

[श्री मधु लिमये]

का कि दायित्व इस सदन की ओर है और वह हमारा पूरा कार्यक्षेत्र है। आंध्र प्रदेश का निर्माण हमने किया, आंध्र प्रदेश में नागरिकों के बारे में संरक्षण देने का कानून हमने पास किया। दुबारा पास किया और तीसरी बार रीजनल कमेटी के निर्माण के लिए प्रेसीडेंटल आर्डर राष्ट्र-पति के द्वारा जारी कराया जिसका कि दायित्व भी सरकार की मार्फत इस सदन की ओर है। इसलिए यह केवल अध्ययन का मामला नहीं है। बल्कि अपने कर्तव्यों की पूर्ति करने का मामला है। अगर साधारण नागरिकों की बात होती तो मैं बिल्कुल ध्यान नहीं देता लेकिन आंध्र प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री जो स्वयं अपराधी हैं वह जब हमारे कार्यक्षेत्र पर आक्रमण करना चाहते हैं, पार्लियामेंट और उसके सदस्यों को दबाना चाहते हैं तो मानहानि का सवाल जरूर उठता है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि सदन मेरे प्रस्ताव को कबूल करे और समिति उसके ऊपर विचार करे। उसके बाद आपको जो करना हो वह करिये। कम से कम यह सदन पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी की नियुक्ति करके इस बात को प्रतिष्ठापित करे कि सदन के कार्यक्षेत्र पर जो आक्रमण करने वाले लोग हैं और उसे चुनौती देने वाले जो लोग हैं उनको हम सही जवाब दे सकते हैं और देंगे।

16.20 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

“That the question of privilege against the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh be referred to the Committee of Privileges for investigation and report.”

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, I take item number 6.—Paper laid on the Table. Mr. Sethi.

6.20½ hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

INDUSTRIAL FINANCE CORPORATION OF INDIA (PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO EMPLOYEES) REGULATIONS

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C. SETHI) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India (Payment of Gratuity to Employees) Regulations, 1968 (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 22nd March, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 43 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-629/69].

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Fernandes.

PETITION RE. PREVENTION OF FOOD ADULTERATION ACT

श्री जाजं फरनेन्डोज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : मैं खाद्य अपमिश्रण निवारण, अधिनियम, 1954 तथा इसके अधीन बनाये गये नियमों के बारे में श्री हेमराज वेर्षी हरिया तथा अन्य व्यक्तियों की एक याचिका पेश करता हूँ।

16.21 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—Contd. MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS —Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now we shall take up further discussion on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. I would like this occasion to begin.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Just a minute. Before the lunch hour, there was a query and a request for a statement. But

as I have admitted now the Calling Attention Notice, I think that it would be appropriate to have a statement made tomorrow and I would permit questions on that.

SHRI S. RUNDU (Balasore) : May I submit one thing? We had also filed calling attention notice two or three days before. But they were rejected. I would request you to club those calling attention notices with that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That would be done.

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur) : I have already submitted my short notice question on that point.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Calling attention notices are also there.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : As I said, External Affairs Ministry's demands are now being discussed. We would consider this also. Now, Mr. Sant Bux Singh may continue his speech.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like us to look at the world situation as it prevails today. It would be fair also for the hon. Members of the Opposition to do so in order to enable them to give prescriptions and judge the policy of our Government.

Two years ago, I made a reference in this House stating that the Soviet Union and the United States were coming together for quite some time. This was not taken so seriously at that time. To talk about blocks having been dissolved is almost outdated today. The extent to which the U. S. Soviet understanding has gone can best be illustrated by a despatch from Washington about President Nixon's Press Conference.

The despatch says :

"Mr. Nixon's conciliatory tone towards the Soviet Union was so marked that at several points he went so far as to explain why Russia was compelled to act in the ambivalent way it did in Vietnam and West Asia where even while supplying the belli-

gerents with large quantities of arms, Russia recognised the danger of tensions."

There was a time when some nations showed no understanding or friendship with the other camp. To-day the President of the U. S. is at pains to explain the policies and action of the Soviet Government.

My hon. friend, Shri Piloo Mody, the other day, was talking about our having ditched President Tito. I would like to answer Shri Mody in Mr. Tito's words. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the spirit that prevails between the Soviet Union and the United States to-day is a triumph not for the spirit of John Foster Dulles but for the spirit of Jawaharlal Nehru, and in the words of President Tito, which I hope my friends of the Swatantra Party will ponder over : "For us Jawaharlal Nehru is not dead. He still lives, for his ideas live, and we who have remained after him are trying to relise those ideas and after us others will continue our work."

We tried for the big powers to come together. But this itself is one of the things that has caused new problems to many of the smaller countries of the world, because an understanding merely between superpowers is not enough if that understanding is not in the interest of a large majority of mankind. The United States has not only moved to friendship with the Soviet Union, but I would like this House to note not that I have any secret information at my command, but it is going to be an understanding between the United States and China in the near future. There were indications to this effect in the election stances taken by the politicians in the United States. It has also been said that Pakistan was permitted its friendship with China by the United States to whom it owed great many obligations.

When we come to Europe—Sir, I am placing these facts before the House so that the Members can visualise the situation in which our country finds itself today—as for the major powers of Europe are concerned, they are very much interested in China holding Russia on the eastern border because consequently the pressure on the western border decreases. Only recently, Mr. Will Brandt, the West German Foreign Minister, has spoken about China being a great power

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

for bringing about peace in the Far East. This has been taken note of and the Soviet representative in many ways has expressed concern over the growing friendship between West Germany and China.

There is another power that we have to take note of when we look at the world today and that power is Japan. On the day this debate started, Japan had concluded a 70-million American Dollar trade pact with China, while on the other side it continues to recognise Formosa. Japan has tremendous economic power and she can produce the Atom Bomb any day that she wants. In the assembly of Nations, it is Japan that wants to take the fourth place. Whether it is obtaining a seat in the Security Council or whether it is trying to stop the influence of our country in the Southeast Asian countries, one finds that Japan and we are not looking at things in compatible ways. Therefore, Sir, what had been said two years ago, that the four super-powers would act and interact on our door-steps, has come true and it is in this context that we have to view our policies today.

I have left out the Soviet Union thus far. It is in our relationship with the Soviet Union that many fruitful things have happened. Between the Soviet Union and us there has been a great amount of friendship. The Soviet Union has helped us in the past in many ways. But today the Soviet Union is the victim of 2000 border skirmishes between herself and China. We welcome the move by the Soviets when they want to settle the border dispute with China by peaceful means. When the Soviet Union wants peace in the Indian sub-continent, it is something worth Contending. It was at Tashkent that the understanding between the Soviet Union and the U. S. A. was first put into practice. This friendship was tested at the cost of or to the benefit of India and Pakistan.

I have no doubt it is the sincere desire of the Soviet Union to befriend India, but from the way things are proceeding, I would like to utter the greatest note of warning that can possibly be uttered to our friends in the Soviet Union. It is being said again and again that the new military regime in Pakistan is looked upon with favour by those that matter in the Soviet Union. It cannot

be forgotten that most of the arms deal with the Soviet Union was negotiated by Gen. Yahya Khan. Whatever else the Soviet Union may or may not learn from the US there is one thing that she surely ought to learn; that is that by bolstering military regimes, neither do you help the people of the country concerned, nor do you further your cause.

Today God knows how much the US counts for in Pakistan. Supply of armaments is neither good for Pakistan, nor does it do any good for the Soviet Union, nor is it good for us.

When it comes to Pakistan itself, we must remember that there are a great many people in this country who constantly feel that they know everything about Pakistan. It is forgotten that between 1947 and 1967, 150 million new births took place in our sub-continent. When we talk about the generational gap in our own politics, we ought to remember that more than two-thirds of the populations of these countries are new, populations that have not known British imperialism, people who have not known the struggle that was carried on or the bitter warfate that took place between the communities.

An entirely new approach has to be established between our country and Pakistan because whatever be the disputes between Pakistan and us, it should be evident to all mankind that these disputes are not going to be resolved by the supply of arms; they are not going to be resolved by foreign powers' interference. They will be resolved by the peoples of these two countries, and when the proper spirit grows in Pakistan, Kashmir will be too small a thing to block a solution; till that proper spirit grows, there is no method by which any country should feel that it can take away even an inch of our territory, because however divided we might be, however much we might quarrel notwithstanding how many parties or regions we might split ourselves into, if there is one thing that this country has shown, it is that, in the face of foreign aggression, in the face of foreign exploitation, the people of the country rise as a man.

What is happening in Pakistan is a matter of great concern to us. It is a

matter of great sorrow to us, because in Pakistan we wish a democratic government we wish a government which falls in line with the aspirations of the people. It is important to the super-powers of the world who supply arms to bear this mind. A mere look at the military outlay of a country like the United States staggers one. In 1929 the military outlay of the USA was 1 billion 77 million dollars; in 1968-69, the estimate is 80 billion dollars, nearly 74 times more. The percentage of national income spent for military purposes in the Soviet Union is 20, which makes it almost equally proportionate to what is spent by the US. When you are producing arms on this scale, when you are busy competing in the production of modern armaments, your armaments are becoming obsolescent and these armaments are dumped on poorer and more backward countries.

So while it is a good thing that the super-powers have come together, if their coming together means that the identity of the smaller nations is lost, we still have a long way to go. It is not only in this sphere that one sees it. We are in the midst of what is known as the Development Decade. As this decade unfolds itself and nearly draws to close, what does one find? That in the developed countries, the richer countries, the industrialised countries, their per capita income has been added to by 60 dollars, while in the poorer countries, the countries that were supposed to be helped, the increase has been less than 2 dollars. The gap between the industrialised and less industrialised, between the rich and poorer nations, increases every day and acute problems of economic inequality face us. While inaugurating the UNBTAD, our Prime Minister rightly said—they are words worth remembering for us as also other developing nations :

“Poverty cannot be the destiny of the majority of mankind.”

As poverty grows, the aid that comes almost cancels itself. It is estimated that by 1973, the poorer countries will be giving back to the richer countries more than they receive,

Coming to China, one feels that a great amount has been achieved in terms of sheer

revolutionary doctrine—nothing has thrilled me mentally more than reading the writings of Comrade Mao Tse-tung—but when it comes to actual practice, when Comrade Mao's ultimate aim is to replace the Communist Party, the peoples' Party, by a military regime, when figures from Hungary tell us that 80 million dollars of the export of China is in narcotics, how much can one believe in the ideology of the Chinese Communist Party? Even more staggering is a statement made by Comrade Mao, that has received little attention. He has said :

“The Soviet Union occupies an area of 22 million square Kilometres while its population is only 200 million. It is time to put an end to this allotment.”

If lands are to be occupied on the basis of per head possession one is not quite certain how our friends in China will start and where they will end. Yet, no matter how much madness there is in any part of the world, country like ours, which has consistently taken a humanistic, idealistic and progressive stand, should not withdraw or shirk from keeping its minds open for all those who tread on the right path, be it in China or any other country.

I would like to point out that a very good start has been made in the last few years in terms of our paying attention to our neighbours, in terms of delegations that have gone and in terms of visits of officials and especially the visits of our Prime Minister, because there is a role meant for India and that role always is that India has to be at the spearhead of the nations that are exploited and oppressed. That we have had a good effect even in causes as distant as the Arab cause is simplified by the growth of the Palestinian movement; and the growth of E I fattah guerillas is a vindication of India's stand of the Arab movement being a secular movement. Not only that. A significant statement was made by Mr. Zulifiquar Ali Bhutto, the erstwhile Foreign Minister of Pakistan, namely ;

“We have come to the conclusion that the Arabs can no longer be approached on the basis of religion. It is only a secular approach that will do”.

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

Not only in West Asia or in the UNCTAD, but at a great many places, the stand of this country has been vindicated.

What is required is, as stated by the opposition that, we should talk less. But we should not get caught in the trap of being empirical at the cost of the moral aspirations of our people. I would suggest to the Foreign Minister that we badly need a policy planning cell in the external Affairs Ministry composed not merely of Foreign Service people but also of public men and professors, so that there is an exchange of ideas. There is one thing that has always to be understood in the context of our country and that is that you have to speak to our people in terms of their moral aspirations, to touch their heart and emotions to arouse their moral indignation. Merely being unpractical will not do nor speaking to them in mundane terms.

President De Gaulle has pointed out that India is necessary for the equilibrium of the world. If India has to speak any voice that makes sense and as distinct from other people, it has to be the voice of our people, who while humble and poor are still for justice, still for uprightness and still for equality.

SHRI M.L. SONDHJI (New Delhi) :
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when the Parliament of India addresses itself to the question of foreign policy it is but natural that we should seek to discuss matters in a wider perspective, a perspective in which this Parliament is the supreme forum of the Indian people and address itself to those dealings of nations in war and peace which are inevitable as the course of human history tells us. Those spirits which incarnated themselves during our national moment here in India gave us a mandate according to which our own realistic urge for freedom will also mingle with these of other nations for freedom. That is the basic urge in us, but not in some dreamy way.

The preceding speaker will forgive me if I say he almost lulled me to sleep in the concluding part of his address. What we need is a certain activism. What we expect from the Minister of Foreign Affairs is a certain pointed interest in particular problems. The problem that occurs to me first

of all is that we look at our map and we have a fashion of hanging our map, in the way it is now we forget our Indian Ocean. Put the map with the Equator above you and the Minister of Foreign Affairs will be aware of India's vital connection with the Indian Ocean. There are winds of change blowing from the Indian Ocean area. Some of these bear good tidings but others cause us concern and even lack of sleep at night. What do we see here? Complacency we see and we see that there is an effort to tell us that God is in heaven and everything is right with the world. The Minister of External Affairs, may I beseech him in the name of the Indian nation, has an obligation first of all to attend to problems of national security. There should be, therefore, a very clear appreciation the role of power, political power and naval power, in the Indian Ocean. Our watch-words today should be peace-keeping in the Indian Ocean area, fire-prevention in the Indian Ocean area and peace-observation in the Indian Ocean area.

What do we see? We see this Government does not place any priority for seeking that corporation amongst those who live in this area, who can accept India as a maritime personality. We find that while the changing power structure in the Indian Ocean has caused concern to other South-East Asian countries, it has even led the Australians who used to regard themselves as having come from Europe and belonging intellectually and emotionally to Europe to try to develop a forward military concept, even the small city State of Singapore has thought in terms of active diplomacy, Cambodia under its brilliant leader Sihanouk is trying to develop realistic changes in its policy in accordance with the changing power structure, while there is a new thinking on the part of Indonesia and while Malaya and Philippines are actively concerned with these problems, the Indian Minister of External Affairs and his distinguished colleague the Defence Minister are, totally indifferent to these vital matters it seem to me, experiencing some peace which has come to them from some vedantic experience. When we tell them, when we bring to their notice what are the implications of British withdrawal from Asia in the end of 1971, they give an answer which is something like this : do not look at the outside world ; dwell on your own soul within. But that does not seem to be their philosophy when

it comes to matters of statecraft, when their own personal interests are involved.

I am reminded of a joke or anecdote. After signing the Munich Pact, it seems by mistake Herr Hitler carried away the umbrella of Mr. Chamberlain. At that time Mr. Chamberlain protested, saying "Why are you carrying away my umbrella? I want it back." Herr Hitler had a sense of humour. So, he replied: "But you gave me half of Czechoslovakia; you did not grumble; but about your umbrella you are grumbling?" "Yes," Mr. Chamberlain coolly replied: "Because, it is my umbrella". Similarly, when it is a question of their own party matter, when it is a Ministership, of Deputy Ministership, they will campaign, they will lobby, they will do everything but when it comes to the question of these changes in the power position of the Indian Ocean, or India becoming a naval power, they do not seem to have any interest at all.

I do not want to run down the achievements of our armed forces but, at the same time, I do not want to be complacent. I say here with all responsibility that our naval performance to 1962 and in 1965 left much to be desired. We know certain movements of our ships were there, but we still do not have that understanding of our own shores and the understanding of the naval techniques which must be employed if we have to command a significant position in this Ocean. It is not for us to hear from the hon. Minister that Indian Ocean is not Indian. It is Indian in the sense that it is a place where we want Indian power and Indian influence; we want prosperity; we want peaceful navigation; we want to prevent intrusion in these waters by those powers which have now become interested in this region for power rivalry outside.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is your suggestion?

SHRI M. L. SONDHU: I am coming to that. My suggestion would be that we have a navy which will produce concentration of hard-hitting power which can deter the intruders. I have no sense of shame in saying that we must instill

fear in others, righteous fear, not fear which leads others to feel oppressed but where they think "India which represents a proud people, who mean no ill-will to the world but who are prepared to defend their rights, is a naval power to reckon with."

I do not wish to say anything about the Soviet Union that may tend to spoil our relations with that country, because I believe that the Soviet Union and India share many ties and I and my party would like to preserve and strengthen those ties. But when it comes to the question of issues like Czechoslovakia, we feel that what the Soviet Union does goes against its own principles and against the principles of world community. Similarly, what the Soviet Union is now trying to do in the Indian Ocean should cause us some concern. I do not know if the hon. Minister is aware, last year in March the Soviet Pacific Fleet came to India on a goodwill visit and we welcomed it at the Madras port. But certain questions arose in my mind about this goodwill visit. While it took the Soviet Pacific Fleet a day less than two weeks to come all the way from Vladivostok to India, it took them as many as eleven days in travelling from India to Somalia. How many soundings were made on the way and how many navigational charts were drawn? What was done to have a check on these things? The hon. Minister does not seem to be very much concerned about it.

We, on this side of the House, believe that in South East Asia now have our primary commitment of our defence and foreign policy. We have no hesitation in welcoming that relations between India and Burma show an improvement in the sense that the border demarcation has been completed a month in advance of schedule; we do not grudge paying a compliment to whoever is responsible for this achievement, but that is a drop in the ocean when you look at the senseless destruction that is going on in Vietnam. We get statements from here, statements galore, that they want to do something, but what is concrete that they have done? Have they urged matters which they themselves have raised earlier? Do we

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

not need some kind of standstill agreement? Must the senseless bloodshed go on when those talks are going on when those talks are going on in Paris? Has this Government tried to exert its moral influence and political influence on Hanoi and Saigon and has it tried to tell them to respect at least the sentiments of their population, which is a Buddhist population which believes in peace, that message that went from India? In parenthesis I would say that the government do not treat the Buddhists well in our own country, the birth-place of Lord Buddha. We know what is happening in Ladakh where there is much trouble brewing and yet they do not understand what the repercussions will be on the rest of the Buddhist world.

I do suggest a grand reconciliation of conflicts in Asia because I think that this is the area where our sense of purpose will yield fulfilment. But I recall that during one of my visits to South-east Asia I was told that hon. Minister, Shri Dinesh Singh, himself had cancelled his visit to one of the South-east Asian countries because he had to attend an important meeting of the Congress Working Committee or the A. I. C. or something here. If this is the way we treat these countries, which are our brother countries, no wonder what the results are!

I would suggest that some efforts be made to put strength into these South-east Asian countries, a belief that we and they have a common destiny. As is known, we have made rapid advances in nuclear energy. I will certainly suggest a nuclear agency for South-east Asia where we invite these countries to co-operate with us.

I would also suggest a very special relationship with Japan because I believe that now is the time to make a political investment in Japan and go with it towards the future technology and regional co-operation.

I would also say that certain other ideas, which are rigidly binding the Minister of External Affairs in the matter of recognition, be given up and diplomatic relations be created with Taiwan, not because of any

spectacular motive but just because it is good to be realistic in these matters. Whether it is the Hallstein Doctrine or any other doctrine which tells us not to have relations with the political entities, I would reject it *in toto* and I would recommend the same to this House.

I would also say that we will have to make up for some of the errors that we had made in the past. It is no use covering it up. We have a new Foreign Minister but I think he will become stale very soon unless he takes a determined attitude to bring about some rethinking in the corridors of the South Block.

Take the question of Tibet. This is the tenth anniversary of the Historic uprising in Lhasa. I know my hon. friends here on left have sometimes been carried away by words and have said that Tibet is an integral part of China. But where did this thought come from? I find that it came from the rather ill-advised delegation of the the Soviet Union to the General Assembly. That delegation was not at all well prepared on the subject. It is now for India to understand that at the time of consideration of this matter before the United Nations we had in fact made an error because we forgot that Tibet had been free of external control for several centuries. All this data and material is available in the Foreign Office. May I ask the hon. Minister if he is prepared to published a white paper on the subject dealing with the use of illegal force by the Chinese when they occupied a country which we had recognised as *de facto* independent, and also whether he is prepared to analyse, with the help of the material available with him, whether the treaty which the Chinese imposed on the Tibetans in 1951 has any juridical value at all. Also, I would like to analyse whether the 1954 agreement is at all good in law.

May I urge before this House that when it refers to the Dalai Lama, a habit has been created of referring to him as somebody who belongs to a vanishing order? I can say after a detailed study of his writings that he is a modern mind and is a person who represents for this country and the world the urge of the Tibetan people to preserve themselves. This is something which we should recognise and not do as the Home Ministry of India does which almost

treats the Dalai Lama as a political prisoner and which harasses Tibetan citizens. I find, the Home Minister of India is still functioning in some antediluvian fashion; it does not understand that in the context of the world situation the Tibetans are our allies. They are our esteemed friends here because we look forward to the day when a different Central Asian arrangement will become a reality and some new pattern will emerge there which will enable the various communities and nationalities and thereto live in peace. That hope we will not give up.

Nearer home, what is happening in Pakistan? I wish to say it on behalf of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh that our commitment to peace with the people of Pakistan is a real one. I also wish to say that this commitment is based on a practical outlook and on realistic considerations. We realise that a lot of propaganda has been done against us and we will do our best to remove that propaganda by concrete actions. But for the time being, I would ask you, when we talk in terms of a creative Indian outlook on Pakistan, the hon. Members somewhere should not rush to the conclusion that we are asking for interference in Pakistan. It is not at that level. It is a level which concerns this Parliament as to the future of India and the future of Asia. Can we contemplate a few months or years from now that a Biafra type of situation could arise in East Pakistan, in East Bengal? Can we visualise that something like that could happen and that the sheer military terror should be used to suppress people? Do we not remember our common links in East Bengal? Do we not remember Nasrul Islam? Do we not remember all the voyages Poet Rabindranath Tagore made on the river Padma? Those are not just airy dreams. Those should be related to life and liberty in our continent. We would have wished that the relationship between India and Pakistan on the border would have been as that is between, let us say, Canada and United States of America. But that was the responsibility of this Government. They have not been able to achieve it or their counter-parts in Pakistan. We must face clearly the human situation. I do not know if the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs is flattered by the fact that his rather insipid

statement the other day was displayed in Pakistani papers and proclaimed as the support to the military rule there. I think, that is not a matter on which he should feel smug because he should here take the opportunity to present some ideas for the future and those ideas, for example, would be how the geographical situation of East Pakistan and the economic requirement of East Pakistan may be considered as part of the Asian pattern which we see in the future.

A similar country is Austria in Europe. Let us, therefore, imbibe the example of Austria with the best means for the preservation of the individuality of East Pakistan. We have no territorial claims or aspirations on East Pakistan. But their own individuality will be best preserved on the Austrian pattern in terms of some idea of neutrality. Otherwise, I warn this House and I warn the hon. Minister that the dangerous edges of international spheres of power will cut East Pakistan to pieces. This will remain even if we in the Bharatiya Jana Sangh make hundred pledges of non-interference. I am, therefore, suggesting that this Government must develop some idea of resolving conflict. Let us not say that we will not interfere. On the other hand, our attitude, our interference or our attention should be a benign one and it should be some sort of an enlightened application of facts which will result in knowing how human beings could resolve their conflicts.

Let us take the question of the Middle-East. We find there that this Government has made its own task more difficult. Is it fitted out for a role of mediation when it does not recognise or does not have diplomatic relations with Israel? I ask this question with all emphasis because, I believe, India has a role to play in bringing the conflict level down and India will be able to play a better role, even if the hon. Minister claims that the Arabs are his friends. We in the Jana Sangh Party regard Arabs as friends. But we believe that there must be a creative response and that would be to have an Ambassador in Tel Aviv and then to bring about a Conciliatory outlook between Arabs and Israelis.

If we refer to the Sino-Soviet confrontation, we find what has happened on the

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

banks of the river Ussuri and these claims which are being made recall to us some pattern of activity on behalf of the Chinese towards India. Therefore, as far as our own experience on the border problem is concerned, I have no doubt that every Indian would like to support the Soviet Union in this matter. But at the same time, the support does not mean lack of intelligence. It does not mean lack of an insight. We must develop our own understanding of what is happening in China and we must not depend upon American scholars to find out what is happening in China. We know China is a great country. I know even today Buddhism is a force in China and I would, therefore, say that there is an effort which we must always make keeping in view the future of it and we do not generate any racial antagonism between Indians and Chinese. I would like our relations with overseas Chinese to be improved. Therefore, I would think that while condemning the acts of violence by China, we must also look to the future. Why, in this Central Asian area, should there not be a dialogue one day between China, Russia, Mongolia, Tibet and India? This is the pattern which must emerge in the future.

17 hrs.

But there is also the question of looking at world problem in the context in which it arises very often, of human rights, for example. And there it comes to our mind that this Government has not dwelt sufficiently on the importance of raising the Pakhtoonistan issue. It is not because they do not know the facts but simply, I suggest, due to lethargy and fear of fresh thinking. That lethargy comes to the question of the Commonwealth also. We remain in the Commonwealth as if it is something inevitable, as if it is like the sacred thread that has been given at the time when one became aware of the world. We find that our countrymen are insulted in England. I would ask one of the architects of Indo-British policy, who happens to be the Defence Minister, why he has not submitted his resignation on this issue when his co-religionists are insulted in England every day. We find that the Indians living in Gibraltar are denied by the elementary rights, for example, the right to participate in the so-

called referendum there. We find many similar actions in which there has been no effort by the Government of this country to understand the true purposes of diplomacy, because, where it comes to the question of Britain, perhaps Ministers here feel a certain sense of inferiority complex and they stand up to attention; they do not realise that there are new forces in Europe. Europe is coming up. It does not occur to the Government of this country to invite Gen. De Gaulle who has become a moral spokesman for Europe. But every Tom, Dick and Harry from England comes here, he is feted sumptuously in the Hyderabad House and all sorts of receptions are given in his honour. I would like a dealing with Britain on the basis of equality and bilateral relations.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member may conclude.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : With your indulgence, I shall now refer finally to a matter which can help the hon. Minister in the work of his Ministry. This is a report which he has presented to us and to you. We find there strange sentences. He has told us that there is a Committee which has been set up, the IFS Committee—I presume, he refers to the Pillai Committee. He says here :

“A substantial portion of the recommendations of the I.F.S. Committee were accepted in principle...”

Mark the word ‘substantial’. Anything can be ‘substantial’ these days ! It is said further :

“.....Of these recommendations, such of those as fell within the administrative competence of the Ministry have largely been implemented.”

Then he says that the others can be implemented only when found acceptable. This conceals a very ugly and sordid state of affairs. Some of his advisers have misguided him. They have implemented those parts which benefit them, but a large number of people who deserve promotions or who deserve incentives have been denied

that ; because of this, the blanket pharaseology has been used. What is the purpose of referring to these matters if there is not the will to reform ? That will must be produced...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member will conclude.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : You are one of the stalwarts of the national movement. Here is an Indianness which must come. We must not have an elitist orientation of foreign policy. Ours is a democracy.

I have to bring to your notice with great sorrow what one of our Heads of Missions abroad has done. What he has done in this. A child was born to his daughter who was staying with him abroad. According to my information, this Head of Mission went to the Foreign Office and secured foreign citizenship and a foreign passport for his grand-child. The person who has written this letter says that the Indian community is feeling that he has let down the dignity of our country.

Finally I come to the question which I had raised during the last session. When our Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, went to America, she stayed at Hotel Carlyle, New York on 15th October. The national flag of India to which we must teach every child in this country to be prepared to lay down his life rather than bring dishonour to that flag, that flag was flown upside down. It is a shame. Nobody has bothered, nobody has even now bothered to write to the Indian students at New York. They wrote a letter to the HINDU.

I will conclude, Sir, by just putting a few questions which would stimulate some concern for fresh thinking and fresh intellectual effort in the foreign office. Does the hon. Minister for Foreign Affairs believe in the elitist orientation of the foreign affairs. I referred to it sometime earlier. I called it Influential Family Service (I.F.S.)—I know it is only on exaggeration but what is the self-criticism in the Foreign Office ? How much do they have concern for social equality which is the hallmark of our Democracy ?

Another question is : what efforts do

they make to secure the co-operation of agencies and institutions outside the Government ?

Thirdly have they evaluated the performance of the Heads of Missions abroad, whether public men have done better or the Service ambassadors have done better. Is their personnel policy geared to the necessities of Indian foreign affairs as it will emerge in future and which requires a high degree of specialisation. At present, I may be forgiven because I belonged to this Ministry once—the hon. Minister's Ministry is like a lady laden with too much jewellery. They have got every possible departmental responsibility and the Administrative Reforms Commission have urged them to give up the External Publicity. I think, Sir, if he has the courage, he would cut down these extraneous departments and concentrate on foreign affairs and show this country where its new frontiers are and a foreign policy which would bring peace to mankind and preserve India's national honour.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI (Jodhpur) : I charge Mr. Sondhi with misleading the House. He said that our national flag was flown upside down.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I have a photograph.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI : It may be a fabricated photograph. This is a blatant lie and it should not be allowed to go on record without challenge.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I lay it on the table of the House. You set up an inquiry committee, Sir.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI : I take very emphatic objection to it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is very difficult for me. Here another hon. Member says that it is not true. He says that he is looging a strong protest in this House. It is for the Minister to reply. Shri K. R. Ganesh.

SHRI K. R. GANESH (Andaman and Nicobar Islands) :

[Shri K. R. Ganesh]

Mr. Sondhi, while speaking, complained that my colleague who spoke before me lulled him to sleep. I think he has made him to rise and speak.

Listening to the speeches from the side of the Opposition, particularly, the speech made by the hon representative of the Swatantra Party, we feel that the hon representative of the Swatantra Party is still living in 1920s and 1930s. I was wondering whether it was a criticism of India's foreign policy or whether it was a criticism of the Soviet foreign policy because most of what he said was basically a criticism of the Soviet Union rather than an appraisal of the foreign policy of this country. It has been a swan song of the Opposition in all the debates that have taken place on Foreign Affairs, to depict that our foreign policy has failed and to point a picture that India's name has gone down in the world today, that Indians have no respect in many parts of the world and that the foreign policy of our country has been a total failure.

17.11 hrs.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR *in the Chair*]

I wish to say that I had the honour to be a Member of the Indian Delegation to the 23rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly. I had the privilege to see the working of international diplomacy from the closest quarters, and the contribution which India has made to the working of the United Nations General Assembly.

The way we express ourselves on foreign affairs here in this country, in the Press and on the floor of this House, seems to be completely at variance with the working of the international diplomacy in the world.

It is a fact that India, even today, is a major contributor to the working of the United Nations.

SHRI SWELL (Antonoms Districts) : It is self-delusion.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : My hon. friend says like that, but I will try to place some very hard facts before him and I would like him to be roused from the self-delusion in which he has placed himself.

It is a fact that except the four big powers our country is represented in the maximum number of committees of the UNO. It was an honour to our country that an Indian was elected as Chairman of the 6th Committee which is a very important and a very powerful Committee, of the UNO.

It is a fact that we are playing a very major role in the Afro-Asian Group.

It is also a fact, whether it was a question of West-Asia, or Viet-Nam or Decolonisation or of Racialism or *Apartheid*, or support to the liberation struggle of South Africans and the people in the portuguese colonies, India has played a very significant role in the working of the UNO and in contributing to the passages of these Resolutions.

We ourselves, in the Committee in which I was working, initiated a very significant resolution on the covenant to define the status of prisoners who take part in the national liberation struggles a status which should be identical with the status that has been given under the Hague and Geneva Conventions to prisoners of war.

This was an important Resolution that India initiated and moved in the 3rd Committee of the United Nations.

How is it that many big and super powers are having bilateral discussions with India? How is it that the Soviet Union, the USA and other countries think it necessary to have bilateral discussions with us? That, I hope, is known to my hon. friend here and my hon. friends there, that bilateral discussions are held with this country by big powers, by super-powers and other countries also.

SHRI SWELL : What about bilateral discussions with China?

SHRI K. R. GANESH : I shall meet you on your own lines; you may be rest assured of that.

Sir, it is also a fact that due to the correct policy that the Government of India followed in relation to the Arab countries,

there is a feeling of friendship and of warmth as far as the Arab nations are concerned. Even those countries which were not favourably disposed towards India during the Indo-Pakistani conflict today show warmth and friendly attitude towards us.

The tour of the Prime Minister to Latin America, to Australia, to Burma, to New Zealand and her proposed tour to Japan, Afghanistan and Indonesia indicates that we are attempting to bring about a new flexibility in our foreign policy so that we may be able to gather new friends and build more bridges of friendship with countries which are our neighbours with whom we should have new relationship.

The address of the Prime Minister of this country to the United Nations General Assembly was accepted as a contribution which reflected the problems, the aspirations and the urges of the developing countries and whatever our friends might say here, it is a fact and is a matter of history that that address was recognised by most of the delegations in the United Nations as a very positive contribution to the problems that the world is facing today.

It is true that a new world situation is opening out and it is our duty to study the situation in detail, in all its ramifications and in all its depth. What constitutes the basic factors in the fast-shifting international situation? It is a fact that cold war has been replaced by a thaw in the relationship between the two super powers and that military alliances and military blocs have almost collapsed and have ceased to have any practical validity as far as international relations are concerned.

Many medium-sized and small countries are trying to assert their independence and trying to veer round the concept of non-alignment. Even countries in Latin America and countries in Africa are more and more veering towards to concept of non-alignment.

Sir, there is a big shift in the United States' opinion as far as China is concerned. Many members have referred to it and therefore I do not wish to go into the details of it. But it is necessary for our country to assess to impact of this shift in the opinion of the United States towards a

very big country like China. We have read in papers that many American liberals and China watchers and opinion-making bodies in the United States have come to the conclusion that time has come for them to normalise relations with the Chinese People's Republic.

The Soviet Chinese confrontation promises to be a very major international development and it will be necessary for this country to study this confrontation in depth and to find out how best we can serve our national interests in the light of these new development that have taken place.

It has been said that we must have a foreign policy which was a policy of enlightened self-interest. I submit that the basis of the foreign policy of our country as evolved by the architect, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru based on non-alignment, peaceful co-existence, based on world peace and lessening of tension in the world was a policy which served the interests of our nation.

Now, Sir, let us examine in details how some of the points that our friends are raising here serve our own national interests. It has been stated that we must raise the Tibetan issue and that we must normalise our relations with Formosa. I submit that we have full sympathy for the Tibetan people who have been subjected by the Chinese Government to oppression. But, how does it serve the basic national interest of India by raising the Tibetan issue or by recognising Formosa as our friend, Shri Sondhi advocated? At a time when the U.S.A. itself is trying to lesson the tensions and normalise the relations with the Chinese People's Republic, at such a time, for somebody in this House to come up and say that we must normalise our relations with Formosa will only mean accentuation of our conflict with China. This would mean a permanent confrontation with China and all efforts we make towards lessening of our confrontation with China would have no effect.

Let us take the question of Viet Nam. Our friends say that we do not condemn what is happening in South Viet Nam. They say so at a time when ruling circles of South Viet Nam themselves have recognised the National Liberation Front and are

[Shri K. R. Ganesh]

prepared to talk with them and when the U.S.A. has also decided to get out of it—I do not mean to say that they are going to get out of Viet Nam tomorrow itself—it means there is a change in their thinking because of the vietnamese people's magnificent struggle for freedom have convinced the U.S. that they can no longer have a military victory as far as Viet Nam is concerned.

Apart from that, as I said, there is a growing anti-Vietnam movement—a very powerful movement—in the U.S.A. At such a time, for our friends to say that we should condemn what is happening in South Viet Nam by which they mean escalation of war there is no question of escalation of war but the question is to bring about peace in that region—from that standpoint I say that condemnation is not going to serve our national interest.

Let us now take the question of Israel—a disturbed area of the world. It has been said time and again that we should recognise Israel at a time when the U.S.A. itself is thinking of a new policy. For the settlement of the West Asian crisis, the big four powers are meeting to sort out and evolve a formula which will be acceptable to the Arab world as well as the Israel is so that a peaceful settlement could be found in the Middle-East. At such a time to change the policy that we have adopted so far is not going to serve our national interest. As has been stated in this House, we have trade, cultural and other political relations with the Arab world. We have also to remember that our trade with the Arab world is to the tune of Rs. 80 crores, our air and sea communications pass through Arab Countries the Arab countries have fourteen votes in the United Nation and that there are 50,000 Indians in the Arab world, apart from the fact that Israel is in occupation of vast tracts of Egyptian and Jordanian territory and we cannot accept the forcible occupation by military means of any territory by any country.

While criticising India's foreign policy the alternatives which our friends on the other side submitted are the alternatives which I have tried to place before this House. This will mean that right from

Pacific to Gibraltar we create a zone of hostility. While we are trying to create a climate of friendship even in the zone of hostility that we have got, i.e. Pakistan and China, we would be creating a new zone of hostility if we adopt these alternatives, which will not serve our national interests.

Time and again, the vacuum that is likely to be created by the withdrawal of British forces from Southeast Asia has been mentioned in this House. I don't understand why such a sense of crisis and so much scare is being raised about this vacuum in Southeast Asia. This, in fact, is one of the welcome developments because the British, the Americans and other foreign powers are trying to leave Southeast Asia and therefore there should be more jubilation rather than this kind of crisis and scare.

I would very humbly draw the attention of the Foreign Minister that this is the natural region in which India can play a very important and significant role. Even if there is going to be any vacuum in this region, with which we don't agree, the only solution for this region is this. If the countries in this region develop their own systems, if they develop viable economies, if they involve their people in their programmes, if their political systems are strong by themselves, then these countries have nothing to be afraid of.

While referring to the vacuum in Southeast Asia, my friend, Shri Sondhi, also referred to the presence of Soviet submarines and Soviet naval forces in the Indian Ocean. When we look at the question of vacuum in Southeast Asia and the question of building up some sort of an alliance in this region, one thing comes out prominently and that is, against whom are you going to build this alliance. It cannot be against the British and the Americans, because they are getting out from this region. Then, against whom this is to be built? I would like to repeat here that this is the region in which India can play a very significant role, this is the natural region in which India can have diplomatic probing and can have some flexibility of approach so that we may have friendly relations with these countries; this will also help us to enter into economic cooperation with these countries so that in

times of crisis we may be able to help one another. I would draw the attention of the Foreign Minister that in this fast changing world situation it is very necessary for our country to have a flexibility of approach, which the Prime Minister has demonstrated by building new bridges with many countries.

It is also equally necessary for us to develop more initiative in the settlement of Viet Nam conflict, in the settlement of West Asian crisis and to give more vigorous help to national liberation movements in Portugese Colonies in Africa. Sir, it is also necessary for us to recognise the German Democratic Republic, whose recognition has been pending with the Government of India particularly in the context that West Germany is having a very large volume of trade with China and it is also supplying arms to Pakistan. In this background it is very necessary for us to recognise the German Democratic Republic.

SHRI MANOHARAN (Madras North) : As usual, Let me congratulate the new Minister who is asked to handle the foreign affairs of this Government. I had already pointed out while participating in the foreign affairs debate earlier that the External Affairs Ministry is sluggish and lethargic. Now it is a happy incident or accident that he has come as a full-fledged Minister. It is for him now to introduce an element of dynamism in the Ministry.

Whatever might be the claim of the Congress Party that the foreign policy of the Government of India has been a successful one, my impression is, and has been—I hope it will possibly be changed through right performance on the part of Government—that whenever Indians got abroad and return, they are terribly disheartened. The image of this country in the capitals of the world has gone down considerably, and is going down and down to unfathomable depths. The image projected some years back has been fashioned, re-fashioned according to the fads, whims and fancies of certain individuals. Instead of projecting the image of this country, they have projected themselves in foreign capitals. Now we are suffering from that hangover, What

is required is to project the image of this country.

I am sorry to say that the foreign policy of this country is being conditioned, has been conditioned not by international developments, but by certain pressure tactics adopted by certain vested interests in the capitals of the world. If I may put it in a nutshell, we have no independent policy as such. We have been claiming that we have our own independent policy, but our policy is being framed and executed after getting the green signal either from Moscow or from Washington. It is a plight and it is time for our hon. Minister, a good friend, who is dynamic, to change the whole face of it.

Who are responsible for spoiling the image of this country? I think there are some forces at work, either in the names of Ambassadors or High Commissioners or in the shape of some foreign office offscials who are either in the indifferent to or ignorant about, the activities of the Ambassadors and High Commissioners abroad, or certain irresponsible utterances of certain responsible Ministers while they are abroad.

I can cite one or two illustrations for the benefit of the Minister and the information of the House. His predecessor, Shri, Chagla visited Singapore in, I think, 1964 or 1965. A grand function was arranged in his honour, in which officials of the Government of Singapore and our people there participated. At that function, an uncontrollable and irresistible sense of happiness dawned upon him thanks to the spirit that he has developed in him and he announced as a free gift to the Government of Singapore 80 horses. The entire press in Singapore wrote editorials over it and columns were written eulogising and praising the Government of India for their gesture and attitude of cordiality to the Government of Singapore. Before the ovation died down, after seven days, a military team from India visited Singapore, probably to rectify the mistakes committed by Mr. Chagla and announced that 80 horses would be given to the Singapore Government not as a free gift, but at a concessional rate? The image created by Mr. Chagla was terribly murdered by this announcement of the military team. While I was in Singapore, the then High Commissioner told me that we have become ridiculously low in the eyes of

[Shri Manaharam]

the Singapore people. I asked him the money involved. He said, it was to the tune of Rs. 7 or 8 lakhs. For saving Rs. 7 lakhs, we have lost permanently our image in that country.

A full-fledged Cabinet minister recently visited Poland. I do not like to mention his name; I am sure Mr. Dinesh Singh will find it out. He was conversing with foreign dignitaries as well as the members of our Mission there. Discussions centered round the personalities in Indian politics and ultimately touched the personality of the Prime Minister of India. When something was said, he was stung to the quick and I have reliably learnt that the minister, said, "I care too hoots for the personality of the Prime Minister." He is still a full-fledged Cabinet Minister. Another instance of how irresponsible utterances of the ministers concerned have created bad blood in foreign capitals is provided by the visit of the Law Minister, Shri Govinda Menon, to the United States. He blabbered something inconsistent with the dignity decorum and decency of this country.

While the late lamented Chief Minister of Madras, Mr. Annadurai, was touring America, a volley of questions was put to him by the press people. They were most embarrassing questions, but still Mr. Annadurai replied projecting the image of the Government of India sky-high. That is the attitude to be taken by any patriotic citizen of this country. While we talk about the damage done to the image of this country, I can say that the culprits responsible for spoiling the image of the country are not to be found in the opposition, but they are to be found in the ruling party.

Even after 22 years of our foreign policy, I want to ask, are we clear about our foreign policy at all? The previous speaker correctly pointed out that rigidity must give way to a sort of flexibility in the thinking of the External Affairs Ministry. Our ambassadors are suffering from a sort of illusion and I cannot entirely blame them. Some ambassadors are doing a very excellent job no doubt, but the majority of them are either ignorant about the developments in this country or they are indifferent. One ambassador told me that he has to depend upon the other foreign embassies to know what is going on

in the Indian sub-continent. They are kept in utter darkness and not at all apprised of the developments promptly by the Foreign Affairs Ministry. Either they are ignorant or they are indifferent and they do not want to know the developments here. The hon. minister's attention must be drawn to this.

The image of India has gone down and how to rectify the mistakes and remedy the maladies in the foreign policy must receive topmost priority today.

Rightly or wrongly, Sir, we are losing friends all over, and we have got a wonderful knock of converting our good friends into enemies in no time. For the past twenty years we have lost very many friends, good friends, and they are now our enemy No. 1. How could Pakistan be able to win over the minds and hearts of so many countries who have assured us support not only militarily but in all aspects? For example, Pakistan is our enemy No. 1 certain people used to say. But I still doubt whether we can declare any permanent enemy in the political situation of the country. Tomorrow Pakistan may be our good friends. Tomorrow China may be our good friends. If the present leadership is removed, of course we can think of better sense dawning upon those people and our country.

Pakistan has already declared war on India. While Pakistan waging war against India we were helped by Russia and Pakistan was helped by China. Now the situation has changed. Pakistan is being helped not only by China and USA but also Russia. So far as we are concerned we isolate ourselves with the main currents of political thinking internationally. We think homilies will do and so-called speeches will do. We think advice like a "Daniel come for judgment" can deliver the goods all over. I think it is high time for the Foreign Affairs Ministry to come out from the rut and some something useful for the country's future prosperity.

What is your foreign policy? What is the credo of foreign policy? What is the crux of it? We have been told our foreign policy is being actuated or motivated by a sort of political philosophy called non-alignment or non-interference or dynamic neutrality. Dynamic neutrality mean giving recognition

to all the countries of the world. Rightly, certain Congress Member Opposite pointed out the yardstick with which we are determining to which country we must accord diplomatic relations and to which country we should not. I am sure it is within the purview of the Government of India. But I doubt very much whether the Government of India is freely exercising its will in formulating the foreign policy of this country because the Government of India being pressurised in accepting certain countries and according diplomatic relations and in rejecting certain countries and withdrawing diplomatic relations.

One example will do to prove this. For the past so many years the Opposition as well as certain thinking section in the Congress Party, though rare, have been claiming that diplomatic relations should be accorded to the German Democratic Republic. But it was not given. I think what logic my hon. friend, Shri Dinesh Singh is going to advance to justify the stand taken by the Government of India for the past so many years is not according diplomatic relations to GDR probably would be that we cannot simply offer diplomatic relations thanks to certain economic considerations. But I doubt very much whether that has any sense of logic.

I said, Sir, the foreign policy of this Country has been conditioned and is being conditioned by the pressure tactics adopted by certain countries of the world. If the hon. Minister says 'no', here is a classic example to prove that the country has been subject to that humiliation by certain countries of the world. Recently, I think in the year 1967, the West German Chancellor, Keisinger, visited India and during his visit he said that his Government would regard "as a very unfriendly attitude towards the Federal Republic if India normalised her relations with GDR" I want to know whether it is interference or not, whether it is a mild intimidation or not whether the Government of India allowed herself to be pressurised by West Germany or not. Rightly Shri Ganesh pointed out that West Germany is now becoming a base for military supply to China. And who is supplying military ware to West Germany? The United States of America is supplying it. And West

Germany is the base through which arms are being supplied to China.

It is high time that we changed our attitude towards GDR and somehow established diplomatic relations. If he says that economic considerations may come in. I can help his task by quoting certain examples, how despite threats and intimidation by West Germany some countries succeeded in establishing relationship with GDR. Yugoslavia established diplomatic relations with GDR in 1957. The relations between West Germany and Yugoslavia continues on the level of the Consulate-General. The second country is Burma. On 26th August 1960 Burma and GDR agreed to exchange consular representatives. In 1962 West Germany-Burma relations were raised to Embassy level. So nothing happened despite intimidation. The third country is Ceylon. In February 1964 GDR and Ceylon agreed to established relations at the level of Consulate-General. Bonn threatened. Ceylon though a small country, rejected the threat and established Consulate-General relations with GDR.

Yet another important point I want to refer is regarding Ceylonese citizenship. I hope the hon. Minister will pay some attention to it. On page 3 of the Report, the Ministry says:

"The two Prime Ministers renewed and extended the contacts established during the visit of the Prime Minister of India to Ceylon last year. They reviewed the progress made in matters of mutual interest and exchanged, in particular, views on recent developments in the Asian region. Among the subjects discussed were bilateral relations between the two countries including the progress made in the implementation of the Indo-Ceylon Agreement of 1964 and matters of common interest in the palk Bay and the Gulf of Manner. The Ceylon Prime Minister announced that his Government had decided to exempt the repatriates under the 1964 Indo-Ceylon Agreement from the purview of the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificates Scheme, which would have acted as a disincentive to repatriates

[Shri Manoharan]

coming away to India. The two Prime Ministers expressed their common resolve to consider bilateral issue in a spirit of friendly co-operation."

Here I would like to quote a letter received by the leader of the DMK Group in Parliament, Shri Anbazhagan, from a responsible man from Ceylon, with a view to make the hon. Minister understand that although we want Ceylon to be a friendly neighbouring country, although we are very keen to maintain those friendly relations, the Government of Ceylon is violating both the spirit and the letter of the Sirimavo-Lal Bahadur Shastri agreement. The letter says:

"India has so far granted citizenship to 35,000 Stateless persons, but Ceylon's figure is below 500. When India has registered 35,000, Ceylon's proportion is about 20,000. There are about 20,000 eligible applicants for Ceylon citizenship but 75 per cent of them are kept in the 'pending branch'. The applications of only those married to Celoynese or where the heads of the families are born in Ceylon are taken up for consideration and the result is that only about 25 per cent of the applications received are dealt with; out of this 25 per cent, about 10 per cent are recommended and the balance are being inquired into. The Officials who are dealing with the citizenship matters are complaining of no work as 75 per cent of the applications are put in the pending list. In these circumstances, it is useless saying that India went up to 35,000 because the registration work commenced in October 1964, whereas the registration work on the Ceylon side commenced only an year ago.

If Ceylon is serious in implementing the Pact, she should take up for consideration the applications of all the eligible 20,000 Stateless persons. The attitude of the Ceylon authorities in keeping 75 per cent of the

applications on the pending list clearly shows that they do not want to implement the Pact for some reason or other."

I am drawing the attention of the hon. Minister to this so that he may take some expeditious steps. Lastly, since I have no time to bring some more points up for the consideration of the Minister, let me wind up. Having studied the efficiency or otherwise of our embassies and high commissions abroad, I have come to the conclusion that they are not at all effectively functioning and, unfortunately, heavy expenditure is involved. Having enjoyed the pleasant experience at the hands of the Air-India people whenever we go abroad, I would request the House to consider and differentiate between the attitude of our embassies and that of the Air-India people. The Air-India people are useful, very effective and very sincere. They are helping the visiting Indians abroad whereas our embassy fellows, I am sorry to say, are simply relegating to the background the interests of India when they are in a foreign country. Having enjoyed the pleasant experience at the hands of the Air-India people, a funny feeling crept into my mind and I would request the External Affairs Minister why he does not think of handling over the entire charge to the Air-India people after closing down our Embassies abroad, because they are doing a marvellous job for this country. This is not a complement. It is my feeling; from the bottom of my heart I am speaking about it.

About the rest of the matters. I think, I will have enough opportunities to meet my friend, Shri Dinesh Singh, personally and privately when I will give useful suggestions and get benefited out of it. But regarding the re-organisation of the Foreign Office, it is the job of Shri Dinesh Singh to see that the whole matter is clenched and the sluggishness and the lethargy of the Foreign Affairs Ministry is completely wiped out; thereby let him prove to the country at large that here is dynamic minister after whose entry into the Foreign Affairs Ministry the ministry started functioning on the lines indicated by the hon. Member of Parliament.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH) : Mr. Chairman, many points have been raised by hon. Members in their speeches and in cut motions and many more will be raised by subsequent speakers before the debate comes to an end. It will not be possible for the Foreign Minister to deal with all the points raised in the debate and that is why I sought your permission to intervene at this stage. I shall try and give replies to some of the points raised here and will leave some of the more important and complicated issues to the Foreign Minister himself to explain to the House.

Some hon. Members, particularly the two who spoke on the opening day, while discussing the foreign policy of this country went to the extent of saying that this country has no foreign policy. Some even said that our policy is weak and vague. Even today some hon. Members said that our policies are under pressure from various big powers of the world. This very challenge to the basic principles of our policies is a very important matter. It raises certain very fundamental issues and I wish to leave it to the hon. Foreign Minister to deal with it in more detail. He will be able to tell the House how the basic principles of our foreign policy are as valid today as they were first enunciated some years back.

It is rather surprising that just when our policy is coming to be appreciated and accepted by a large number of countries in the world, and particularly by the developing countries, there should be so many sceptics at home.

SHRI SWELL : What is the policy ?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : I think, it is very well known to this House.

SHRI SWELL : We do not see any policy at all.

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : You have taken 20 years and even then you have not been able to understand it or accept it ; it is rather strange.

We are a peace loving country and it is our desire to live in peace and amity with all our neighbours. As our Prime Minister said the other day ; our doors are open for a dialogue with any country in the world on the basis of mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each other. On this basis and principle we are going ahead in trying to establish and develop our bilateral relations with as many countries of the world as possible, particularly of South-east Asia, Asia and Africa, who happen to be our neighbours.

I have not got the time at my disposal to give a general survey as to how our relations are progressing with all the countries of the world but I will, with your permission, mention just two or three countries; our immediate neighbours, with whom our relations are very cordial and friendly.

I will first refer to Ceylon. Our relations with Ceylon are very friendly and they are developing on the right lines and have been further strengthened by the visit of our Prime Minister to Ceylon last year and by the return visit of the Ceylonese Prime Minister to this country last winter. The main problem which was coming in the way of the improvement of relations between the countries was the problem of Stateless people of Indian origin in Ceylon. That problem has been very successfully solved. As the House is aware, in 1964, we had the Indo-Ceylon Agreement. In that connection, I would like to say this much that the Agreement is being adhered to and is being implemented very conscientiously and sincerely by both sides. My hon. friend, Mr. Manoharan, said that the Ceylon Government are not implementing the Agreement as sincerely as it should be done. He is not correct in making that statement because our assessment is that the progress is quite satisfactory. It is true that in the beginning or even now there is a little delay in the granting of Ceylonese citizenship to the Stateless people over there because Ceylon had no Act, no law, in their country. As the House is aware, they have enacted a suitable law for giving citizenship. Now, they are going ahead with it and they have invited applications which are being examined both expeditiously and with a great

[Shri Surendra Pal Sing]

deal of sympathy. We, on our side, are making all preparations and schemes have been drawn up for providing relief and rehabilitation for all those people who come from Ceylon.

As regards the question of Kachchativu and Gulf of Mannar, it has already been stated on behalf of the Government that the question of Kachchativu, the question of fishing rights and the territorial waters, all these matters, will be decided by mutual discussions between the two Governments and it has been agreed between the two Prime Minister that, until such time as some agreement is arrived at, the *status quo* should remain. That is where the matter rests at the moment. We are hopeful that this problem will be solved satisfactorily and with mutual satisfaction to both the countries.

In regard to Burma, our relations with Burma are also improving. They are very friendly and, as the House is aware, our Prime Minister paid a visit to Burma very recently and she made a statement in the House the other day and she gave an indication of the outstanding problems between the two countries which were discussed there. It is hoped some of the problems which are in our way for so long will be solved satisfactorily very soon. The main problem there is about the people of Indian origin in Burma and the question of compensation for the properties which have been nationalised. The question of their detention in jail on various economic offences, etc., all these things, was discussed and it is hoped that the problem will be solved very soon and the Government of Burma, as the House is aware, have agreed to expedite decision on the question of Indian nationals detained for alleged economic offences. They have also agreed to send us a draft agreement about compensation for properties of Indian citizens that have been nationalised by Burma. They have agreed to facilitate and expedite the clearance of certificates for such Indian nationals who wish to come back to India and we have also been assured that no discrimination will be exercised against people of Indian origin who want to take the Burmese citizenship and that their applications too will be sympathetically considered.

As regards Indo-Burma boundary question, as the House is aware, the work is progressing very satisfactorily and the first 240 miles of border have been demarcated ahead of schedule.

A word about Nepal. We have had age-old cultural, religious and historical ties with that country. Our relations with Nepal are such as exist between two brothers and, as between two brothers, so between Nepal and India, sometimes differences of opinion too crop up. But we try to solve these differences in a spirit of mutual co-operation, friendship and respect for each other. That is the only way in which friendship between the two countries can endure. We are both non-aligned countries and, being next-door neighbours, we have both vital interests in the security of each other.

We are greatly interested in Nepal's economic and industrial progress and, to the extent possible, we are giving a great deal of aid to that country. In spite of our own difficulties at home, we are the biggest contributors to Nepal's economic and industrial development plans. The total assistance which has been given by India upto the end of the Third Plan period is of the order of Rs. 30 crores and, for the Fourth Plan period, the allocation is Rs. 40 crores. Our trade with Nepal is of a developing character and we have assured that country that we will give all possible assistance and support to them for setting up any kind of indigenous industry that they want to set up in Nepal. Our trade with Nepal is also progressing satisfactorily. We have a trade agreement with them which is functioning to the satisfaction of both the countries. This is in regard to three or four of our neighbours.

18 hrs.

As regards our other two neighbours, namely, Pakistan and China, this is a matter which will be dealt with by the hon. Minister tomorrow when he gives his reply. All that I can say is that our relations with those two neighbours, despite our best efforts, have not been normalised and their attitude towards us is still inimical. We have made a number of gestures, particularly in regard

to Pakistan, but, there has been no positive response from that side. We only hope that one day these two countries, and particularly Pakistan, will disabuse themselves of the idea that India has any evil designs against these two countries, and they will see the logic and the wisdom of the principle of peaceful co-existence.

I would like to say a few words about the Indian Ocean area. This subject was mentioned by Prof. Sondhi and one or two other members in their Cut Motions. From geographical and political angles, India occupies a very strategic and important place in Asia and in this Indian Ocean region. The shores of our country are washed by the Indian Ocean which links the countries of East Africa and Arab world with the countries of South Asia. This is an area which comprises of countries which have just gained their independence and countries which are in the industrial and economic sense, backward as compared to the rest of the world. The main interest of these countries is that peace and stability should be maintained in this area. It is in our own interest and in the interest of all the littoral States that this area of Indian Ocean is kept as an area of peace and co-operation and not an area of tension or rivalry. It is our policy that no foreign power should establish any military or naval base in this Ocean which, we feel, might lead to an introduction of tension into this area and that in turn might lead to a certain amount of domination of some of the littoral countries by imperialist powers. Our views have been made clear in this House. We are against any kind of bases being set up in this area. Sometime back there was a news that Great Britain, in collaboration with the United States of America, wanted to establish some bases in some islands near Mauritius. As soon as we came to know of that we took up that matter with the U. K. Government and we protested against that, and they in their reply told us that they had no intention of setting up any military base on the island; their idea was to set up some transit facilities and some staging facilities and communication facilities on these islands and there was no intention on their part to station any troops there. In regard to Indian Ocean our policy is very clear. We do not want any foreign bases at all there.

A reference has been made to the performances of our diplomatic mission abroad. Mr. Dwivedy in his speech on the first day and Prof. Sondhi and Mr. Manoharan have made a point here that our Ambassadors and High Commissioners lack knowledge of Indian culture and history and, thus, they are not true representatives of India and that they have not been able to project the image of India abroad properly. They have also said that their behaviour towards local visitors and some of the visitors from India is of a cavalier fashion. Our diplomatic family is rather a large family and it is quite possible that in a big family like this there may be a few individuals here and there who are not upto the mark, whose competency and behaviour can be questioned; there are always a few black sheep in every fold. Therefore, some of the complaints may be correct. But by and large, this is a very sweeping criticism which has been made by the hon. members about our diplomatic missions abroad. I think, this is based on a subjective assessment. They may have come across some such incidents that is why they feel like that. I do not agree that our entire diplomatic corps is like that. If we take the Services as a whole, our diplomats are a very fine lot of people, very highly educated, refined, and cultured and they have a very thorough knowledge of our culture, industry and background. They are quite competent to project our image abroad. Proper care is taken at the time of appointment of our Heads of Missions abroad and the criterion followed is that we choose a person who is experienced, who is suitable for the job in view and we also ensure that the individual so chosen is fully aware of Indian heritage and culture and the possesses a historical perspective of all the local events. Then before they go abroad we brief them very thoroughly in the Ministry about our culture about our achievements, about the achievements in the economic and industrial field so that they have a thorough and proper picture of the country they will represent abroad. Before they go abroad, we send them on what is called 'Bharat Darshan'. They go round the country and see for themselves what is happening and how things are developing. Even after they take charge of the missions abroad, a continuous dialogue is maintained between the headquarter and the Missions.

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh]

and we keep them fully posted with all the developments in the country and in the regions roundabout India.

As regards their behaviour to visitors and Indians particularly who go from here, we have issued clear instructions to all our missions that fullest courtesy and fullest help should be accorded to everybody whether they are local visitors or visitors from India and whenever any breaches of these standing orders come to our notice we immediately look into the complaints and corrective measures are taken straightway. But our experience tells us that some of these complaints which come to us are based on certain misunderstandings. Hon. Members must realise that our Missions abroad have to function under certain limitations, financial and otherwise. It is not always possible for them to do all the things which are asked by some of the visitors. They have not got that much power and financial resources to meet all their requirements.

A point has been made that we keep no check on our expenditure on our foreign missions abroad. This point was made out by Shri Dwivedy and by one or two members even to-day. Every effort is made to keep the expenditure of our foreign missions at the lowest possible level and a number of economy measures are taken on a continuous basis to ensure utmost economy in the budget of our Missions abroad, such as, if I may read out : a thorough scrutiny of the proposals for additional staff is made by the Ministry on the basis of work study and results. A detailed scrutiny of the Budget proposals received from the missions and posts is conducted with an emphasis on economy in foreign exchange. Proposals for the opening of new missions are implemented on the basis of priorities laid down and only after the most careful examination in the context of prevailing international situation. Lastly, the recommendations of our Foreign Service Inspectors made on the basis of on-the-spot studies with emphasis on rationalisation of the staffing pattern, economy, etc. are implemented with expedition. Now as a result of these measures during the last 3 years, we have been able to get a net saving of approximately 152.11 lakhs of rupees. It was also mentioned here that the expenditure is increasing slightly year by

year and this year's expenditure is of the order of Rs. 11.38 crores which is higher than what we spent last year. To a certain extent this point is correct that expenditure this year is slightly higher. In 1967-68 the total expenditure on our foreign missions was Rs. 10.52 crores and the estimated expenditure during 1968-69 comes to Rs. 10.60 crores. The budget provision for 1969-70 is of the order of Rs. 11.38 crores which is slightly higher than the previous year's but it is not abnormal considering that the cost of living all over the world is going up. One point which we must remember and keep in mind is this. When we are evaluating the cost of running of our missions abroad it is necessary to take into account the remittances received from the foreign missions accredited to India. The total remittance received in India in 1967-68 was Rs. 14 crores approximately. This does not include the expenditure of nearly 30 crores by the US Embassy out of the PL-480 funds. So the total expenditure by the foreign missions in New Delhi comes to near-about Rs. 44 crores. Our expenditure of Rs. 11.38 crores as against this Rs. 44 crores is not really very excessive ; and in fact it is very moderate and we can say that our foreign service is about the cheapest foreign service in the world and I am also proud to say that it is one of the finest in the world.

I would like to make a brief reference to Africa. We attach great importance to countries of Africa and during the past few years we have been taking a number of concrete steps to bring about a better understanding and better cooperation between ourselves and many countries of Africa. A large number of countries in Africa have just gained their independence and they are developing countries. Some of their socio-economic problems which they face are more or less the same problems which we ourselves faced not very long ago and even now we are facing these problems. It is our feeling that we have a great deal to give to those countries in the way of experience and expertise; more than what they probably can get from other countries. We will be happy to share our experience with them.

I had the honour of representing India in the meeting of the E. C. A. at Addis

Ababa in February last and during my speech I made this point very clear that the Government of India was very keen to co-operate with the countries of Africa and to share her experience with those countries in order to develop their economy and their industries as fast as possible to achieve a faster rate of growth. Our approach to their problems was appreciated and a number of enquiries were received from them and we are hopeful that this will lead to more co-operation between India and the African countries.

There are a number of ways in which we are cooperating with African countries by providing technical assistance, by giving them scholarships to their students, by providing training facilities and equipments for setting up industries in African countries and by deputing teachers, technicians, and experts in the countries of Africa.

Now, as regards India's policy and attitude towards the freedom movement in Africa, Mr. Ganesh who spoke a short while ago, said that we should take a very keen interest, and in that connection I may say that the policy of the Government of India is that the colonial rule in African countries should come to an end as early as possible and all the people of the colonies of Portugal etc. should get their independence and they should be able to have a Government of their own choice.

We have taken up the cause of these people on every occasion, at every international forum and in the UN and elsewhere. India is a Member of the Committee of Twenty-Four. And, in that Committee we have always taken up the cause of these people and as a result of our efforts and the efforts of other friends a number of Resolutions have been passed by the UN Assembly and by this Committee condemning continuance of colonial rule in Africa. We are hopeful that one day we will be able to build up the world opinion to such a strength and pitch that it will not be possible for Portugal to continue to keep a hold on these colonies.

As regards providing material help to various freedom movements, it is Govern-

ment's policy that we should render all possible help to these people to enable them to equip themselves with necessary education and expertise so that when they go back to their countries they are able to arouse the masses and awaken them to the political realities and start a movement in their own country which will help them to gain their independence as early as possible. Towards this end we have provided educational training facilities for students of these countries and in addition to that we have also given medicines and first-aid equipment etc. We are doing everything possible to give our support to all the freedom movement in Africa.

In regard to Rhodesia, we continue to hold that any future constitutional set up in this territory must ensure the principle of one man-one vote. We maintain that it is the responsibility of the British Government to free Rhodesia and to bring about independence to Rhodesia based on majority rule. We are against the recent "Fearless Proposals," because they are not substitute for the Nibmar principle of no independence before majority rule and that is a principle to which the British Government is committed. We also maintain that it is the responsibility of the British Government to topple the Smith regime in Rhodesia which is illegal and which functions against the interests of the majority of the local people. We are also of the opinion that if the sanctions in Rhodesia fail, the U. K. Government should go to the extent of using force for removing this Smith regime. As the House is aware, the U. K. Government is very reluctant to use force and they have told us that the mandatory sanctions which are in force at the present moment have already begun to bite and given a few more years they feel that Mr. Smith will be able to give up his present stand and see reason and come to a settlement with the British Government. We ourselves do not feel that these mandatory sanctions will succeed very much because it is our opinion that so long as the back-door is open, Rhodesia can get all their requirements from South Africa and Portuguese Colonies like Angola and these sanctions will not compel him to see reason. It is our view that something more should be done, apart from these sanctions. We will continue our efforts in this direction and we will try to build up world public opinion

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh]

against this illegal regime of Mr. Smith in Rhodesia.

Lastly, I would like to mention a subject which has been discussed and debated on a number of occasions and on which this House and the people outside feel a great deal agitated and which arouses their emotions & that is the question of Indians in East Africa and in other countries of Africa. The House is fully aware of the entire background and developments that have taken place there. The whole situation have been aggravated by a certain policy—the policy of Africanisation which has been followed by Kenya and a number of other countries as a result of which some of the people of Indian origin are facing certain difficulties and hardship and they are compelled to leave the country in which they have been living for generations. In order to understand this problem properly, we must first realise that the people of Indian origin in these countries belong to two categories. There are people who are Indian citizens and there are people who have got foreign nationality. I think a majority of them are British passport holders. In regard to those who are Indian citizens we are fully responsible for them and if anything happens to them and if their interests are in jeopardy, we can intercede on their behalf and we can take certain measures to ameliorate their lot. Our difficulty arises in regard to people who are British passport holders. Our idea is not to abandon them completely and take a legalistic view and say that we cannot do much for them. Legal difficulty is there and difficulty is there also because of international law. All these countries of Africa are sovereign independent countries. They are following certain policies about which we cannot say very much. As regards the people who are affected, that is, people of Indian origin, they are national of a third country. Legally we may not do much, but I think it is our moral duty to give whatever help is possible to these people and to mitigate their difficulties. And this is what we have been doing all along. The House is aware that after the U. K. Immigration Act came into being, it became very difficult for these people when they were compelled to leave Africa by force of circumstances in getting entry into U. K.

So, this matter was solved by India coming forward and entering into an agreement with U. K. whereby it will now be possible for these people to come to India, if they are compelled to leave Africa and are not able to get entry into U. K. It is open to them to come to India for a short spell with a proper endorsement on their passports that they will ultimately get entry into U. K. They can remain here and decide whether to go back to U. K. or not. People who do not want to go to U. K. and who are keen to settle down here, can do so and we are examining those cases on merit and on humanitarian grounds. People who are not able to go to U. K. can come to India. We also give them certain facilities, customs facilities regarding stock in trade etc.

There is some difficulty about the repatriation of their assets from these countries, particularly Kenya. As regards those who are Indian citizens, we propose to take up the matter with the Kenya Government to ensure that when they are leaving the country, they should be allowed to repatriate their assets in full. There is difficulty in regard to those holding British passports, because we cannot support their case as strongly as we can in the case of our own citizens, but on their behalf also we propose to have talks with the Kenya Government so that some sort of a solution is found which will make it easy for them to repatriate their assets thus saving them from untold miseries and difficulties.

This is all I have to say. I have taken more time than intended. I am thankful for the opportunity given to me to intervene. I assure hon. Members that although it has not been possible for me to give replies to all the points raised, very careful note has been taken of all the points raised, and due weight and consideration will be given to them by the Ministry.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA : (Secunderabad) : There has been mention about the need to recognise certain countries. Some say that just because we are non-aligned, we should recognise Formosa and Israel and because we have recognised

West Germany we should do likewise in the case of GDR. The other point made by Shri Manoharan was that we are being pressurised.

Non-alignment is a posture in relation to the two big powers when they were in conflict with each other ; it has nothing to do with recognition of any country at all. For recognition to be accorded, the Ministry will have to consider only the nation's self-interest.

There is a history behind most of these countries. For example, Israel has been created as a nation based on religion, which is a new invention of the British Government. First they did in the case of Ulster, than Pakistan. As for Pakistan, we know to our cost, how much we have suffered. Apart from this, Israel has committed aggression twice ; it has flooded the UN's Resolution and has refused to vacate the land it had taken through aggression. We have had a similar experience with Pakistan. We know that part of Kashmir is occupied by Pakistan. Also we will not recognise a principle or extension of a principle which makes religion the basis of a State and condones aggression by which you can acquire territory.

As for Formosa, we know that the relations between India and China are already strained and complicated. Naturally it is for any foreign office concerned to see that they are not complicated further. Also during the 1962 aggression by China on us, Formosa never once condemned it. On the contrary, it supported the stand taken by Mao Tse-tung. Therefore, if the External Affairs Ministry does not consider the recognition of that country, there is ample reason for it.

About pressurising, Shri Manoharan said that we do not recognise GDR because of pressure from the western bloc. I ask, why was this pressure not effective in the case of Formosa ? Recognition of Formosa is as much a matter of interest for the Western Powers as the non-recognition of GDR. Therefore, it is

not right to say that we are being pressurised. Germany has been divided and so also China has been divided. I suppose I am not wrong if I express the hope that the Foreign Ministry would see to it that GDR is recognised. I am a great supporter of the stand that GDR must be recognised.

While I do not agree with a lot of what Mr. Piloo Mody said, I agree with him in this that at one time our foreign policy was based on idealism. Wherever the question of freedom and slavery was concerned we were the first to support that cause and there was some idealism which impelled or compelled us to move on. That has been diluted a great deal, our enthusiasm has cooled down.

The deputy Minister did mention about Rhodesia. But I ask, is not our policy about Rhodesia a weak policy ? Mr. Wilson started by saying that economic sanctions will be effective within six months. But years have passed. We do not mention anything about Rhodesia unless we are forced to mention it in the House in answer to a question or a debate. As far as I know, no pressure was exercised by us on Great Britain. Similarly, British troops landed on Anguilla. It is a small country with 6,000 people. There is a question of its being in revolt or passing a danger to Great Britain. But still Great Britain acted under pressure from USA and sent war-ships.

Both Pakistan and China have got vested interests in their hostility to us as means of bringing about cohesion within their own rank and also satisfying their people that their voice is a voice of power and strength. In fact, China has been seeking enemies and on all frontiers she has got enemies—United States, Soviet Russia and India. She has forced us to become a little unfriendly. Pakistan has been feeding on "hate India" simply to exist. When there was a democratic movement in Pakistan, there was hardly a whisper from the Government of India. In the name of non-interference, are we going to take up a stand of complete silence and inaction ? Have we

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

not the right to express our views on what is happening in the land next to us, which is going to influence us, just as we are going to influence them ?

Therefore, the policy that has been pursued by the Government of India has not produced results. They have been trying for a dialogue for years and there is no dialogue. There must be some other way out. France has been friendly to us. It has been a party to any of the aggressions on us. We have absolutely failed to make use of France as a bridge between India and China. This "peace offensive" we are following is futile, as far as Pakistan is concerned. I maintain that all the democratic movements in Pakistan should have our full sympathy. We talk about free world. Free world comes into existence only when communism is concerned. It tolerates any kind of dictatorship as long as possible. The question of detente is there. The foreign policy of the whole world is in a fluid state. They say Russia and USA are coming closer. It is possible ; probably it is so. At the same time, take the case of Germany. When in Berlin they were having elections the Soviet Union had military exercises in the neighbourhood in order to exert some pressure. At that very moment China opened a front in Ussuri. So is there detente between the Soviet Union and America or between the United States ? But we as a nation have to be on guard. We must have strength also to say even to the Soviet Union that though we value the friendship of the Soviet Union very much they cannot take our friendship for granted and they cannot keep on supplying arms to Pakistan whereby they create an imbalance in this region. If they continue that they should not mind if we feel otherwise. With regard to China there should be further attempts made to bring the two countries together. In the case of Pakistan they will come together only when there is a change in Pakistan and a democratic government is formed. With China our interest is world interest because we both countries have a population of 700 million there and 500 million here. The population pressure is what United States and Soviet Union are afraid

of. We, by having family planning programme, are really doing service to both United States and Soviet Union by reducing the pressure on their empty spaces.

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, every year this debate on foreign policy gives us an opportunity to review our foreign policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow. We go on to the next item now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, let the Government tell us whether they allowed West Pakistan authorities to carry troops in C-130 planes to East Pakistan overflying Indian territory. It has been published in an international weekly. All the denial here that it is not correct is less than convincing.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND
TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH
iah) : Sir, I beg to present the Thirty-
fourth Report of the Business Advisory
Committee.

18.33 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION
COIR INDUSTRY IN KERALA

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN
(Ambalapuzha) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, coir plays an important role in the economy of Kerala and it contributes greatly to the national economy. It is giving employment to 5 lakh to 6 lakh people in Kerala. For the last seventeen years it has contributed to the foreign exchange position of India to the tune of Rs. 183 crores. By way of excise, customs duties and other items it has contri-