities. They were under colonial rule of colonial exploitation. Thailand was never under colonial rule, but it was under colonial exploitation, Malaysia and Indonesia and other countries were under colonial rule. After independence, they are also emerging countries. Some of them are very well developed. The small city State of Singapore is highly developed. Our relationship with these countries, I must confess, is not what it should be. We are friendly with them. But, then, Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand have centuries old cultural relationship with us. Much better effort should be made for much more cultural contact between these countries, because in future Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand are going to be economically very powerful countries, and this is the time when we should try to improve our relations, not only in the economic field but also in the social and cultural

ral fields so that a much closer tie is established between these countries.

I would have liked to speak on several other matters but I could not do so for want of time. So, I will conclude by saying that the foreign policy that is being followed by the Government of India is the policy of non-alignment. If anybody tries to say that the policy of non-alignment followed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been changed, I do not think he would be making a correct statement, because the policy of non-alignment is still there. Actually, the policy of non-alignment has been completely damaged during the last regime when, in the name of non-alignment, they had completely bartered away India's real interests.

Today the policy that is being followed is in the enlightened national interest of the country. I congratulate the Foreign Minister and the junior Minister for pursuing a policy, which has enhanced the prestige of our country throughout the world, and today we can proudly say that India is looked upon by all nations of the world with a new esteem and a new respect.

**SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH** (Hoshangabad): Mr. Chairman, ever since two years ago when the Janata of India, the brave people of India, catapulted the Janata Party into power and office, and the impassioned orator of the erstwhile Jan Sangh, now a leading light of the Janata Party, a leading light of the Janata Government also, came to occupy the office formerly occupied by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and, later on, by various successors upto—Shri Y. B. Chavan, the External Affairs Minister, the Videsh Mantri, rather the Videsh Karya Mantri, with his affable nature and winsome manner has been glove-trotting, rather globe-flying on his patriotic mission of winning friends and influencing people for India, the outcome has been a curious amalgam of personal friendships and uncertain influence. The year 1977 bids fair to go down in history as the

*annus mirabilis* of the second half of the 20th century. By the events that have been ushered in during 1977, not merely in our country, Sir, not merely the peaceful revolution through the ballot box which has revived the freedom, seen the rebirth of democracy in our country, maybe because of that, but about events that have taken place in other countries of the world also one can with confidence say that that year's events will become the seed bed of geo-political developments that will dominate the coming years to the end of this century may be till the dawn of the 21st century. Across the seas the United State of America also has undergone a complete change of regime. The discredited, disgraced Nixon regime gave place to a new political order and a new government stepped in. In our own Asia, the most populous continent, the most ancient continent of the world, in our little neighbour Sri Lanka there was a similar change of political order. As the biggest nation of the world we are the largest democracy in the world, but the largest country is China, and we cannot change geography and we have to live as good friends, if possible. Karl Marx once said forgetting that he himself was a philosopher: "Philosophers explain the world, we have to change it." He meant by that, we have to change the society and social order. We cannot change geography. God has put in juxtaposition; India and China. And in China also in 1977 there was a complete change from the old order of Mao to new order; we do not know where it is likely to lead. But they have had a complete change and they have set the pace towards modernisation by the end of this century. And so also, we too, the biggest democracy in the world, the largest democracy at present, are looking forward to becoming the greatest democracy in the world by the end of this century. That is our aim, our goal, and our vision. And China has set its pace towards a new order of society and a new orientation, and in the same year 1977 in a corner of West Asia, a most unexpected, almost a miraculous, event took place. The

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

leader of a country which had been a mortal enemy of its neighbour in West Asia, President Sadat, male, shall I say almost in religious parlance, a pilgrimage to his neighbour country, Israel and addressed the Knesset, the thing which could never have been expected six months earlier, and we were all taken aback by the fast moving pace of events. That, Sir, today after 18 months, has led to the first step towards peace in a part of the world which has been a seething cauldron for the last 30 years. Should we not welcome that?

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition—somebody called him the 'shadow Prime Minister', I do not know if it is quite appropriate to call him 'shadow Prime Minister'...

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY  
(Bombay North-East): A shadow of the Prime Minister.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:  
Shadow of the former Prime Minister.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is appropriate to say 'Shadow of the former Prime Minister', 'shadow of the extinguished Prime Minister' we may call him. He talked about United Arab Nationalism. I wish there was a united Arab nationalism. That would have been a good thing for the world. Where is the unity in the Arab world?

Even today the papers brought the news that the Arab nations could not agree even on mild sanctions against Egypt. Faced with that, should we not also welcome the bold step, the courageous step, that President Sadat took towards securing peace and towards accomplishing his mission of peace in west Asia? I think we should, the Government should. But while welcoming the move which resulted in the fruition of peace between the two neighbours, Egypt and Israel, we should also insist, the Government should insist, that Resolution No. 242 if I am right—my memory may betray me, my memory is not strong,—of the United Nations Security Council with

regard to Arab rights should also be implemented.

Having said that, the year 1977 again saw the liberation of all peoples, all nations of the world, except Southern Africa,—Namibia and Zimbabwe towards the liberation of which we are also pledged, India is pledged, the Government is pledged; in the United Nations and outside Government have played a significant role in this regard. And I am sure that within a few years, even within a few months perhaps, these two countries also would become free, and that will see the geo-political picture completely changing into one of freedom, political freedom, for all the people, whatever may be the economic domination by certain interests, certain Powers, over other countries—to that I will come later, a little later.

Now, in our own continent of Asia, we are the largest democracy, and we should go forward with confidence and courage and pride in our own heritage and with a vision of the coming future of our country. That is the first requirement for our country and our Government and for the people of our country. We have been lately faced with difficult problems, and problems there must be, otherwise life would be dull. Without problems to be solved, life would be dull and therefore there must be problems. And I must say the Government has handled certain issues with tact and fineness and firmness, though it could have done better.

Recently, while we have had peace moves in West Asia, unfortunately in Southeast Asia there are certain other events taking place, and China invaded Viet Nam. Unified Viet Nam, United Viet Nam, had been admitted to the United Nations in 1977, only two years ago, after having withstood the mightiest power in the world for over 20 years. And Viet Nam has, helped by Russia, invaded with its troops, Kampuchea. China, with its declared intention of teach-



ing Viet Nam a lesson—I do not know how far it would be correct for one nation to teach another nation a lesson—invaded Viet Nam, and China and Viet Nam were locked in combat, and India had to face this problem, a dual problem, of how to react to events, and our Government played its cards very skilfully by refusing to recognise Kampuchea unless and until Government was sure whether the new regime had been established and had come to stay. This norm, this criterion, was laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as far back as the late forties and the early Fifties. When the question of Israel was raised in the Lok Sabha in those days, Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, reiterated again and again that “we would not recognise Israel”—recognition is different from the establishment of diplomatic relations. “We shall not recognise Israel till we are sure that the regime has come to stay and it is an established regime”. That is the stand which the Government of India has taken today with regard to Kampuchea and I think it is a correct stand. But soon after our indefatigable External Affairs Minister returned from China—he recently visited China, when he was in China, China invaded Vietnam—we had a visit by the Soviet Prime Minister, and unfortunately, I must say, we were treated, when the Soviet Prime Minister was here, to discourses, to lectures on ‘aggression’ and what ‘aggression’ constitutes as if we did not know what ‘aggression’ means and as if we had to be taught. We faced aggression a few years ago by China, by Pakistan. But I am glad that the Government was not inveigled by the Soviet Prime Minister into subscribing to their thesis, their doctrine, their theory or their stance of branding China as aggressor. The Joint Communiqué only referred to the attack by China against Vietnam. Now I am somewhat amused and amazed when the Soviet Union tries to teach us or any country what ‘aggression’

is and how ‘aggression’ should be described. The Soviet Union itself, when calling China ‘aggression’ forgets the acts of aggression that it committed itself, since the end of the Second World War and even earlier. After the First World War, Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia were bobbed up by Russia, and then after the Second World War came Stalin’s penetration, not so peaceful penetration, sometimes very unpeaceful penetration into the Eastern Europe and many East European countries were also sucked into the Soviet camp. Only Romania stood apart.

So far as India is concerned, we get sad when we remember how—during the Second World War, overnight the Communist Party of India—now unfortunately split, at that time, they were one-obeyed the *Moscow diktat* in 1941 and overnight the Imperialist war became the people’s war and they all became people’s warriors, and they asked the people of India to believe that they were people’s warriors. These were the events, and then came Hungry and Czechoslovakia in recent years.

I do not know whether you are aware of the talk that we had with the Hungarian friends who were here last month. When I questioned them, they admitted, their leader admitted that even today, there are Soviet troops on Hungarian soil, and we know how Imre Nagy was liquidated in Hungary and how in Czechoslovakia Dubcek was sent out. I do not know where he is now, where he is at present.

14 hrs.

The only apology that was made by the Hungarian leader at our talks with them last month in Parliament House was that because there were American troops somewhere north, either in West Germany or West Berlin, Russian troops were stationed in Hungary. But they are invisible

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

troops; they do not come out; they do not show themselves to the people. They remain in the barracks. Only when there is trouble, they will be called; the tanks will be called; the tanks will roll in the streets and the planes will zoom overhead. Therefore, we should beware of both our neighbours, China and Russia....

1.01 hrs.

[SHRIMATI PARVATI KRISHNAN in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is for the Minister to reply; he is listening to the debate.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Madam Chairman, I will finish in five minutes.

China is a closer neighbour and is nearer to India. There was aggression by China. But now that the Chinese leaders have turned a new leaf after the death of Mao, we need not distrust them. Let us give them a chance and see whether they are as good as their word. Russia is Janus-faced, with one face towards Europe and the other towards Asia, and it is accordingly following a policy. But they also, these two communist giants, are now looking towards the whole world as to where their influence can be spread. Russia is naturally casting its eyes towards Europe but there is not much for them there, and so, it is now cast its eyes towards Asia.

My hon. friend, Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt, talked about the Indian Ocean. I also feel that the Indian Ocean should remain a zone of peace. The whole world should be a zone of peace, why only the Indian Ocean? That is the goal that we are pursuing, that our Government and our External Affairs Minister, is also pursuing—Shanti, Shanti, Shanti and Jai Jagat, as he said in the United Nations. When we talk of American presence in the Indian Ocean, why do we forget how strong the Russian power also is in the Indian Ocean?

These are the facts and figures about the Soviet presence in and around the Indian Ocean apart from the increase of Soviet shipdays in it:

(1) The Soviet use of naval facilities at Hodeida, Yemen which can accommodate guided missile destroyers and submarines; (2) re-fuelling and repair facilities for the Soviet Navy at Aden; (3) use by the Soviets of a 17,500 foot runway, tank farms and port facilities at Berbera, Somalia and additional Somalian tank and airfield facilities—not now perhaps—at Mogadiscio and Bela di Amin, respectively; (4) the Soviet use of mooring facilities off the Malagasy Republic; (5) the Soviet use of mooring facilities and logistical aid at Port Louis, Mauritius and also off the Mauritian coast; and (6) the possibility of establishment of bunkering stations or naval facilities for use by the Soviet in Angola and Mozambique.

Therefore, having said that, I would only request and urge the Government to ensure that in the resumed talks with China—in the near future, I suppose, the talks will be resumed after the present dust of events has settled in South-East Asia—the Government would take up the question of not merely the question of the border dispute, the border question, but also about the McMahon line. The whole question arose, and it became so thorny because the McMahon line was only in the air, so to say, not on the ground. As Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru admitted, there was no demarcation on the ground. If that had been done, perhaps even the unfortunate events of 1962 might not have happened.

Pandit Nehru admitted later on that there had been no McMahon line demarcation on the ground—it was only on the map cartographic. Now that will be taken up, I am sure, and there has been an assurance by the Chinese Government that so many

issues have been unfrozen or defrozen. Along with those, I would insist, the Tibet issue also should be defreezed or defrozen. And what I would ask for is this. Mr. Chou-en-Lai promised in 1955 or about that time, during Buddha Mahaparinirvana celebrations here in India, about that time, Chou-en-Lai, the Prime Minister of China at that time, assured our then Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, that Tibet would be given full autonomy. But that proved to be a hollow promise. 'Promises like piecrusts are meant to be broken' so said Stalin. Chou-en-Lai at that time followed Stalin's dictum 'Promises like piecrusts are meant to be broken'. Now, the whole situation has changed. There is a new regime in China, and our External Affairs Minister, who had talks, was impressed by the forth-comingness of the Chinese leaders. I hope he will take up this issue also, and try to secure internal autonomy, if not full independence, for Tibet.

At that Banquet in Peking which he attended, he made a very significant point. This is 'Sino-Indian Relations-Banquet Speech'—I hope it was a 'big Banquet'.. Banquet Speech by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee; in that, he said, referring to India's vision:

Our vision is based on the recognition that:

"while each nation must choose its own path to progress, the interests of all countries south of the Himalayas could be prompted through economic cooperation based on equality and dignity."

And in his famous oration at the United Nations in 1977, he had also said—I was there at that time; so, I remember it very well. Here it is:—

"If we realise that man's survival is inextricably linked with that of millions of others as never in the past, we will reach the only answer to the requirement of our times:

national sovereignty must adjust itself to international interdependence."

Now, putting these two pieces together, I would like to make a few proposals to him on which, I hope, he will ponder.

I agree that India's security, particularly because of our refusal to go in for nuclear arms, to develop nuclear arms, is not a hundred per cent okay, that means, we are not a hundred per cent secure. President Tito had said in 1960, he told me, I had the honour of meeting him in Belgrade in 1960—that, in the late forties when Stalin threatened Yugoslavia and Stalin's troops stood on Yugoslavia's border, then he had no inhibition, Yugoslavia had no inhibitions, no hesitations in securing arms from wherever possible, east, west, north or south; he said, 'we were fully prepared to meet Stalin on our borders; but he did not advance'. Then with a very smile on his face President Tito said 'in 1953, Stalin died and we became a little more comfortable.' Therefore, to-day placed as we are, we should not put all our eggs in one basket. I do not know but the Defence Minister told us some days ago in reply to a question of mine that we are not self-sufficient even in conventional arms. Not sufficient—not in nuclear arms, we are not going in for nuclear arms at all, we are not even going for a nuclear umbrella, we are not self-sufficient even in conventional arms. From where are we going to get them? We should get them from wherever they are available and we should not be dependent only on one power, whether it be the Soviet Union or the USA or any other country, that is one proposal.

The second proposal is that we should strive very earnestly for a Confederation of all the countries south of the Himalayas, taking his own proposal to its logical conclusion. He said that the interests of the coun-

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]  
tries south of the Himalayas should be promoted through economic co-operation based on equality and dignity. We should promote a Confederation of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, even Nepal, Sri Lanka and Burma and I am sure if this is put forward earnestly, with all the strength at our command—we are the biggest nation, the largest democracy on earth—it will catch. It may not catch to-day but it may catch tomorrow or the day after. Had anybody dreamt at any time that there should be a European Economic Community and a European Parliament coming into being? That has happened. Then why can't we?..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I am concluding. Please be a little more patient. Please give me two more minutes to make two more proposals.

I, therefore, suggest that we should put forward our proposals for a Confederation and failing that, a South Asian Economic Community like the European Economic Community which may ultimately lead to a South Asian Parliament and perhaps later on to Parliament of Asia and Parliament of the World. *Jai Jagat.*

Lastly, I would say China suspects us because we have the 1971 Treaty with Russia. We have not had any such treaty with any other country in the world. I do not say it is wrong. I don't but to disabuse China's mind of any suspicion about us we, on our

part, can offer such a Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation to China, after the border question is resolved.

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur): Dr. Subramaniam Swamy is very happy.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I have made three proposals which I hope the Government will fully and seriously ponder and consider.

I cannot conclude better than by recalling the vision that came to Rabindranath Tagore when he was at the apex of his power—poetical and intellectual. That is the vision which we should all have. I am sure the Minister has it and we all in India should have it and mankind also should cherish that vision. What is that vision? With that I will conclude. Where the mind without fear and the head is held high.  
Where knowledge is free.

Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls,

Where words come out from the depth of truth,

Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection,

Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way in the dreary desert sand of dead habit,

Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever widening thought and

action,

Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let all mankind awake....

Not only my country awake, let all mankind awake.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE** (Howrah): Madam, Chairman, the international situation which we are now discussing, is changing very rapidly and the recent developments have a significant bearing on the course of other developments in the world, particularly, in Asia and the South-Asian zone. The time at my disposal is very short. That is why I am stating only the positive policies from our party. The attempt on the part of the Government to develop the friendly relations with all the neighbouring countries is a very welcome attempt and it should be consistently pursued.

Here comes the Question of normalisation of the relations with China. We fully support the stand taken by Government of India to send its External Affairs Minister to China to have dialogues, to improve relations with China. Due to sudden attack of China on Vietnam, this link has been temporarily disrupted. But, we want that Government of India should again pick up that link and try its level best to develop relations with China as early as possible.

I am not going into the reasons. But now, I see the policy of the Government of India to extend its relations is being attacked from various corners. I think this is a wrong attack and the general policy pursued by the present Government to develop friendly relations with all the neighbouring States should be consistently pursued and from that any diversion will only help the imperialists to come into the picture as trouble-makers and create illfeelings among the neighbouring countries.

In this respect, I oppose the stand which has just now been expressed by my friend, Shri Kamath. This is a question of reopening the Tibet issue. All this has been discussed and settled. So, there is no question of reopening this issue. In a way we have already accepted the sovereignty of China over Tibet. Silence of the

Government of India on the question of the judgment of the Pakistan High Court on Mr. Bhutto's hanging order is not at all helpful. The world public opinion has raised the demand of clemency; but on the plea that we will not interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan and we shall not remain silent. It will be in the interest of democracy—general people are in favour of Mr. Bhutto's being given the clemency—that he should be saved from the gallows. Even the U.N. General Secretary has expressed this demand and various Governments have also raised this demand. Very recently, in the Conference of the Arab States, they have decided to move a joint resolution to raise this demand. But, what will be the consequence if Mr. Bhutto is put to hanging? A tremendous repercussion is feared and then there will be further turmoil against the present military rule in Pakistan. Actually, the issue is not of Mr. Bhutto's personal life, the issue is whether the military Government should exist or whether a democratic form of Government should come into power. The question is linked up with the announcement of the coming election. Now he has become the key figure is mobilising the forces of democracy in Pakistan. In the coming election, Shri Bhutto has become a real challenge to the military rule now in Pakistan. That is why the Pakistan's military administrator wants to get rid of Bhutto because he fears in the coming elections Bhutto's party may get the majority—if there is a free and fair elections. This implication must be understood and Government of India must raise its voice demanding clemency for Mr. Bhutto.

Madam Chairman, our foreign policy is non-alignment. But the main question is what should be the content of this non-alignment. It is true that we are taking a stand against neo-colonialism and against imperialism but still there is vacillation and weakness. I will give some examples.

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

I do not agree with Mr. Kamath regarding his views on American base in Diego Garcia and its strengthening of the fleet equating with Soviet presence of the Naval forces in Indian Ocean. Equating of a socialist country with an imperialist country is the weakness of the Government of India's policy in foreign relations. We have to see who is the real enemy of the people. Is it the imperialist forces or the socialist forces? Who is creating trouble in Bangladesh, West Asia, Rhodesia and South Africa? All this is now quite clear. Where there are reactionary forces they get the backing of the American imperialism both in terms of money and modern sophisticated weapons so that they remain in a position to dominate and intervene in such a way that the world-scale national liberation movements and advance towards democracy are curbed and suppressed. (Interruptions)

Friends, you have to keep in mind that the Government of India—India as a whole, has taken socialism as the objective of our country. That is, we have to go towards socialism...

**AN HON'BLE MEMBER:** That is Gandhian socialism.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE:** So, in India this battle for socialist ideology is coming more and more to the forefront and the superiority of the socialist system is asserting itself not only here but also elsewhere. All the newly liberated countries are taking to socialism. The same thing is happening in Africa. This shows that socialism is the superior social system in which system the question of unemployment, the question of poverty and the question of exploitation have got solved basically. We cannot get rid of unemployment, poverty, oppression and social injustice unless we fully change the present social system and go into a socialist system. The present social system in India is of a composite character—having the aspects of both capitalist and feudalistic

system. That is why in India disparity is day by day growing because of this exploitative character of this system. That is why the Government want to keep equi-distance both from imperialist America and socialist countries and they equate America and socialist countries at the same level.

That is not anti-imperialism, that is not a fight against neo-colonialism, which is the policy of the group of imperialist forces where America is the main leader. What is the purpose of the agreement just arrived at between Egypt and Israel aided by America, in which Mr. Carter himself took initiative? He went to Israel and Egypt. What is the main purpose? The main purposes is to strengthen American base in Israel and Egypt Israel is their main base. With this agreement he has been able to win over Egypt. Immediately after the agreement is reached, America has promised economic aid and supply of arms, sophisticated arms, to Egypt. Even in today's paper it has appeared that America will give aid worth of Rs. 4.5 billion dollars. About 3 billion to Israel and about 1.5 billion to Egypt. What is the purpose? The purpose is that they want to divide the entire Arab countries because the direction of the entire Arab movement goes against Imperialism. The Arab countries want full independence and sovereignty and they want to have an independent Palestinian State. India has accepted their policy and the position. We have supported them and that stand is a correct stand. But if we see the role of American Imperialism and their strategy—thereby now they are successful in bringing about the disruption in the entire Arab movement—you would see that is why they would continuously pursue the tactics in strengthening the naval base in Diego Garcia. This is from "Business Standard" I am referring, which they have decided to follow. They have decided to have a base in the Indian ocean for their 5th

Fleet permanently. I quote here the news item:

"The American aircraft carrier Constellation sailed from Subic Bay in the Philippines on March 8 accompanied by a destroyer and a cruiser. The Constellation carries about 50 fighters and attack aircraft plus some anti-submarine aircraft and four E-20 Hankeye aeroplanes which can do much the same job as the E-3As. The United States has sent similar carrier groups into the Indian ocean and Arabian Sea at regular intervals for several years. But now there is a serious talk of basing a large group—a Fifth Fleet in the Indian ocean permanently."

They want to make this base a permanent base. Whereas the UNO has passed a resolution that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace. Our Government has also put forth the same demand, the littoral countries also raised the same demand. Who is defying the UNO Resolution? Is it the Soviet Union defying your demand or the American Imperialism? It is not responding to your call, it is not responding to the demand of all the littoral countries. They are not only defying the UNO Resolution but also they are strengthening Diego Garcia base because they want to dominate the Middle-East, South-East Asia and the entire region of Asia. Now, here lies the danger to the security not only of India but also of the littoral and other South-East Asian countries. You have already known about the role of U.S. imperialism when Bangladesh war was there. Can you equate those two countries USA and Russia when there was a war with Bangladesh? Even from that experience if you fail to learn and try to equate between these two it shows that though we are pursuing the policy of non-alignment, we want to keep the American Imperialism satisfied so that we can gain some monetary help or some assistance from them. But America will not give you monetary assistance without a

pre-condition involving its imperialist interests. The recent example is the nuclear fuel supply. What is it doing now? America is blackmailing us in regard to supply of nuclear fuel to Tarapur. What about the Soviet Union proposal? The Soviet Union has come forward to help us. I have read in some news paper about this. There is no agreement but they are prepared to supply nuclear fuel for developing our atomic power plants. So, it is wrong to equate these two countries and this must always be kept in mind. In coming days, fights between the forces of imperialism and forces of freedom and democracy are bound to intensify on a World scale. And there the lining up will take place. In this what should be the role of the Government of India? Here, the Government of India should be firmly in the camp of the anti-imperialist forces; it should be more assertive and more vocal. Instead of expressing positively the stand of the Government of India regarding this recent Egypt-Israel agreement, we want that this agreement should be bitterly condemned. What are the Arab countries doing? Simply expressing our stand shows that there is weakness, that we cannot denounce American Imperialism. That courage is absent that courage must be shown. This does not weaken our independent stand, it strengthens our independent stand. Wherever necessary, we can have some agreement with America regarding technical collaboration, cultural collaboration, but when America game is there to disrupt the Arab movement and deny the Palestinian people of their right for an independent state, we must make known our stand in strong and clear terms. Egypt and Israel have entered into an agreement with the support of American imperialism; they are now consolidating the aggression conducted by Israel during 1967. Israel has not agreed to vacate all those areas, which they occupied. We have opposed this and we support the Government of India's stand, but it is our

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

belief that this opposition should be done in a positive way. We should not have a weak approach towards this problem. Our Government should firmly condemn this agreement in Middle-East because it has very serious consequences.

The Government should give recognition to the Cambodian Government. Here also, the Government has shown weaknesses because the new Cambodian Government is formed by the people of Cambodia; it has not been formed by Vietnam. That is why the Government of India should come forward immediately with its recognition.

China says that their forces have vacated Vietnam but we find that some area is still under their occupation. I have seen a Vietnamese statement, according to which at 17 points, 10000 strong army is still there. That is why, unless this complete vacation is there, negotiations cannot start. In this respect also, the Government has taken a good stand; we fully support that, but there also they should also assert that education should be complete according to the historical line of the old border so that the negotiations could start and all these disputes settled through negotiations and not by a war.

In general, though we are in agreement with the foreign policy of the Government of India, yet these stances should be clearly focussed and the role of the American imperialism must be openly denounced.

**श्री अंबर झाक शर्मा (दिल्ली सदर) :** सभापति महोदय, मैं इस सम्बन्ध में लीडर आफ दि अपोजिशन के विचार बहुत ध्यान से सुने। उन्होंने भी इस देश की नान-अलाइन्मेंट की पालिसी की सराहना की और कहा कि हमारी विदेश की पालिसी एक नेशनल कंसेन्सस से बननी चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस से कोई भी धावसी ठिकर नहीं कर सकता है। यह कोई पार्टी का सबाल नहीं है। हमारी फारन पालिसी पर एक नेशनल कंसेन्सस होना चाहिए। लेकिन जब मैं उनका बयान सुन रहा था तब उनके नान अलाइन्मेंट के अर्थसभ में मुझे श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की वह तस्वीर नजर आयी जो कि कोई लोक सभा में भेरे सामने आयी

थी। लीडर आफ दि अपोजिशन चाहते थे कि जनता पार्टी इस पालिसी में उसी सम्बन्धी का इस्तेमाल करे जो कि वह करती थी। वे चाहते थे कि हम भी उसी तरह से यू० एस० ए० को कंडम करे, उसी तरह से पाकिस्तान और बाहना को कंडम करें। उनका नान-अलाइन्मेंट का मतलब केवल सोवियत रूस के साथ दोस्ती रखने से और बाकी किसी दूसरे देश के साथ दोस्ती रखने से नहीं था। यही वे हम से भी चाहते हैं। दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि जनता पार्टी इस तरह की नान अलाइन्मेंट पालिसी में विश्वास नहीं रख सकती। जनता पार्टी चाहती है कि म्यूचुअल कोअप्रेेशन हो, पीसफुल को-एग्जिस्टेंस हो और जैनुइन नान-अलाइन्मेंट होनी चाहिए। हो सकता है किसी भाई को इसके इम्प्लेमेंटेशन में फर्क दिखाई देता हो। यह नीति आज नहीं पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने रखी थी। उसी को जनता पार्टी सही मानें में माने ले जा रही है।

आज इस तरह से और हमारे भी कुछ साथी कहते हैं कि गंभी महोदय को चीन नहीं जाना चाहिए था और जाने के बाद चीन नें जो वीयतनाम पर आक्रमण किया उसको उन्होंने जोर से कंडम नहीं किया और इसकी वजह से सोवियत संघ के साथ दोस्ती खतरे में पड़ेगी और हमने कम्बुजिया को भी रिकग-नाइज नहीं किया। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपको याद होगा कि जब आक्रमण हुआ था तो हमारे विदेश मंत्री बिना एक मिनट की भी देर किए हुए एक दम वापिस आ गए थे। यह प्रॉटेस्ट नहीं तो क्या था? क्या यह चीन की आँखें खोलने वाली बात नहीं थी? इतना ही नहीं हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जो कुछ पहले ही दिन कहा उसको मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं कौट कर रहा हूँ :

"The Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, has expressed his profound shock and distress at the outbreak of hostilities on the northern borders of Vietnam. This has created a situation endangering international peace and security. The Prime Minister expressed his earnest hope for the immediate restoration of peace and, as a first step, stressed the urgent need for the withdrawal of Chinese forces from Vietnam."

श्री विचार हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने प्रकट किए थे। यहाँ पर एपेशन शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया गया है। साथ ही हमने यह भी कहा कि हम कम्बुजिया को और इसको अलग अलग निगाह से देखते हैं। बहुत से देश दोनों इन्चुज को मिलाते हैं लेकिन हमने इन दोनों इन्चुज को अलग अलग निगाह से देखा है। हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने कहा कि किसी को पतिश करने के लिए, किसी को सबक सिखाने के लिए आप मित्रिटी का इस्तेमाल नहीं कर सकते हैं। अगर अगवा है तो हमारी नीति यह है कि बैठ करके शांति से देबल के ऊपर उसकी सुलझाव्य चाहिए।



हमारे दोस्त कहते हैं कि इस में हमारी कमजोरी है। लेकिन यह कोई नई चीज नहीं है। मेरे पास 1975 की रिपोर्ट है एक्सटर्नल एफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री की जब शोन्तो इंदिरा गांधी प्रधान मंत्री थीं। यह कहती है :

"The Indian Government followed a consistent policy of seeking to normalise relations with China. A Chinese Table-Tennis team came to India in February 1975, at the invitation of Indian Table-Tennis Federation, to take part in the world Table-Tennis Championships. Similarly, the Indian Government agreed to the Chinese request to instal a general telex link at its Embassy in New Delhi on a reciprocal basis India also supported China's candidature in international organizations like the Asian Development Bank."

जो पालिसी पहली सरकार ने तय की थी क्या यह उस का एक्सटेंशन नहीं है। चीन से हमने अपने एम्बेसडर को वापिस बुला लिया था। किस ने पहले वहाँ दुबारा एम्बेसडर को भेजा क्या पहली सरकार ने नहीं भेजा अगर वह वापिस भेज सकती है और जब पहली सरकार कहती है कि हम नार्मल रिश्तों का चाहते हैं तो अगर हम भी वही बात कहते हैं तो इस में आपत्ति की क्या बात है और क्यों कहा जाता है कि प्राय टेबल टेनिस की टीम भेज सकते हैं, उनको बुला सकते हैं। चीन ने कहा कि बोर्डर के सवाल पर बात नहीं करेंगे, हमने कहा नहीं, आपको उस सवाल पर भी बात करनी होगी, जब तक वह तय नहीं हो जाता है चीन के साथ पूरे तौर पर नार्मलाइजेशन नहीं हो सकता है। आपकी याद होगा कि एक और बात हमने लगाई थी। हमने कहा था कि सोवियत संघ के साथ हमारी दोस्ती के बारे में बातचीत नहीं कि जाएगी। मैं चाहता हूँ मंत्री महोदय स्पष्ट करें इस बात की और जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है इस संदर्भ में की सारी बातचीत के अन्दर सोवियत संघ के साथ हमारी दोस्ती के बारे में कुछ भी बात नहीं की गई और न किसी तरह से यह बिज प्रश्नकारों के जरिये सामने आई। घटना ही सवाल नहीं है की पाकिस्तान के साथ उनके क्या रिश्तों हैं, पाकिस्तान कमजोर में उनके सोचने का क्या तरीका है, सीधे विवेक की आम्स देते हैं। उसका सवाल है। जो सड़क बनाई है उसका सवाल है जब हम नार्मलाइजेशन चाहते हैं और इस सवाल में भी पास किया है तो मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या बातचीत के अलावा और कोई दुसरा रास्ता है ?

कहते हैं कि मंत्री महोदय को बहाने नहीं जाना चाहिये था। क्यों नहीं जाना था ? आखिर उनका दिमाग क्या है, वह क्या सोचते हैं इसको अल्टीमेट सूचना देने के लिये मंत्री जो वहाँ पर गये इसके लिये मैं उनकी बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। मैं नहीं समझता कि वह किस तरह से कंटेम करवाना चाहते हैं। क्या इससे भी ज्यादा और कोई तरीका हो सकता है कंटेम करने का जैसा कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री जो ने किया ? एशिया ने क्या किया ? रशिया के साथ उनका एग््रीमेंट था। आखिर रशिया ने भी भारत ने जो किया उससे कुछ बहुत ज्यादा नहीं किया। लोग कह रहे थे कि रशियन नेबल प्लोट आगे जा रहा है। पता नहीं वह वहाँ जाते जाते पहुंचा भी कि नहीं। मेरा कहना है कि एक कमिटेड लॉबी है जो एक देश के साथ है और जो चाहती है कि भारत केवल एक जगह रहे, दूसरों के साथ दोस्ती न रहे। मैं उनसे पूछता चाहता हूँ कि भारत किसके साथ दोस्ती करे यह बात क्या मास्को, वाशिंगटन या पीकिंग में तय होगी? नहीं। यह बात नई दिल्ली तय करेगी। जिस भारत सरकार के साथ भारत को जनता के ऊपर है वही लोग तय करेंगे कि किस के साथ दोस्ती होगी चाहिये।

आज हमें सिखा दी जाती है कि केवल एक तरफ देखें, दूसरी तरफ नहीं। यह नहीं हो सकता है। आज भी हम कहते हैं कि चाहना है जो कुछ किया गलत किया, उसको हम कंटेम करते हैं। ऐग्रेसन का कम किसी को नहीं मिलना चाहिये। लेकिन चाहना के साथ बातचीत का दरवाजा खुला रहना चाहिये। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि बातचीत खत्म हो। आखिर 1962 में जब भारत पर हमला हुआ था तो इन बातों ने क्या किया ? और रशिया ने क्या किया था ? सभापति महोदय, आपको धरुंछी तरह याद होगा। अगर याद हो तो मैं आपकी जानकारी के लिये उसका उद्धरण कोट करना चाहता हूँ। जब चाहना है हम पर हमला किया उस समय क्या कहा गया था :

"Mr. Kosygin not to make an issue of the matter and to accept Delhi's clear view Moscow then opted for calculated restraint and even refused to condemn the Chinese attack much less to denounce it as "aggression." Instead, Pravde, in an editorial entitled "In the interest of people and in the name of universal people and in the name of universal days later, on October 25. "As for the Soviet people, they see the statement of the Chinese Government as evidence of sincere concern over relations with India and eagerness to bring the conflict to a halt."

[श्री कंवरलाल गुप्ता]

यह कहा था रशिया ने। आज हमसे यह धाधा की जाती है कि हम उसके बारे में बहुत सख्ती से कुछ करें। मेमबरता है कि जनता पार्टी ने जो किया है वह बिल्कुल ठीक है।

जहां तक सोवियत नियम का सवाल है, मैं मानता हूँ कि सोवियत यूनियन ने आज से नहीं, शुरू से हमारा साथ दिया है, जो सही माने में हमारा दोस्त है। मैं उनमें से सोवियत यूनियन की भिन्ती गिनता हूँ, और हमारी दोस्ती पक्की रहेगी। यह हमने सऊदी से अमरीका, बाइना और दूसरे लोगों को बताया है कि हम सोवियत की कोस्ट पर दूसरों के साथ दोस्ती नहीं करना चाहते। कोसिगिन साहब का क्या स्टेटमेंट है, जो लोग कहते हैं कि इससे रशिया पर खराब असर पड़ेगा, स्वयं कोसिगिन साहब यहां प्राये और उन्होंने क्या कहा :

“Indo Soviet ties: strong like rock.”

तो जब कोसिगिन यह कहते हैं, तो यह जो कैसा दुबलसत है वह दूसरी तरह की बातें करें, यह अच्छा नहीं होगा।

मैं स्वयं रशिया गया था, वहां जाकर मेरे ऊपर जो प्रभाव पड़ा वह मैं जानता हूँ, क्योंकि मैं भारतीय हूँ, इसलिये मेरी इज्जत है। इस तरह का बातावरण सोवियत यूनियन में है, इसको कोई डिनाई नहीं कर सकता है। इसलिये सोवियत यूनियन की दोस्ती हम रखना चाहते हैं और उसे मजबूत बनाना चाहते हैं लेकिन एक शब्द में जरूर कहूंगा और चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय भी इनके बारे में विचार करें।

एमजेन्सी के दिनों में मास्को रेडियो ने और तास के दूसरे समाचार-पत्रों ने जिस तरह से एमरजेन्सी का समर्थन किया था और जिस तरह से हमारे उपर आक्रमण किया, हमारे इंटरनेल मामलों में दखलान्दाजी की, हम उसको भूल गये, क्योंकि हम रशिया के साथ दोस्ती चाहते हैं।

दुब की बात यह है कि आज भी रशिया हमारे इंटरनेल मामलों में कभी-कभी दखल देता है। रीसेन्सी थार 09स 09स 0 के बारे में तास ने एक खतरनाक खबर निकाली जो कि सत्य नहीं थी, पटनायक का नाम लेकर। पटनायक ने उतना कहा भी नहीं, मेरे पास समय नहीं है इसलिये मैं कोट नहीं करना चाहता उसके बाद तास का कोरस्पोंडेन्स थार 09स 09स 0 के बाफिस में गया, वहां बात की। उन्होंने उसके कन्ट्रिब्यूशन का पत्र भी लिखकर दिया, लेकिन तास ने उसकी कोई कन्ट्रिब्यूशन नहीं छापी। (जबबखाल) रशिया में सरकारी और गैर-सरकारी एजेन्सी में कोई फर्क नहीं है। तो उन्होंने कान्ट्रिब्यूशन भी नहीं निकाला।

This is immoral and means interference in the internal affairs of this country. I will request the hon Min-

ister to say something about it and what action has been taken in this connection by our government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude now.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I have taken just ten minutes; I have hardly begun.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Irrespective of how much time you have taken, I have to go by the number given by the whip. You have got two minutes more.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not make such remarks about the Chair; such remarks are impermissible.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: That is by the way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then it will not go on record since it is by the way.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: agree.

आज भी कम्युन्यी की रिकग्नीशन के बारे में बात की जाती है, हमारे मित्र ने भी कहा कि रिकग्नाइज करना चाहिये। हमारी सरकार ने कहा कि वहां गवर्नमेंट एस्टैबलिश नहीं है। मुझे जहां तक जानकारी है, नान-ग्लान्ड कंट्रीज की संख्या दुनिया में 88 है। 88 में से केवल 5 देश ऐसे हैं, जिन्होंने अभी तक कम्युन्यी को रिकग्नाइज किया है। आप चाहते हैं कि एक वम हम जन्म करें, तो मैं चाहूंगा कि वहां गवर्नमेंट एस्टैबलिश हो जाये तो उसके बाद हमें करने में एतराज नहीं होगा। यह हमें करना चाहिये।

इसके बाद एक बीज की तरफ मैं नती महोदय का ध्यान और विलाळमा कि आपन और बाइना की ट्रेड ट्रीटी हुई है, यू 09स 09स 0 के साथ भी उसकी अंडर-स्टैंडिंग हुई है, बाइना ने बियतनाम पर अटैक किया 1962 में हमारे ऊपर अटैक किया और आज बाइना के रिसेन्स पाकिस्तान के साथ कैसे हैं, इन सब को भिखकर आप देखेंगे तो तस्वीर थोड़ी सी भयानक सी भी दीखती है। मैं चाहूंगा मंत्री महोदय इस के बारे में स्पष्टीकरण करें। बाहे यह ऊपर से ट्रेड ऐग्रीमेंट है, ऊपर से यह ज्यादा खतरनाक नहीं लगता, लेकिन कभी भी ये खतरनाक रास्ता प्रख्यार कर सकते हैं। इसलिये सरकार को इस संबंध में एलर्ट होना चाहिये और मैं

\*\*Not recorded.

तो यह कहूंगा कि आज की जो स्थिति है उस स्थिति में मेरा मत साफ है कि आप चाहे कुछ भी कहें लेकिन हमारे पास और कोई रास्ता नहीं है। आज पाकिस्तान के बारे में आप ने जबाब दिया है, चाटना के पास ऐटम बन है। ऐसी हालत में भारत को ऐटम बन बनाया बिना कोई रास्ता नहीं है क्योंकि टैट इक द चीनसी डेटेंट।

यू० एस० ए० के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, हम यू० ए० से दोस्ती चाहते हैं, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है। लेकिन दोस्ती का मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम अपने नेशनल इंटरैस्ट को सैक्रिफाइस करें। हम जो चाहते हैं उसके ऊपर हम ने कोई कमप्रोमाइज नहीं किया। यहां पर जब कार्टर साहब आए थे तो हमने नान-प्रॉलिफरेशन ट्रीटी पर हस्ताक्षर करने से मना कर दिया... (बबबबबब)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now. I have already given you two minutes and you have taken three minutes more. Please conclude now.

श्री कंबार लाल गुप्त : मेरा कहना यह है कि आज भी अमेरिका के साथ हमारा मतभेद है, लेकिन मतभेद दोस्तों की तरह से है, दुश्मनी की तरह से नहीं है।

पब्लिसिटी के बारे में एक बात कह कर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। पब्लिसिटी के बारे में हम ने देखा है। मेरे पास इंदिरा गांधी जो पब्लिसिटी करती थी उसकी भी रियोट है। दस लाख रैम्फलेट्स वहां पर बांट गए। हिन्दुस्तान में क्या हो रहा है, अन्दर के मानने के बारे में। एमर्जेंसी में क्या हुआ, मैं करीब दस देवों में बूम कर आया, लेकिन मैंने देखा हमारी पब्लिसिटी बात ही कमजोर है। मैंने मंत्री महोदय को बिट्टी लिखी, उन्होंने उस को ऐकनालेज भी नहीं किया। मैं नहीं जानता शायद ज्यादा दोस्ती की वजह से ऐकनालेज नहीं किया या उस की ज़रूरत नहीं समझी। लेकिन मैं यह कहूंगा कि इस तरीके की पुनर पब्लिसिटी हमारी है.....

विदेश मंत्री (श्री भद्रल विहारी बाजपेयी) : उस के बारे में मैंने आप से बात की.....

श्री कंबार लाल गुप्त : बात मैंने की, आप ने नहीं। वह तो मैं ने जानबूझ कर के सारी बात कही नहीं।

इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इस संबंध में देखें कि किस तरह से उन की एग्जीक्यूटिव का काम होता है। बाहर मैं जहां गया वहां की पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को नहीं मालूम कि एमर्जेंसी में हिन्दुस्तान में क्या हुआ। .... (बबबबबब) ....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have called the Minister of State Shri Kundu. Please sit down.

श्री कंबार लाल गुप्त : यह कह कर मैं जो श्राउट्स है उन का सम्बंध करता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU): I have been listening with rapt attention speeches made by hon. members of this House. I must say that the speeches which have been made so far are indeed very much thought provoking, illuminating and pulsating with ideas. It would not be proper for me to refer to every distinguished Member and make a reply, which I think my distinguished colleague will do.

We are indeed thankful to Shri Kamath that he has found out to plead for my colleague who does not need any support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not even yours?

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: Support means—among colleagues there is always. I shall go through some portions of my speech which are written. If it appears boring, I hope you will excuse me. Whatever I speak, I will speak from my heart.

MR. CHAIRMAN: His heart will emerge through the written text.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: Hon. Members had spoken at great length on the recent developments in South-East Asia and therefore, I prefer to begin with that. Nowhere has the struggle for their independence undergone such suffering and devastation as in Vietnam and, to a lesser extent, in Kampuchea. No people have evoked such admiration for their heroism and their fighting determination as the people of Vietnam. No Nationalism has proved its mettle as much as the Vietnamese did in their protracted struggle against first the French imperialism and later American intervention. It was our conviction from the very beginning that the struggle in Vietnam should not be seen in ideological terms, but rather as the fulfilment of Vietnamese aspirations for freedom and peace. The whole world, therefore, hoped, when peace finally came after American withdrawal, that Vietnam as also

[Shri Samarendra Kundu]  
Kampuchea and Laos would settle down to the gigantic task of reconstruction and rehabilitation of their respective nations. We also hoped that co-operative relationships would develop between Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea on the one hand and the countries of the ASEAN, which belonged to South East Asia on the other.

This time last year, the situation in the region looked promising. The dialogue for cooperation and building up of confidence appeared to be going on. Numerous visits were exchanged by their leaders and it looked that the process of reconciliation and the re-establishing of age-old contracts were on the way. We welcomed that all three countries had joined the nonaligned movement and hoped that these principles would provide the basis to bring stability to the region. Hon. members know how strongly we believe in genuine non-alignment. Genuine non-alignment has been the sheet-anchor of India's foreign policy even since our independence. That most countries which achieved the independence in the last three decades have joined the non-aligned family is indicative of the conceptual soundness and indispensability of the policy of nonaligned. We perceive nonalignment not as a negative philosophy of taking advantage of differences between Great Powers but as a positive policy based on independence of action and judgment.

At the same time, it is necessary to ensure, and this has been the policy of the present Government, that non-alignment remains genuine and purposeful and steers clear of rival power block complex ideological conformity and the pulls of confrontationists multilateral military alliances. We are convinced that no attempt either from inside or outside can weaken or defect the movement if we remain genuinely nonaligned and faithful to the principles proclaimed by the founding fathers of the movement as early as 1961.

It is necessary therefore at the prevailing situation to reiterate some of the basic policies which we believe in. We believe in Panchsheel also, which in short means non-use of force and non-interference, respect for the territorial integrity of each other and on that basis the scope for cooperative relationships as between independent countries free from great power military alliances. Having said this, I must say that we are shocked to know that there was a setback to that position during the last three months. When we learnt of the tensions building up between these neighbouring countries, we expressed our hope that they would be settled by peaceful negotiations. We had no love for Pol Pot regime either which practised harsh and brutal policies. Hon. Members would care to remember that while hoping, in due course, for better relations with Kampuchea, in 1974 we decided to withdraw our mission from Phnom Penh. Following the developments early this year, the situation in Kampuchea continues to be unsettled. Until such time a stability is established, the question of recognition has been deferred. Our approach is entirely in accordance with the principles of non-alignment and desire to see stability and reconciliation between independent nations of South East Asia. We hope that the situation will evolve where the cherished aspirations of independence, progress and of friendship and trust would reduce dangers to international peace.

15 hrs.

We were indeed shocked and distressed to learn of the massive armed attack by China on Vietnam. We were aware that the relations between Vietnam and China had deteriorated, that there was tension between them, and were aware that the relations between Vietnam and China had deteriorated, that there was tension between them, and that China had concentrated troops on the border. While apprehensions of conflict were in the air, the nature

and timing of such a massive conflict had nowhere been precisely anticipated. As soon as we came to know of this massive attack, we did not lose time to put forth our views effectively on this issue. We did not hesitate in calling for Chinese withdrawal from Vietnam at a time even when our relations with China were at a delicate stage, having been unfrozen after nearly two decades.

In order to seek concrete ways to defuse the potentially explosive situation created by this conflict, we immediately had diplomatic exchanges with a number of governments. Underlining the need to uphold established principles in relations amongst States, we have pointed out the danger to the international community from the situation.

We also followed the developments in the Security Council. Although we are not members of the Security Council, we spoke in the debate and expressed our concern at the situation and the dangers of a chain reaction. Since then, as the House is aware, ASEAN-sponsored resolutions could not be adopted. Meanwhile, even if the fighting in Vietnam has de-escalated, we do not know if the Chinese withdrawal is complete.

The challenge remains for all countries of South East Asia and the Great Powers as, indeed, for the entire international community to assist in the restoration of stability, based on equality and respect for all nations with full regard to established frontiers. We would be prepared to join in any way which could lead to a restoration of good amicable relations amongst the countries. We can only reiterate that as in South Asia, where we have sought to develop mutual confidence and cooperation between the neighbouring countries, so too in South East Asian countries the same principles of mutual respect and mutual cooperation must in the end prevail. These are good principles and sensible international politics.

Meanwhile, may I reiterate that our own relations with Vietnam and ASEAN countries have developed constructively and held promise of further improvement.

I may recall that I had myself, as I said earlier, gone to Vietnam as the leader of an economic delegation. Subsequently, after my return, as the House is well aware, India came forward and agreed to provide food and cotton yarn, railway equipment, livestock and technical cooperation in agriculture.

We also made available 400,000 tonnes of wheat to meet their immediate shortage. In all, about Rs. 90 crores have gone to Vietnam in various forms of aid, loan and assistance, and we continue to do so.

During this year India has taken a number of other significant steps to strengthen its ties with the countries in South East Asia through some notable visits and bilateral agreements. We are happy to receive the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Singapore and Australia during this one year. We also had visits of the Deputy Prime Ministers of Singapore and Thailand and the Foreign Ministers of Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam. With Thailand we signed a seabed boundary agreement, while with both Indonesia and Thailand, we signed an agreement on the determination of the Trijunction Points of the Seabed Boundaries. With Malaysia, we signed an economic and technical co-operation agreement, which lays the foundation for future all-round co-operation between our two countries. With Singapore we expect to strengthen our economic ties in number of ways. Similar efforts are underway to widen and diversify our relations with Thailand, the Philippines and Indonesia. The first-ever Indian Exhibition of Machinery was held in Indonesia. This Exhibition has been well-received and it has created a favourable impression, which would further

[Shri Samarendra Kundu]

strengthen our ties, not only with Indonesia, but with the rest of the South East Asia countries as well.

The Prime Minister had a brief meeting with the Prime Minister of Thailand recently, on the 28th morning, at the airport when the Foreign Minister and myself were present. Our prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Thailand had very useful discussion; the views of Thailand on the happenings in Indo-China, in fact in the whole of South East Asia are of particular importance to us, because of Thailand's situation. So, in that context we greatly value the discussions and talks that we had with the Thailand leaders.

In January I visited Burma and Philippines and was impressed to find not only great cordiality for our country, but the recognition of immense potential for economic, cultural and trade relations between these countries and India. We are following up on these potentials to activate our relations.

During this year, India also took the initiative to establish a dialogue with the ASEAN for co-operation in diverse fields and the Secretary-General of the ASEAN Secretariat visited this country last year. India and all the countries of South East Asia jointly recognise that their mutual relations have an intrinsic value, and this is appreciated by both sides. India's efforts to develop various forms of co-operation have all been guided by local needs and requirements of these countries, which are sought to be matched with possibilities and the potential in India. India does not seek to impose its experience on these countries but, at the same time, it is mutually recognised that the wide range of our own experience of development has some relevance to each individual country.

I think some hon. Members referred to the Asian personality and the African personality. I think the hon. Member, Shri Stephen, referred to it. The distinguished member of this House, Shri Kamath, raised the arena of discussion to a greater height when he mentioned about a federation of south of the Himalayas and also a South East Asian Economic Community. He also asked us to have a greater vision and encouraged us and said, "with hope, courage determination" we should go ahead. I can promise Shri Kamath that we are on this job. We do not know if we will be able to fulfil this great task. He would remember that as I said last year on this topic, we are determined in our own humble way to project, as far as possible, Asian personality, which was unfortunately forgotten during the last many years. Our national movement contributed to the concept of Pan-Asianism and was in turn enriched by it. Unfortunately, Asia, the most populous continent and the cradle of ancient culture and civilisation, has lagged behind in the crystallisation of a regional ethos. This may be due to the fact that we are a heterogeneous continent, but it would be a betrayal of our Asian hood if we are to lag behind in the crystallisation. However, we cannot hope that the continental edifices of Asian cooperation would be constructed by one big jump. We have to make a beginning each State in Asia, through bilateral and sub-regional cooperation in our immediate neighbourhood. I am happy to say that in spite of a recent setback in a certain region of Asia the idea sponsored by certain countries in West Asia for a regional grouping, the strengthening of ASEAN about which I have mentioned earlier, growing friendly relations with our neighbouring and South East Asian countries go to suggest that the dream that we all, including Mr. Kamath and others, dreamt last year while I was speaking—and you have all appreciated—while participating in the Budget speech, will come true one day. I am convinced that in course of time

these sub-regional groups will come together, in one form or other, and join hands to form an Asian cooperation stretching from one of the continent to the other. That will be the emergence of the Asian personality which will be a factor of international life, a force for peace and cooperation and synthesis of the great values that originated in Asia and have today become the common heritage of mankind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister now come from dreams to reality!

Will you take a long time because at 3.15 p.m. the Deputy Prime Minister has to make a statement?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: (Bombay North-East) He can print the whole speech and circulate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue after 3.15 p.m.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: I will speak up to 3.15 and will continue after the statement is made by the Deputy Prime Minister.

This House is aware, as many hon. Members expressed their concern, about the reports of increasing presence of the navies of Great Powers in the Indian Ocean. We continue to maintain a close watch over these developments and I should like to reiterate here that we are opposed to any military bases and presence of any power of any kind in this region which would lead to increased tension and cause anxiety. Increased presence of foreign navies in this area could only further increase tensions in the area around us. We are glad that the United Nations, which is already seized of this problem would be calling a Conference to deal with the question in the coming months. It is indeed unfortunate that the talks between the USA and the USSR have been suspended indefinitely with no sign of their resumption in the near future. However, I am happy to say here that when Mr.

Kosygin came here, he said that he would try his best to re-start the negotiations soon. We recognise that this region is vital for the world's economy and we maintain that no one power should try to gain a short-term advantage which is best illusory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, I will ask the Deputy Prime Minister to make a statement regarding dearness allowance

15.14 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. DEARNESS ALLOWANCE TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI CHARAN SINGH): As perhaps the House is already aware, the Staff Side of the National Council of the Joint Consultative Machinery had raised certain demands relating to—

(i) Merger of dearness allowance with pay;

(ii) Enhancement/restoration of the higher rates of dearness allowance allowed by Government while implementing the Third Pay Commission's recommendations; and

(iii) Interpretation of the existing dearness allowance formula.

As Government was unable to accept the demands, disagreement was recorded in June 1978 between the Official Side and the Staff Side on these three issues. In pursuance of the disagreement, the three issues were referred to the Board of Arbitration in September 1978 in accordance with the Scheme for Joint Consultative Machinery and Compulsory Arbitration.

Although the matter was referred to arbitration, Government's desire all along had been to settle the issues through negotiations. Efforts were initiated accordingly some time ago