

MR. SPEAKER: Let me explain it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: You may explain after I have made my submission.

MR. SPEAKER: Then other Members will also get up one by one. Shri Banerjee will begin and others will follow.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am only repeating what other hon. Members have said earlier on many occasions. The Minister is allowed to make a speech *suo motu*. I do not question that. But when we table a short notice question or calling attention, it is deliberately refused. Then, when the strike is over, the Minister makes a statement. The strike was over yesterday. It was announced over the All India Radio. Now he makes his statement. In the same manner, we have given notice of a short notice question regarding the impending strike by the LIC employees. About 40,000 of them are going on strike tomorrow. The Finance Minister has refused to do anything in the matter. Let him also make a statement today. Why should he not do that?

MR. SPEAKER: Let me explain the position. Every day I get notice of a strike somewhere in the country.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: But this was a major one.

MR. SPEAKER: Please hear me. There is a strike every day, whether it is by LIC workers, school teachers or food corporation workers. There is either a threatened strike or a continuing strike. If I were to allow a Calling Attention on each strike, you would not get any opportunity for taking up other subjects which are also important. I agree that this is also important. I am only explaining the procedure I am following. It may not be to your taste, but I have to explain it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You could have allowed a discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I know I can do it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: But what is the use now? The strike is over.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a strike or threatened strike every day. We have a dozen of them every day.

श्री ज.ज. फर्नेन्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां केन्द्रीय सरकार मालिक है वहां तो आप को देना चाहिए, जैसे कि बंगलौर में हिन्दुस्तान एयरलाइन्स में हड़ताल चल रही है, दस दिन से कितना नुकसान हो रहा है ?...

MR. SPEAKER: Where will it lead us to if we allow all these things?..... (Interruptions).

श्री भवु लिम्बे (मूंगेर) : इस पर बहस करने का रास्ता क्या है ?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know. I cannot help it.

12.39 hours

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS,
1968-69—Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—
Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: We will now take up further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs. We have already spent about 40 minutes on this debate and we have got 5 hours and 20 minutes. The Prime Minister will reply round about 3.15 to 3.30 p.m. tomorrow.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Let her make a statement on Vietnam now. Let us know her views.

MR. SPEAKER: In her reply she will give all the news.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai):
We must indicate our reaction to President Johnson's announcement.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not see the names of Members who gave them but I got a number of calling-attention notices about Vietnam, President Johnson's announcement, two top leaders of Nagaland going to China etc. All these pertain to the Foreign Ministry. We are having the foreign affairs debate and she is going to reply to it tomorrow. So, this will be the fit occasion for her to say about that. That is why I did not allow the calling-attention notices.

श्री मधु लिमबे (मुंगेर) : प्रश्नी करने से फायदा यह होगा कि बहस में जो बोलने वाले लोग हैं वे उस में सुझाव दे सकते हैं, बोल सकते हैं इस में उन को आपत्ति क्या है?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेई (बलरामपुर) : लोग सुझाव दे दें उस के बाद वे स्टेटेमेंट करें वह ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। नहीं तो कुछ का कुछ स्टेटेमेंट करेंगे।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Shri Bhagat can make a statement outside but she cannot make a statement here!

MR. SPEAKER: Now, yesterday Shri Supakar was speaking. He has already taken 9 minutes. Will he kindly conclude early?

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday I was discussing the way in which our hon. Minister tried to help as far as possible the people of Indian origin in Kenya who had British passports. In his statement during the debate in this House on 6th March, 1968, the hon. Minister of State made this statement—I quote:—

“Therefore I suggested that instead of 1,500 they should take 15,000 people, so that instead of being phased over a period of 15 or 20 years, this should be phased over a

period of 2 to 3 years. This is the point we are emphasizing and they have said that they have not kept any limit in the Act and therefore it is flexible and they may consider increasing it. But I do not know. Until they do it, we have no hopes and we shall continue pressing it that they should increase the limit and the phasing should be on a short term basis and not on a long term basis.”

That was what he was doing regarding the United Kingdom.

So far as Kenya is concerned, we know that the hon. Minister visited Kenya on the 14th of last month. The question is: Did he achieve anything or was his visit altogether useless? In his statement the hon. Minister has stated here in the House—I quote:—

“The House will be glad to hear that the Government of Kenya has now decided to extend a period varying from 1 to 2 years work permits issued to non-citizens which will include persons of Indian origin, holders of British and Colonial passports. This will be subject to renewal.”

I think that under the circumstances, having regard to the relationship with the people of Kenya and good relations between the Government of India and the Government of Kenya to which a reference has been made on several occasions in this House, this was the best that could be done. Although a lot of campaign was started against the hon. Minister of State for his alleged failure in his mission to Kenya, I would just quote one report from Nairobi, which was reported in Indian papers, of 27th March, 1968. This is a PTI message and it states:—

“Mr. C. M. G. Argwings Kodhek, Kenyan Minister of State for

[Shri Sradhakar Supakar]

Foreign Affairs, said here yesterday (that is, 26th March, 1968) that Kenya's relations with India are as strong as ever.

In a statement in Parliament the Minister said:—

"The Kenya Government has noted various reports that have appeared in Kenya newspapers as well as the Indian press regarding the recent visit to Kenya of the Indian Minister of State for External Affairs, Mr. B. R. Bhagat.

The Kenya Government, as a matter of policy, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs do not believe in conducting matters affecting relations between States through the medium of the Press. The statements which have appeared to date contribute to distortion of the truth."

In the face of this, when Mr. Masani made the statement yesterday in the House that:

"It is quite clear and our diplomacy was heavy footed, that we were clumsy in the approach we made and that our Minister should never have gone to Kenya unless the ground had been prepared and his visit was welcomed by Mr. N Jomo Kenyatta and his colleagues."

this is not a very kind remark to make in view of the fact that Mr. Bhagat had not gone there to have a reception from the Ministers or the people there. He had gone on a particular mission and we had to judge whether and how far he had succeeded. As I submitted earlier, having regard to the circumstances of the case, he had succeeded to a large extent.

Now I will come to another small aspect to which reference was made by Mr. Masani. He said regarding the non-proliferation treaty that we have a few months to go when the last stage whether we should sign the treaty or not will come before us and he advised our Government to sign it as early as possible. He also said that a period of 90 days has been provided there to back out from the treaty when necessary and that, therefore, we should accept it. I would say that having regard to our bitter experience in the conflict of 1965, our Government should think twice, rather I should say, that our Government should think two hundred times before arriving at a final conclusion and signing such a treaty in haste. What was our experience in 1965 with Pakistan? The NATO countries had supplied a large quantity of arms to Pakistan on the definite understanding that if they were to use it, they would use it only against China and not against India. But, as soon as the conflict broke out, Pakistan could get away with its promises on the false ground that India launched the first attack on Pakistan and, therefore, they could wipe out all the promises they had made to the NATO countries.

Now, Sir, we know our next-door neighbour is a nuclear country having powerful nuclear weapons. Should we depend without any thought on the guarantees that are proposed to be given by the big powers? We know, Sir, that two of our very dangerous neighbours are always inimical to us—China and Pakistan and Pakistan is the blue-eyed boy, rather a blue-eyed girl, of these NATO countries. Therefore, in that eventuality in future of a possible nuclear attack from these two powers, can we depend unconditionally on the unconditional support and the guarantee that is proposed to be given to us? Therefore, I would say that the proposal that was made that there should be a Committee of responsible leaders of the country to look into the pros

(Min. of

and cons and the consequences of signing this treaty may be considered. That is all right but the ground that we have a right to go back within 90 days, can never be the consideration whatsoever, because those people who will probably attack us will not give us 90 days' notice. 90 days is sufficient time, according to Mr. Masani. All I would say is even 90 minutes is a long time for backing out, is rather more than enough for us.

Therefore, Sir, I would submit that this matter must be considered and looked into not from any big power stand-point, but on its own merits, on the angle of our own interests, safety and on the basis of the particular dangers that are facing us from the north, north-eastern and north-western borders. And, therefore, I would say that this matter deserves serious consideration.

One sentence more, and I finish. The statement of President Johnson, so far as it relates to de-escalation of the conflict in Vietnam is a very welcome statement, and this deserves consideration. I hope, with the co-operation of all concerned, and especially because we are the Chairman of the International Control Commission, we might take an initiative to see that all the parties concerned come to the Conference Table, to a Round Table Conference, as has been repeatedly suggested on behalf of our Government, while stopping bombing. I hope that will materialise in view of the recent statement of President Johnson, who deserves our thanks.

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts): Mr. Speaker, Sir, of our External Affairs Ministry, it can be said with a great measure of certainty that over the years we have seen a steady almost a run-away recession of our standing and prestige. And, Sir, I think we touched the nadir last month when the emissary of the Prime Minister received an unprecedented, an entirely unwarranted snubbing at the hands of the head of a neighbouring African nation, for whom we have

cherished nothing but goodwill all along.

Sir, it is not as if nothing has happened in this country, for which we can legitimately be proud and which we could have projected to the outside world and earned a little of its trust and respect.

For over twenty years now, while other countries in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America and in Eastern Europe have gone under one dictatorship or the other, we have managed to make the Parliamentary democracy a going concern. And, although today we have entered a period of instability, to me, it appears, this is an inevitable transition from juvenility to manhood.

Then, Sir, despite various failings, we have succeeded in building up an industrial base in this country with a capacity many times more than its present performance which has evoked complimentary comments from the Delegates to the recent UNCTAD that India today may be considered a developed nation. And this year, Sir, we have had what would appear to be an agricultural break-through. All these things could have earned for us a better respect among our neighbours and among the other nations of the world. But despite it all, we have been treated with scant respect. There must be, therefore, something radically wrong with the way in which we have managed our external affairs, and it is time that we take a hard critical look at our foreign policy. But it is here that I am sorely disappointed.

Sir, I have in my hand here this book, the Annual Report of the External Affairs Ministry. If you read it, you will find that it is little better than a chronological narration of who visited this country when, who entertained whom where and who from among the favourite few of this Government visited which country at what time. There is hardly an attempt to study the world situation to re-appraise the merits, the demerits, the points of strength, the

[Shri Swell]

points of weakness, of our foreign policy in the light of the developing events in the world.

When I go through this book, I have the impression that the people behind this Report are a group of psychedelic devotees whose sole pleasure seems to lie in proceeding blindly by certain mantras and these mantras are set out right at the beginning of the book. I quote:

"In order to achieve this, we chose for ourselves the path of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence even when such a policy was suspect or misunderstood."

I have no quarrel with peaceful co-existence as such for I do not consider peaceful co-existence a policy. It is a general state of the world which every nation, right down to centuries, has devoutly wished but has scarcely bothered to promote. Everybody swears by peaceful co-existence with the others. But non-alignment is a policy which we chose for ourselves at a particular point of history when the world was a bipolar world, divided up between communism on the one hand dominated by Soviet Russia and western democracy on the other dominated by the United States. At that time, we thought that our role in the world was to assert our independence, not to tie ourselves to the apron-strings of one or the other of the super powers and to build in the world a third power which would stand between the two world powers, exert its influence and try to avert any disaster which might have resulted from a head-on collision of these super powers. But what is the complexion of the world today? What is non-alignment in the context of the modern world situation? Who is aligned? Who is not aligned? In one sense, I think, the most non-aligned nation in the world today is Communist China, because it has broken out from the monolithic, mono-centrist Communist world and swears against Soviet revisionism and American imperialism with the same viciousness while at the same time it rattles

its sword almost constantly against us who proclaim that we are non-aligned. In another sense, Pakistan is the most non-aligned nation because it is aligned with everybody, with Russia, with America, with China.... (Interruptions). India does not count for anything and, therefore, there is no special point in anybody aligning with us.

13 hours

About ourselves, with whom are we aligned or non-aligned? We go to the United States; we go to Russia, beg for their help, receive their help equally in an equal measure or sometimes more or less. And if we can bring back the Bandung days even today, I am sure, this Government would join hands with China too in order that we not only may live in peace, in peaceful existence, with her, the most portentous of our neighbours, but also that we may be able to project, what we call, an Asian personality.

MR. SPEAKER: Is he finishing in two minutes?

SHRI SWELL: I will request you to give me more time, Sir, because I would like to deal with the non-proliferation treaty also.

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately the time is rationed out. He may try to finish in two minutes.

SHRI SWELL: I can continue even after Lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: No. He may try to conclude now itself.

SHRI SWELL: These are the things which we do not want to admit even to ourselves, with disastrous results, with the results that we find ourselves out of step with the world and the developments in the world. For example, we failed to grasp the full import of the Glassborough meeting between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin, which resulted in the calling off of the Arab-Israeli conflict last year.

Even today we do not evince any better understanding of the situation in Vietnam. We fail to understand that the persons who are calling the tune in Vietnam today are not President Ho Chi Minh or President Nguyen-Van-Thieu but Lyndon Johnson and Alexei Kosygin. The dramatic events of the last few days in which President Johnson unilaterally declared his intention not to run for the American Presidency any more and to sharply de-escalate bombing of North Vietnam, his invitation to President Nguyen-Van-Thieu to come and talk over things with him, and this morning's report of favourable response from Hanoi show that it is these two super-powers who are controlling the course of events in Vietnam, and if Soviet Russia should respond in a similar manner to the gesture of the United States, I might as well predict that, in a few days' time, we might see the end of the Vietnam conflict. In the same way, we fail to understand the emergence of new forces in Europe. We fail to understand the true significance of the role of President De Gaulle, his implacable animosity against the Anglo-American bloc and his economic war against the dollar and the pound which to a considerable extent was responsible for the last gold crisis. We fail to see the emergence of nationalism within the communist bloc not only in the case of China but in the case of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

Now, in this world as it is, in this poly-centrist world, non-alignment is less than meaningless.

Now, I come to the most important question that faces us today, our attitude towards the nuclear weapons non-proliferation treaty. I do not think that we have projected for ourselves a more confused, a more helpless and a more pathetic image than in relation to this draft treaty which is before the United Nations and which the two super-powers would like us to sign. That is because our mantra of non-alignment fails us completely where the two super-powers are combined.

We say on the one hand that this treaty is not a perfect treaty. But we also say in the same breath that it would be unrealistic to look for a perfect treaty and that we appreciate the step-by-step approach. We say on the one hand that this treaty does not impose any obligation on the nuclear powers to destroy the nuclear stock-pile and to desist from a development of the nuclear technology, but we do not say how nuclear aggression from China which is not a party to this treaty and, therefore, is not bound by any obligation of this treaty can be contained and eliminated by the destruction of the nuclear stock-pile of the present nuclear powers.

Then we say that this treaty imposes unequal obligation on non-nuclear countries like ourselves, because even our pursuit of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes would be subject to the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency. But we do not say how we are going to pursue the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in our country. In the few atomic plants that we have, whether at Trombay or at Tarapore, or at Rana Pratap Sagar or even in the new plant that we are thinking of at Kalpakkam, the reactors and the nuclear materials have been supplied to us by friendly countries who would be a party to this treaty and whose research and technology would be denied to us the moment we place ourselves outside the orbit of this treaty. We say that this treaty does not give us guarantee against China; we say that the joint guarantee which the two super-powers are now offering us does not have sufficient credibility. But we do not tell this country and the world that only one or two years ago it was we who went all over to make this request that the guarantee should not be bilateral, but should be multilateral, and now that this joint guarantee has come, we fight shy of it. We say that China is the greatest cause for worry to us. I agree. But I would ask this question of Minister of External Affairs: how

[Shri Swell]

can we at the present moment, as we are, when we are way behind China in the development of nuclear weaponry—and from all reports that we have, our towns and cities are within firing range of Chinese nuclear guns and missiles—how can we at this stage defend ourselves? How can we deter any aggression from China unless and until there is some kind of guarantee, a guarantee which can be given to us at the moment only by the super-powers? Then we say that the credibility is small but we do not take any steps to make the credibility more reassuring. We would not, for instance, agree to the cruising of the nuclear fleets of the two super-powers anywhere near our shores; we would not agree to the establishment of any base in this country anywhere, the only thing that would directly involve the super-powers in the nuclear defence of this country, the only step by which we can have a real operational credibility to this guarantee.

On the other hand, I would submit to the Prime Minister that this treaty is not immutable. There is a provision in it for a five yearly mandatory review of its working. There is a provision for the amendment of the treaty itself by a vote of the majority of the parties to it, and the parties who will be in a majority will naturally be the non-nuclear weapon countries.

There is a provision also for withdrawal from this treaty in the exercise of national sovereignty, whenever we feel that it is working against the interests of this country.

These are options open to us and I think, on the balance, everything considered, it is in our interest that we should sign this treaty and I would urge upon this Government to do it in good time, and to do it with grace.

13.15 hours

The Lok Sabha adjourned for lunch till fourteen of the clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at five minutes past fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1968-69—
Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Sondhi.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): Sir, there are great problems which confront our country and as is inevitable, many of these are related to foreign affairs. But today we find that a look at India's image in the world suggests that all is not well with the affairs of our State in relation to external affairs. There is paralysis of Indian foreign policy in South-East Asia, miscalculation and blundering in West Asia and mis-perception of nuclear policy. There is failure to utilise our bargaining capacities in our diplomacy towards the super-powers. There is lack of credibility in our China policy. There is failure to make our strategic superiority meaningful in relation to Pakistan.

Today the Indian foreign policy does not reflect political understanding of our strategic requirements or a contribution towards international understanding in the nuclear age. The Prime Minister—I say this in no spirit of rancour, but with a sense of humility—today seems to be sitting on the top of a moribund organisation, which has cast her in the ironic role of presiding over the dismantling of the international image of India, with which her father's name was once associated. I do not wish to introduce bitterness or rancour in the debate, but I cannot help referring to the fact that the Prime Minister seems to be unable to develop an appreciation of the various new trends and particularly the upsurge of

new movements in the world. It would be an advantage to be able to see the sorts of developments which are taking place in the world—the upsurge of nationalism in East Europe and the new developments in South-East Asia. But unfortunately, it seems even able men in the Congress Party cannot be associated with foreign affairs; perhaps some of them are too ambitious.

The crux of the matter today is that we have introduced a certain mendicant mentality in our foreign affairs. I would suggest listening to the Indian wisdom of India. I would quote the chapter from Tirukkural on the evil of begging:

“Not to beg at all even from those excellent persons who cheerfully give without refusing will do immense good. If the Creator of the world has decreed even begging as a means of livelihood, may he too go a begging and perish. There is no greater folly than the holdness with which one seeks to remedy evils of poverty by begging rather than by working.”

Permit me, Sir, to refer to the matter of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Today this treaty itself has become a cause of worsening of international relations. A writer, who should be listened to with respect in India, because he happens to be a rare British Member of Parliament who supported this country in 1965, when most people in Britain were hostile towards India—John Grigg, formerly known as Lord Altrincham—in a recent article says:

“The treaty is an elaborate fantasy based upon a single massive fallacy—that the spread of nuclear weapons increases the danger of war. Yet, experience already suggests that nuclear powers deal with each other more gingerly than non-nuclear powers and it is a matter of record that the big bombs have not been used since 1945, whereas conventional weapons have been all too freely used.”

He refers then to the three main objections to the proposed treaty—firstly, it would give bomb-owners an unfair commercial advantage; secondly, it would do nothing to control vertical proliferation by the nuclear powers; and, thirdly, it would leave bombless nations exposed to nuclear blackmail.

I think, the Government here must bear the responsibility for keeping this country in a state of nuclear unpreparedness and, what is more objectionable, being unprepared to do nuclear thinking. Eloquent speeches have been made here which, however, reflect the state of affairs in the world which existed several years ago. To day the world is changed, since 1962. The nuclear confrontation in Cuba presented the nuclear dimensions which were appreciated in the Soviet Union, America and elsewhere.

The present situation which we find in South East Asia—the United States calling halt to escalation and other developments to which I shall refer presently—has a bearing upon the present problem and it is in terms of the fact that a big nuclear power need not look to the fate of those to whom it has given certain assurances and will take steps which meet its own global responsibilities. This is something which this country and this Parliament must take note of. Therefore, actually the lesson of Vietnam for us, I would say, is the lesson of nuclear preparedness.

Again, permit me to quote John Grigg. In his recent article in the *Manchester Guardian*, which I commend to the External Affairs Ministry, he says—I should have thought that he would say “If”, but he is probably optimistic about India—

“India has read the lessons of Vietnam and will not sign the non-proliferation treaty in its present form. She would be unwise to sign it in any form since her only defence against Chinese blackmail consists in achieving a balance of

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

terror' which can be achieved only if she becomes a nuclear power in her own right."

It is not the question as to where the threat comes from. This country must participate in the nuclear era. It must safeguard to itself all those dimensions of human progress which are available in the nuclear age. In this case I would commend to the powers that be what even the Prime Minister of this country, who initiated the nuclear era, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, with whom our party had many differences but who on this matter did exercise some judgement and left guidance which might even help this Government if it were not influenced and pressurised or if it were not subject to the mendicant mentality which I referred to earlier, said in the Rajya Sabha on May 24, 1957-I quote from Shri Nehru's speech:—

"If more and more countries possess these weapons, it will be much more difficult to control them than it is today. In fact, quite a new situation will arise, which might threaten humanity. It might even be that a group of misguided persons might try to terrorize the world. It is a possibility. Therefore, it is desirable to come to grips with this subject before the danger spreads too much. That is one reason for urgent action."

This was in 1957. Today there is a group of misguided persons who are terrorizing the world. Therefore in terms of the logic of what Shri Nehru said today, there is an obligation on Government and on Parliament to consider that as far as all those perspectives which were given, where India stood for nuclear disarmament, are concerned, are today no longer valid. The countries of the world that matter are not talking of nuclear disarmament; they are talking of arms control and this concept of arms control today has resulted in this non-proliferation treaty.

May I know whether this treaty does not sanctify continued vertical proliferation of nuclear powers? May I know what this treaty has to give us in relation to the Chinese nuclear capability? May I further know whether, as far as proclaiming India's intent to become a part of the structure which this treaty suggests is concerned, it will not make us incapable of any independence in foreign affairs?

We have been told that there are certain guarantees which are offered. We know the fate of countries which were subject to these guarantees, countries like Czechoslovakia which suffered when there were joint guarantees because in that case each waited for the other to act first—the Soviet Union said, "If France first intervenes then we will come to your help" and *vice versa*. It is seriously suggested that India should be to this position? On the other hand, I would say that this Government, if it is honest, must remember that this non-proliferation treaty does not meet the requirements which their representative had urged in the meeting which was held in Geneva. At that time, it was said very clearly that India would insist on the fulfilment of those assurances which were required and which were implicit in Resolution 2028 of the 20th General Assembly Session. The Indian delegate, Mr. V. C. Trivedi, on 15th February, 1966, said:

"The Indian delegation hopes that the discussions in the Committee will proceed on the firm and unflinching basis of these five principles, and that we shall soon have a balanced treaty, an effective treaty and a treaty without loopholes; in fact, a treaty which solves the essential problem of proliferation, that is, the problem of present as well as of future proliferation".

Today, we are given a treaty which Mr. Grigg refers to is a misbegotten treaty. I would say, in our parlance, it is a treaty which declares us

mlechha and if we want to give up discrimination within our own country, surely, we must take a stand that in the comity of nations there should not be a discrimination of this sort.

This Treaty ignores the strategic logic in a world situation where alliances are crumbling. The obsession with the 'nth country problem' has been generated by certain vested interests, certain scholars and politicians who suggested a certain model of nuclear conflict quite ignoring that today nuclear weapons are a challenge to the rationale of alliances.

Today, we find strange patterns of ideological co-existence in the world in the sense that in this multi-polar world, in this polycentrist world, it becomes very relevant that India should consider that this particular nuclear dimension of the problem is that today even the test ban treaty has not been extended to cover underground explosions. There are no steps towards disarmament. An Indian test, therefore, I would say, must be commissioned for the purpose of entering into a nuclear dialogue with the rest of the world. Otherwise, we are just opting out of all this. I say, with a sense of responsibility, that Government has no reason to indulge in this sort of tactics to misguide the country. As a matter of fact, our thoughts go back to Dr. H. J. Bhabha who was good enough to give an interview with the Hindu correspondent to give a break-up of the figures for making a bomb. I quote:

"Thus, on the basis of the figures given in that paper, a stockpile of some 50 atomic bombs would cost under Rs. 10 crores and a stockpile of 50 two-megaton hydrogen bombs something of the order of Rs. 15 crores. These expenditures were small compared with the military budgets of many countries. Therefore, they might have to reckon with a number of countries possessing nuclear weapons within the next five or 10 years, unless some important and tangible steps were taken towards disarmament."

This was said in 1964 everywhere, whether it was Prime Minister Nehru or Mr. Bhabha or other spokesmen, that it is always tangible steps towards disarmament. Today, the shape of non-proliferation treaty is without disarmament. Non-proliferation is a measure of arms control. There is no mention of disarmament in the treaty. Therefore, if we accept the logic of what was said earlier, today the decision to go nuclear is a sensible decision, a decision which meets the requirements of an era in which we are.

In this context, I would say that we need not despair; we need not feel as if we are giving up the heritage of *Ahimsa* which we have; we need not feel that we shall be outcaste in the world. I would suggest that if you look at the matter very clearly, we find that there are other countries also. Rumania is a very respectable country, a country which has taken initiatives in world affairs. There is France which under the leadership of de Gaulle has worked on this problem and, I think, is altogether a responsible power. I quote the French position as given by M. Couvé de Murville:

"These discussions which have been taking place for the last several years are, unfortunately, not for disarming those who are armed. But for preventing those who are unarmed from arming themselves."

Similarly, there are statements by the Brazilians, by the Germans and by the Italians. They are looking to India, this Parliament, and this particular session of Lok Sabha assumes a historic importance. Are we going to deny India a say in the nuclear period in matters which are of very wide dimensions? Therefore, I think, it is commendable that the *Bhartiya Jan Sangh* has focussed attention on this problem in its recent Resolution.

"The guarantee given by Soviet Russia and the United States of America, jointly or severally, to safeguard the country so attacked would thus be of no avail,

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

"Even if the Government of India was not in a position to go in for the atom bomb today, the option for India going nuclear must not be given up."

But it is my submission that India can undertake a test explosion. India should undertake an explosion which can be an underground explosion or which could even be an explosion of the nature of 'Project Ploughshare', something which can be used for irrigation purposes and thereby demonstrate our willingness to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes. But we must enter the nuclear comity; otherwise, we shall be working in foreign affairs at our peril.

I come now to the question which, I think, has been engaging the attention of this House and of all members, the problem in Vietnam. I feel that the recent developments there merit our close attention. The American offer and the North Vietnamese response are positive gestures which we must look at very carefully, but at the same time our reaction must be speedy. I was surprised that the Government of India, which has been taking interest in this problem, was not in a position to come out immediately with a response are positive gestures which we must look at very carefully, but at the same time our reaction must be speedy. I was surprised that the Government of India, which has been taking interest in this problem, was not in a position to come out immediately with a response. That is the unfortunate position; we miss that moment, that moment which is so important, and there is always some sort of pettifogging which goes on. Today, I think, the implication is clear. We must make an effort that New Delhi becomes the place where these talks for solving the Vietnam problem should take place. The focus must be on New Delhi and we, I submit, are underestimating our influence, as indeed we underestimate our influence on the Soviet Union and the United States in relation to the

nuclear treaty. The United States is sowing the world with its own civil rights problem and the racial disturbances in the United States, and the Soviet Union is having enough troubles in East Europe, and with both these countries if our relations are put on a secure footing and on a sound basis, we can have a legitimate influence on them. We can ask that this Conference be held in New Delhi and we can make a gesture that, for this Conference, we shall make available all those facilities which were so misused during the UNCTAD Conference. Fortunately.....

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA (Gauhati): Even after the announcement, bombing of North Vietnam is going on.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: I should say that the United States' announcement of stopping aerial and naval bombardment should be considered seriously because, in this case, there is a natural identity of interests. I think, and we can urge for considering this whole problem of de-escalation in the context of an assertion of a will that we shall look to the problems of South-East Asia in a perspective which can be determined by a kind of new arrangement of mutual co-operation in this area, in which there are the democratic forces like the Buddhists in South Vietnam, the regime in North Vietnam, and similarly in other places. This is very much a mosaic and we must study all those who are concerned, and those types of population which live there. In this connection, I would say that the Asian world is not any longer what it was before World War II, and the United States should have learnt, by now, a salutary lesson that they cannot think in terms of an involvement in land warfare without the co-operation of an Asian power. I am not suggesting that India send its troops there, but I do suggest that diplomatic initiatives, that political initiatives, are possible which can result in ameliorating the military situation there.

In this connection, I would say that we should focus attention on the individual countries; for example, Cambodia; we see a certain transformation there. Prince Sihanouk has, I think, been underestimated by our Government and has been treated sometimes in a way in which he has not been allowed to play a leading role which he is entitled to. That is because Cambodia is, I think, really a country which is capable of taking initiative and I quote here from a recent article of Prince Nordom Sihanouk:

"This situation led my country to propose—first of all—that a Khmere/Laotian 'buffer-zone' should be created for the purpose of shoring up Lao's tottering neutrality. It then suggested the setting up of a neutralized block of countries, which would include South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Indeed, it even went so far as to propose the institution of a 'belt' of neutral States stretching from Saigon to New Delhi, which would have counter-balanced, and served as a barrier to the ambitions of the 'rival camps.'"

There are some words which are significant. He says:

"I still believe, however, that, if we are to avoid in future becoming involved in the bloody quarrels of great powers, we Asians will have to reconsider the possibility of coming to an arrangement between ourselves, which will naturally respect all established national regimes, but will enable each one of us to command the political, economic and military support of all in a struggle for survival."

Therefore, this whole question of South-East Asian Co-operation depends very much on the sort of impression that we had. Again if we think that we are involved in this area and if we feel that our presence here reflects the cultural ties which we have enjoyed for a long time and which can today

forge new links with a purposeful diplomacy, with a diplomacy which does not blunder in the manner it has blundered so far and it is evident that North Vietnam will have enhanced importance, one would suggest sending an Ambassador there because communism today is very much poly-centric. If there can be a Titoism in Europe, so also we can expect that the nationalist urges will lead North Vietnam which was historically anti-Chinese, to develop an independent personality. But do we have a trained Ambassador here who knows the moral and cultural revolution, knows about South Vietnam and North Vietnam—I do not know.

With regard to China also, I would say that an independent approach to China can be developed provided we can think in terms of research on our own basis and that research, I think, requires a shift in these attitudes which we have inherited. There is a Policy Planning Division in the External Affairs Ministry. I would like to know whether any projects have been taken up for an independent assessment of India's interests or is it that we are so flooded with the research outputs of American Universities that we just go along with that. I give a warning, Sir. The American policy towards China.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now you please conclude.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Only two minutes, Sir. In this context, our research probabilities must be widened so that one day if American attitudes towards China change, of which there are some indications, we should be prepared for them and it should not be said that we were taken aback.

Sir, coming nearer home, on the problem of Kutch—I have also said earlier—the public opinion here does not understand the rather indescant hurry of the Government to go ahead and to try and solve this problem as if it is the crucial problem in Indo-Pakistan relations. There are precedents

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

where judgments of international tribunals have been held over because they were in excess of their jurisdiction. We must examine that.

With regard to Pakistan, I crave your indulgence, Sir, because it is such an important matter that, I think, we should not look only in terms of....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am very sorry. If I show any indulgence, every Member will claim the same privilege. You now conclude.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: With regard to Pakistan, I wish to emphasize that the situation is a very fluid one. 'After Ayub Who' has started and the younger generation there, I think, is full of questions. In this matter, whether the future will produce Bhutto or it will produce another military dictator or perhaps that East Bengal and Pakhtoonistan will develop their independent personalities, I think, a solution in terms of the Austrian solution can be suggested for East Bengal and there can be a solution for Pakhtoonistan because it should be remembered that in the so-called referendum there, only one-fourth of the Pathans participated while the three-fourths did not. I would refer to a communique issued during Mr. Khrushchev's visit. It said that it hoped that the Pakhtoons would get their independent status. In this connection, if Afghanistan needs access to the sea, I do not see why we should be reluctant to give that.

In Eastern Europe changes are taking place and in this matter again, the Prime Minister who went there and who gave us a report on her visit, did not convey any idea as to the changes that are taking place. Czechoslovakia is returning to a sort of neo-Masaryskism and in terms of that it is a resurgence to nationalism and India should take an interest in the developments in Eastern Europe which would result in a beneficent influence.

In conclusion I must refer to the Report which was given to us on the Indian Foreign Service, the so-called Pillai Report. It is said that there would be so many reforms which would be undertaken. May I ask the Government whether this report has been thrown into the waste-paper basket because there were specific suggestions here and I have to quote here what a retired Ambassador has to say. This is what Mr. Tyabji says: 'Flair and feeling had taken the place of hard work in the foreign service'. Sir, these are the strictures which must be gone into. But I come to a specific question now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Sir, this is a matter which is very important. The tone and temper of the foreign service depends upon whether its organization is modernised, is made free from favouritism and works with efficiency or not. I have here a letter which I could read out. But I will give a gist of it. Appointments are made in this fashion. Here, for example, in our Embassy in Paris, Shri C. S. Jha, the Ambassador, took with him his P.A. Shri C. N. Dewan who does not belong to the Foreign Service at all and was on the verge of retirement. He rewarded him with this post. Not only that. Shri Jha ordered for the appointment of Shri Dewan's son, Shri Narinder Dewan as a clerk in the Paris Embassy. Another instance is in respect of Washington. One Shri G. R. Sapara, P.A. of a Board Member was posted to Washington.

In conclusion I would say that when we refer to India's role in world affairs, the situation today is such that we can take initiatives. It is not a question of our despairing in the Indian ocean. We can take the initiative. We can take the initiative with regard to Viet Nam. What is required after all is the will and that will is lacking, Sir. Our will is not there to manifest India

as a modern power, as a power in the nuclear era, as a great united nation dedicated to those great ideals which our civilization has provided for us.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): Sir, we have had the privilege of listening to three speeches from the opposition benches. The first was that of the spokesman of the Swatantra party. Then there was an independent Member, Shri Swell. I will come to Shri Sondhi a little later. When I listened to the speeches of these two hon. Members, I felt greatly hurt. Foreign Affairs is a subject on which to a very great extent there must be unanimity of approach. The inter-party disputes and argumentation should not reach the level of hurting the reputation of our country either here or abroad. These two hon. Members did not observe this salutary principle and went on attacking in such a way that they decried India to a very great extent. Shri Swell went to the extent of saying that we don't count at all in the international world and Shri Masani went on saying that we are insulted everywhere. I do not want to reply in general terms. Let us argue the matter and see how far these accusations are true.

Sir, take UNCTAD for instance. UNCTAD is not a conference convened by India, nor is the Government of India responsible for its proceedings. It is an organisation of the United Nations and the office-bearers of the UNCTAD are the servants of the United Nations Organisation. All that the Government of India did was to make arrangements for the holding of this conference. The test is whether arrangements were so satisfactory as to elicit the appreciation of the delegates. That is the main thing. Regarding the resolutions, they suffer from the same disability as those of the Security Council suffer from or those of the UN General Assembly suffer from. That is because of the pattern of international politics. To make that as a charge against the Government of India betrays the psychology of

finding any stick good enough to beat Government of India with. They do not care whether India's reputation suffers thereby or not.

I may tell you that many of the UNCTAD delegates had been under a misapprehension about the might of India, either in the military field or in the industrial sector. Many of these delegates went and toured the various public undertakings. I have discussed with some of them. They have frankly told me that they never had this picture of India placed before them and that all the propaganda done by interested parties was such that they thought that in India they would see nothing but hungry-looking people all dying everywhere. But this conference had brought home to the thousand and odd delegates that India was making progress and is making tremendous progress.

SHRI XAVIER (Tirunelveli): But were the delegates taken round to the villages and shown? They have seen only Delhi.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: This was exactly the psychology that I was referring to. If a word is said in favour of our country it is brushed aside. If something is said against it, it is noted down with golden letters in their diaries. This is not patriotism.

Regarding this UNCTAD conference, Shri M. R. Masani says that it was a mountain and a mouse came out of it. As I have said this was an international conference under the UNO for whose decisions the Government of India are not responsible. Still, we played a big part in playing host and in making arrangements. But Shri M. R. Masani sees nothing but mouse in it. I do not know why he has taken to this mouse-hunting. In England, in the old days, there was the national sport of fox-hunting. I do not know whether Shri M. R. Masani is introducing into Swatantra Party the sport of mouse-hunting.

Take the instance of Kenya. My hon. friend all the time shouts that India was insulted, insulted and insulted.

After all, a Minister of State went there; but in Kenya, not only Cabinet Ministers but even the vice-president had met him and talked to him. It may be that because of his illness, President Kenyatta might not have met him; President Kenyatta is a very old man and he is ill. I am telling you a fact. My hon. friends should know the facts. It may be that an interview was arranged but it could not be fulfilled. To take this mere incidental happening in a visit and treat it as an insult.....

AN HON. MEMBER: A Daniel come to judgment!

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA:was a wrong way of looking at things. I shall catch them by their arguments. Suppose President Kenyatta did not see him, and therefore it is great insult to the country. When Prime Minister Kosygin of the USSR calls on our Prime Minister and takes counsel from here, what is it? Is it prestige or is it insult? When Marshal Tito comes to India or when the President of the Burma Republic comes to India and talks to our Prime Minister on topics of common interest, should that not be construed in the same breath, as some respect paid to India and its Government by foreign dignitaries? When such things go to the credit of the Government of India or India, they completely ignore it. But they magnify this one little incident of not seeing one of our Ministers to such an extent that we hear of it all the time in Parliament. This is not a healthy psychology. On the other hand, India today is respected.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA: Ask him to raise the level of the debate.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Will he stop interfering like this? This is not in keeping with the dignity of the House. I will have to be very serious about it. When your spokesman speaks he will be interrupted and I will be helpless. Please keep order.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): When the small boy from their side was speaking, we did not interrupt. We cannot tolerate this insult to our Deputy Leader.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I cannot tolerate Randhir Singh.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उन्होंने क्या शब्द प्रयाग किया है ? बड़े अंग्रेजीदा बनते हैं, क्या संसद् के दूसरे सदस्य को व्वाय कहकर सम्बोधित करना चाहिये ? क्या यह हरियाणा की अंग्रेजी है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Randhir Singh will please resume his seat. I cannot allow this sort of interruption. If this goes on, when a member from the other side speaks, there may be interruptions from this side and I will be helpless.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: India today is in such an advantageous position, that whether it is the Prime Minister of USSR or the President of Yugoslavia or many other heads of government, they think it worthwhile to discuss international problems with India, take counsel and come to decisions.

Take even the latest turn of events, which is very welcome, which has also been welcomed by Shri Sondhi, that USA and North Vietnam are trying to negotiate. If you look to the previous history of this event, India took this very same stand, that these two countries are following now. India took this stand years and years ago. If these two countries had listened to the advice of India, then all the misery, destruction and havoc could have been avoided. But even as some of my friends do not listen to your advice sometimes, these two countries do not listen to the advice of India. They think that when they are in a comfortable position, advice does not matter; when they get into difficulties, they will

appreciate the value of advice. Today any patriotic Indian, if he gets above party feeling, will see that India's foreign policy, in so far as this problem is concerned, stands justified, vindicated. The very suggestion made by Prof. Sondhi that the conference on this issue should be held in India in a tribute paid to Indian policy, because India has created such an atmosphere in the world.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारतीय (मेरठ) :
महेश योगी को सौं दीजिये ।

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: Today the Government of India are aware of the problems enunciated by Prof. Sondhi. We have to keep a good-neighbourly atmosphere, not in terms of mere theory only. We have to see that countries to our east and west are put into a co-operative field of progress and peace.

There is some criticism regarding the policy of Government *vis-a-vis* the West and West Asia. Some people ask why we should go to the extent of blaming Israel. It is not Israel we are blaming, but the act of aggression committed by her. We are sore that China has aggressed on our territory and occupied a little piece of it. If this is condemnable, it applies with equal force to any other country including Israel. Israel herself admits that the desert area and some other areas have been occupied by them forcibly and they are prepared to vacate provided certain conditions are fulfilled. That is a different matter but it is aggression. Therefore, the Government of India has taken the stand that wherever there is aggression, it should be vacated. It is not because we want to condemn them or uphold them, irrespective of the merits of the case. At the same time, the Government of India has pleaded that Israel must be recognised as a State. Therefore, we are not blind partisans of any one in particular. Our foreign policy is independent, discriminatory, just and impartial. That is why we are holding

the scales even between the parties concerned. After all Israel has come into existence, whether we wanted it or not. We cannot just black it out of the map of the world. At the same time the capitalistic powers are helping Israel in such a way that the underdeveloped countries, countries not sufficiently armed or former colonial countries, as they say, have a stake in coming together in order to see that their independence is guaranteed that their independent judgment is safeguarded. It is for this purpose that India has made a common cause with all the Middle-east countries; it is not for any particular selfish reason or any anti-pathology we have towards Israel. Therefore, we cannot but follow this policy of consolidating anti-imperialist opinion, anti-capitalist opinion in this area so that the world may live in peace and ultimately make progress and produce plenty. Likewise in Cambodia or other countries in Southeast Asia, we are entirely willing to co-operate with them. I had two occasions to talk to Prince Sihanouk and he spent some time with me. Some of these people are placed in such a difficult situation that they will not be able to state a firm policy and adhere to it. If there is pressure from communist side, they will take one posture and if there is pressure from America, they will have to take another posture as they are small countries. On all sides military might is pressurising them. It is not like India. We can afford to take an independent line, for its own sake. Therefore, if you blame India that we have not co-operated with this East Asian country or that country, you must see whether their mind is firmly made up on certain healthy lines. You must do so before blaming India for not co-operating. It is India that is prepared to co-operate with these small nations. The situation is such that they are not able to go to the full length we want them to. Take for instance, Indonesia. What an amount of friendship we have shown them from the beginning, even during the pre-independence days. Nehru and Gandhi and all the others were participants in

[Shri Hanumanthaiya].

the full sense of the term in their independence fight. They helped their independence movement. Slowly the spirit of power went to the head of some of these leaders to such an extent that they wanted the Indian Ocean to be named as Indonesian Ocean. What is to be done? The same thing is happening in African countries. Their newly begotten power makes them talk and do things in a way older nations dare not do. But we have to wait and have patience. India is in fact a picture of patience so far as the frivolous attitude of some of the countries and their leaders is concerned. I tell you it is not by way of praise that I say that the Minister of State for External Affairs has exercised patience in the true Indian spirit in spite of difficulties; if at all you have to blame, you have to blame the person who has not given the interview and not the person who has exercised his patience in the true spirit of Indian culture and civilisation. If any of you want to attack the Minister of State all the time, that merely shows you are more angry against the Congress than against those people who, you say, insulted us in Kenya.

AN HON. MEMBER: They did insult.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: I want to sound a note of self-confidence not because of their criticism or because of my vanity. Today, India in a military way is in such a position that it is able to face any enemy. The other day, the Defence Minister described the progress we have made in that area. Specially, our army is so trained and equipped that whether it is China or any other country, we are in a position not only to defend ourselves but bring glory to this country. And this is not an empty reputation that I am sponsoring. If you read the journals, you will know; even in the *American Time*, the tank battle waged by the Indian army in Khem Karan sector was compared to the strategy adopted by Hannibal. Therefore, let us not go away with the impression that merely

because an interview was not given there or a letter was not replied to here, we are weak. We are stronger than all the people put together who have any notion of insulting us. Only, India is too big a country, too mighty a country to get excited over these small things.

Only one point more and I shall close my speech. I hope my Jan Sangh friends will concede that I should have at least as much time as was given to my very good, amiable friend, Mr. Sor-dhi.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You take your time.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: I see from the amendments printed, and I have also heard statements on the floor of the House, especially by my irrepressible friend Mr. Banerjee and his colleagues that we must quit the Commonwealth. Several Members of this House have attended the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conferences, including my distinguished friend, the leader of the Jan Sangh. The atmosphere in those conferences is such that you will feel that you have gone into a family gathering.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai): I was present in the last conference. It is just contrary to what you say. It is fight and quarrel. It was neither common nor wealth.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has the right to make an observation; it is his observation.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: I want to bring to the notice of this House a famous statement made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom at the time of the Chinese aggression and a year later also. He said if ever China attacks India not only the United Kingdom but all the Commonwealth countries will come to the aid

of India, not by mere words but with all their military forces. A statement of this nature was not made by Kenya whose independence we supported or by Indonesia, for which we had goodwill ever since the inception of their freedom movement. In fact, if you make analysis of world opinion, not one Afro-Asian nation except Malaya came forward with this categorical statement. UK is like the old mother-in-law who can bear any amount of taunting. Its silence does not mean consent. Suppose we walk out of the Commonwealth, what else can we do afterwards? The only threat we can make is that we will come back into the Commonwealth. It may be the ideology of the communist party to strengthen the communist bloc and weaken the western bloc. They may think that our being in the Commonwealth goes to strengthen the western bloc. They know also that no such result has been placed in that account so far, nor is it likely to take place hereafter. In fact, in spite of so much adverse comment, when there is some real difficulty facing India, it is the U.K., Canada and other Commonwealth countries that will come to our rescue and not any of these new-fangled Afro-Asian countries, with all their tall talk. Some of them are not able to save themselves from their difficulties. To say, whenever some occasion arises, that we must walk out of the Commonwealth is just like our friends staging a walk-out so often in this House, only to return five minutes later.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore): Sir, the sense of fear and insecurity which was hovering over the South-east Asian countries and also the fear which we were facing due to the war in Vietnam has been relieved by the dramatic announcement a few days back by the American President that there will be de-escalation of war and stopping of 90 per cent. of the bombing there. On behalf of my group, I thank the Government for having pursued an independent approach about Vietnam. There has been pressure by Americans and other western countries for the

very reason that we are non-aligned and we are not at all siding with any bloc, whereas Pakistan has not opened its mouth until this day with regard to Vietnam. In spite of the adversaries, India had played an important role in the struggle for the freedom of Asian and African countries. That is why our tradition of keeping our foreign policy independent without any strings or attachment or obligations has created more friends now. When President Johnson announced in the United States that he is going to send millions of troops in order to strengthen the losing battle in Vietnam and there was the fear that China may directly participate in the Vietnam war, our Government cautiously pursued the policy of non-alignment and it exerted its pressure on friendly nations and declared that unless and until America stops completely the bombing of Vietnam there is no question of peace talks. For that we are thankful to the Government.

15 hours.

With regard to the non-proliferation treaty I would like to comment that the policy pursued by the Government of India is in the interest of our nation. I do not agree with the view expressed by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Swatantra Party, Shri Masani, yesterday. He was arguing that we should not produce any nuclear weapons, we should not even prepare for the production of atom bombs or nuclear weapons. Since we have a potential enemy on our frontiers, namely, China, unless and until we produce, or start producing, nuclear weapons the future of our country, the security of our country, the interest of our country is at stake. He was arguing that we can improve the draft treaty regarding non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, for which he even wanted that a committee may be appointed to improve some of the provisions which do not help the interests of our country. We have more than once proclaimed both at the United Nations and with our friendly countries that this

[Shri V. Krishnamoorthy]

treaty, as it is drafted, is detrimental to the interests of our country.

The two super-powers are in favour of this non-proliferation treaty. Who are the super-powers? Soviet Russia on the one hand and America on the other. The foreign policy followed by one is diametrically opposed to the policy followed by the other. The Soviet Union may be headed by Mr. Kosygin today. Tomorrow it may change. With every change of head of government the foreign policy also changes. Should we adjust ourselves to the changing foreign policy, or to every purge which takes place, in the Soviet Union? Our foreign policy should be for our preservation; not for Dharmopadesam; it should be for the protection of our country. That is why I extend our support to the policy pursued by the Government of India with regard to the refusal to sign the non-proliferation treaty. I would appeal to my hon. friend, Shri Masani, to use his good offices and influence to get the draft treaty suitably amended.

Now, the points which are to our detriment in the draft treaty are: (1) it does not include an obligatory provision for cessation of further production of nuclear weapons; (2) it does not prevent the deployment of nuclear weapons on our territories by nuclear weapon countries; (3) respecting the non-nuclear weapon countries desire regarding the explosion of nuclear weapons for peaceful purposes; (4) benefits would be available at attractive prices. Why should we surrender our knowledge, why should we surrender our effort to the foreign countries? Is it in the interest of our country to sign that non-proliferation treaty?

That is why I am saying that the cautious approach which is being pursued by the Government of India should be supported by one and all. We may differ on so many matters internally; we may differ on hundred-and-one matters but with regard to our foreign

policy, which is non-alignment and independence, which keeps with our tradition and which keeps the very integrity and security of our country, every Indian should support the Government's approach.

With regard to Pakistan, I am afraid, the missions which we have in various countries have failed to propagate the mistakes being committed by Pakistan. They are dancing over the triangular rope. On the one hand they are having direct contact with China and on the other they are having direct contact with the Americans and they are having them in such a way that it is the duty of our foreign missions to propagate that the attitude of Pakistan is in no way consistent with principles. There we have failed.

Very recently, I am told, they extended the lease for the American bases. When they are meant for espionage activities both for China and Russia and when Pakistan has got contact with China, why should they extend the lease of foreign bases for the Americans? Our missions have failed in that aspect.

Our relations with Soviet Russia should be improved further. They are always our good friends.

AN HON. MEMBER: Outwardly.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY: But we have to remember one thing. The recent development in Pakistan and the effort of the Pakistani Foreign Ministers for going very frequently to Soviet Russia are to secure their friendship and to see that their friendship with India is discarded. We must be very cautious and very alert in maintaining the relationship that we have so far gained by our foreign policy.

With regard to the Commonwealth, our leader, Shri Hanumanthaiya, was saying that it is a family of nations. I would like to ask of the hon. Prime Minister what the Government of

India is doing. The Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson, had openly taken sides when there were conflicts between India and Pakistan. Pakistan is a member of the Commonwealth and India is a member of the Commonwealth. When there was large-scale fighting going on the British Government had openly taken sides with Pakistan. Is it not a fact? Why should we continue the friendship and the membership of the Commonwealth?

Then, 80,000 Kenya Indians, who are having British passports, are deprived even of entry into the British Isles. The same thing is going to happen even in Malaysia and some other countries. Lakhs of South Indian people there are having British passports. If they resort to the same thing, what will be their future? Unless we take retaliatory measures, unless we threaten the British Government that if they pursue the worst policy which has been pursued by passing the Bill banning Asians with British passports from entering Britain we will withdraw from the Commonwealth, the situation will not at all improve. I request the Government of India to pursue that policy.

Then, about the German Democratic Republic the Foreign Minister of East Germany has seen our Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister here. I understand the Government of India's role with regard to East Germany. They are giving all facilities like diplomatic status to East Germany, but they are not giving *de jure* status. I do not know why. When we have an independent policy even against the big imperialists or big nations like America with regard to Vietnam, why do we not pursue an independent attitude with regard to East Germany also?

With regard to the G.D.R., I am told, Yugoslavia which is an East European country has accorded diplomatic status both to West Germany and East Germany. Everybody

knows Yugoslavia is a communist country and West Germany approves the diplomatic status of East Germany recognised by Yugoslavia? Why not we accord East Germany diplomatic status? Are we inferior to Yugoslavia? Are we a member of the communist countries? Are we not pursuing a policy of independent nations? Why should such a fear exist for the Government of India? I know the Government of India thinks, Shri Morarji Desai thinks, that foreign aid will be cut, the Marks which will be coming to India will be cut if we recognise the G. D. R. as a country and accord it diplomatic status. Here, the Government of India fails in the sense that the Government of India pursues some policy with regard to Vietnam and pursues a contradictory policy with regard to East Germany.

Coming to India's neighbouring countries, Ceylon, Burma and Malaysia, the Kachchativu affair which has been discussed in the House for more than 10 times is still unresolved. I agree Ceylon is a friendly country and everybody agrees Ceylon is a friendly country. But when it is a question of an island, when it is in between Ceylon and India, is it not the duty of the Government of India to protect that island because that is of very strategic importance? Suppose—I do not wish—Ceylon goes with some other bloc? What about Kachchativu? Is it not detrimental to our interest? The Government of India has failed to establish that India's claim over Kachchativu island is very strong. One or two weeks back, there was some religious function there. The Ceylon Government sent their representatives there and they provided amenities to the people there. But the Government of India did not send anybody there. That is why I charge the Government of India that they have failed in their duty.

With these words, I say that wherever the policy with regard to foreign affairs is consistent with our

[Shri V. Krishnamoorthy]

tradition, wherever it is consistent with the maintenance of security of our country, wherever it is consistent with the maintenance of the prestige and integrity of our country, we will support it. But wherever the Government of India fails in its duty, it is our duty to point out the malady and help the Government of India to rectify it in future.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there are a great number of extremely exciting and provocative international issues and very many things have been referred to, but there was one thing that Shri Sondhi pointed out that calls for our decision; the nuclear proliferation treaty. This is of historic importance. I completely share his opinion. With great eloquence, he pointed out the drawbacks of the treaty.

I would like to urge this House to look upon this as something of extreme national significance, something that should be viewed outside the interests of the parties because, in the shape of the nuclear proliferation treaty, today the world faces something which perhaps has been unknown in the annals of world history. We talk of great charters. Even people with a little education talk about the Magna Carta, but here is something completely in the reverse. India initiated a move that there should be nuclear disarmament and that the world should not destroy itself. What has happened? All the big powers of the world have come together and produced a major hoax and flung it at the world in the name of peace, in the name of fairness, in the name of development. They want the world to sign this treaty. Let us see what the signing or not signing of the Treaty means.

The discussion so far on the terms and conditions of the Treaty, do not sufficiently emphasize what signing the Treaty would mean. It would mean signing away the sovereignty

of every country; it would mean signing away the future of scientific progress and the sharing in nuclear progress and knowledge. In the case of India, it will mean endangering our security in a tremendously serious sort of way.

Yesterday, Mr. Masani wanted us to sign the Treaty. On one side he talked about Vietnam and at the same time suggested reliance on the great powers. Had outside reliance been enough, had the might of the United States been that great, it is not President Johnson who would have renounced his claim to the future Presidency of the United States. What Vietnam has shown and what we should also look at is that, if the people take it upon themselves that their national destiny is to be decided by themselves, then the world's mightiest powers or coming together of several powers cannot do anything. After all, there were countries, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, helping the Americans, and yet, if somebody has been vindicated today, it is the heroic people of North Vietnam and it is a lesson that we have to take. *(Interruptions)* To me, Vietnamese are the same, whether they be in the North or in the South. Let us not get into that debate, but the lesson that I should like to point out to a great number of my hon. friends is this: through pacts, through treaties, through your future being in the hands of other people, you are never safe. Let us take the case of our nearest neighbour, Pakistan, which tied itself more than any other country did through SEATO and CENTO pacts. No one came to help Pakistan in what it considered to be its grim hour, and I am sure, Mr. Masani would not like us to follow the path of Pakistan—CENTO and SEATO led straight to China.

There are lessons to be drawn before we get into anything. Let us again look at this Treaty, because the decision that we are going to take

is going to be a hard decision, and I think that, whatever decision this country takes, should not be the decision of the Congress Party alone. It is a national decision of great consequence. As things stand, if we decide not to sign the Treaty, we might find ourselves completely alone in the world. Let us put this to our people. Let us not rush into any decision. Let us tell them that, among the powers that are on the nuclear threshold, there are four or five, by which I mean, Germany, Japan, Italy, Brazil, Canada and India, which could go into nuclear armament, but because of their peculiar placing, neither Canada nor Brazil will go through with this; Japan, because of its emotional historic association, might not press for the bomb. In the case of Germany there are so many issues which might prevent the Germans from taking a stand. As far as other Powers are concerned, their gross national product will not permit them to become credible nuclear powers. Therefore, this is one decision that India faces, and India faces alone, and if we have to go through it, we must take our people into confidence, we must cut across Party lines, we must get rid of the habit of facing our people with a decision by misleading them, by simplifying the issues and then saying, 'There was no alternative'. Our people are capable of utmost sacrifices. Let us not lose faith in our people. There have been great debates in the United States. There were debates before the manufacture of Hydrogen bomb and the debate that went on in their homes on Vietnam led to President Johnson's decision. We have to have a debate of this kind when we face a problem of this magnitude.

Before quoting other authorities I would like to say something. I am told that two years ago you yourself said, Sir, that if some more countries become nuclear, it is more likely to be conducive to peace. I

recommend to my friends of the Swatantra Party to read an article, a despatch from Washington by the *Times of India* correspondent, Mr. Vohra.... (Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Surely, we do not have to waste time for Vohra!

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH: It is not Mr. Vohra, but it is Vohra quoting Dr. Edward Teller who is the father of Hydrogen Bomb and other American statesman whom, I am sure, my friends in the Swatantra Party would not mind. Representatives of the Congress, people in charge of strategic institutes have all said that this treaty is not worthwhile, this treaty is not conducive to peace. I would also commend an article in the *Manchester Guardian* that my friend, Mr. Sondhi, referred to, wherein it is said that the sooner the world rejects this treaty, the better it would be. But, merely rejecting the treaty in a theoretical fashion will not be enough. We have to work out the implications. I do not think that it is correct to say, 'Let us have a crash programme, let us make a single bomb'. Sir, making a single bomb might merely give China a leverage to misbehave and to indulge in nuclear black-mail; we have to go through the whole hog. If we have to have a meaningful programme, we have to think in terms of ten billion dollars. This is a major decision. We should get all the facts and I would recommend to the Prime Minister to convene an important Commission consisting of members of various Parties to go into this entire issue and to place the facts before the public, because this decision cannot be a bureaucratic decision, this decision cannot be a scientific decision. This decision basically has to be a political decision, a national decision. We will be deciding our fate, the fate of our children and perhaps giving an example to the world, Here is an India which stands alone and which takes a deci-

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]
 sion at its own cost and sacrifice'. We must not appear to waver because those who waver are subject to pressure. India has withstood pressures in the past. Fortunately there used to be pressures only from a certain camp. Last time when I spoke here, I pointed out to this House what I had seen abroad during my visit to the United States and the Soviet Union: the coming together of these two Powers. This was a thing that had been initiated by the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, something that we wanted to come through. But the oddity and irony of history is that by coming together the first thing they did was to betray the hopes of the world, try to blackmail the world and deny the world the advantages of nuclear energy. Therefore, we will have to take a stand. It is not that the policy of non-alignment has failed, but it is that our policy of non-alignment has succeeded, and non-alignment—I would like to point out again, because this is a word that is used in all sorts of manner—is merely a stand based on a policy which holds that the people of any country must decide their own future. They must not be subject to pressures. Non-alignment as such is nothing. Otherwise, it can be non-alignment of the kind that Shri Swell spoke about and on that qualification it is China alone that is non-aligned or, in short, cut off from the rest of the world.

Sir, there is another thing that I would like to refer to in this context. I have said that India perhaps will have to face this decision alone. One of the tragedies that I saw in the United Nations was that African countries—for whose independence, for whose admission to the United Nations we have fought for somehow or other—were following their former colonial masters and what happened in Kenya was a tragedy in which the participants were our own brethren who did not side with

Africans, and there was the tragedy of African Nationalism, subjecting itself to White Colonialism and being misguided by it. It is of greater significance than the visit of State Minister. I hope that we will show patience, we will put the thing in the correct perspective and not get fussy. I would like to commend to this House in this context, Sir, and I would conclude in two minutes; I would commend the stand the Government has taken on the issue of Kachchativu, because all the time we used to take a stand that everything is ours. When it came to negotiations, when it came to something being awarded to other people, the nation naturally got excited. It is for the first time, when it concerns a neighbour of ours that the Government have rightly taken a stand that all claims should be examined and wherever the rightness lies, we shall stand by it.

Then, Sir, a great deal of criticism has been quite often voiced about the External Publicity. This is not fully fair. We have said so many things. We have enacted so many scenes in this House and there are dozens of foreign correspondents who report them back to their countries. There was some objection raised by hon. Members when Shri Hanumanthaiya said that the delegates to the UNCTAD had been impressed. Some hon. Members took offence that somebody should get impressed, about India. Sir, the image of this country is open to everyone to see. It is a democratic country. All sorts of things go on. Let us not be unfair when we attack our Civil Servants. We must realise our responsibility when we make these statements and it is no part of our duty to condemn our own services. We must first fulfil our duty. If there is something that is causing concern to the world outside, it is the shakiness of the Indian politics. It is not India's defence, it is not India's people, it is not India's administration that is causing concern. If there is any one

who is being looked at with a big Question mark, it is we and our brethern. We alone can ensure that we, as politicians, behave with responsibility and improve India's image abroad. Thank you.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there was a time, not so long ago, when our people would take pride in our foreign policy, and as a compensation, so to speak, for domestic failures; but such small mercies are now denied to us. It is no wonder after all, for foreign policy is a function of internal policy and in either respect we have got into a shambles.

It is heart-warming that the stupendous heroism of the people of Viet Nam has supplied a new radiance to contemporary history, and this has been due, not as my innocent friend Shri Hanumanthaiya suggested on account of the delayed acceptance of India's advice by the Viet Nameese, but it has been the result of the most magnificent resistance of the people to the wickedest and the most diabolic aggression in history. The American pride of possession of the atom bomb and the rockets and B-52 and God knows what other enormity, has fallen before the dedicated determination of a people fighting for freedom. Spending every year 30 billion dollars, which is more than the total gross national product of this country on war, with the use of napalm and poison gas, saturation raid and fragmentation bombing and so many other things, they have got the result which we know now. Before the pages of history there is now waiting to be recorded the myth of the American preponderance of power, the myth that the American writ would run wherever in the world they choose to be.

This is the lesson which has to be drawn by our country and by other countries today. The United States

has been shown up as a phantom image, with front of brass and feet of clay, and that is a lesson which has got to be imprinted in our mind that the American imperialism, as someone once said, is not very much more than a paper-tiger.

The Viet Nam story is a call to us and to all other people that we should shed fear and hesitation and pusillanimity in regard to the United States. This lesson has also been underlined by the recent incident of the spy ship Pueblo getting into the Korean waters and getting into very hot water indeed. And we need this lesson very much because the US presence is very much with us.

I have here a question and answered on the 25th March, namely starred question No. 835 which informed us that out of PL-480 funds, United States' expenditure in India during some 20 months from the 1st of April, 1966 to the 31st December, 1967, was Rs. 62.44 crores, a very great deal more than the total budget of the External Affairs Ministry, and this includes the expenditure of the US Information Service; Rs. 6.06 crores which is a great deal more than what the Information Ministry spends, if we keep out items relating to broadcasting. The American presence is very much with us and we should take the lesson from what has happened in Viet Nam.

Never once has this India Government, as far as we know, protested to the American Government regarding those stinking operations of the CIA about which so much is heard and in regard to which the Home Minister makes so many sanctimonious declarations. Never, as far as we know, have this Government told the American Government that it is their agency which is creating such havoc with the morals of this country and with all that we hold dear and all that we cherish in our land.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

I have noticed that as a result of the Viet Nam incidents, President Johnson has begun to win plaudits! I am not astonished that the Deputy Prime Minister who makes illiterate statements on foreign policy in regard to "two Chinas" has chosen to deliver himself of some observations. I am not astonished that my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani finds himself in some difficulty; I am sorry he is not here; I shall never forget how he talked about India's fight being conducted on the Mekong by his friends of the United States. His speech yesterday lacked its usual proud sparkle because he was sorry and he was very sad; he was sad along with Tunku Abdul Rahman and Mr. Lee Kuan Yew who said, according to him, that the United States were fighting in Viet Nam in order to help 'free Asians'; he was very sad and very melancholy about it. Of course, he was paying plaudits to President Johnson. But who does not know that President Johnson has made a virtue of a necessity? He recalled Gen. Westmoreland. If Alexander the Great were to replace Westmoreland, he could not win against the people of Vietnam. That is the position in history today.

It is very good of Hanoi to respond in the way it has done, putting Johnson on trial, as it were, because Johnson's offer—let us not forget it—is not yet unconditional. It does not relate to total stoppage of bombing of Vietnam; it does not promise the cessation of all hostile acts. And even the *Statesman* of day before yesterday was constrained to observe editorially that Johnson's gesture falls short not only of what Hanoi wants, but of what is reasonable."

I want the Prime Minister to remember one thing on this matter. I am glad she has observed some restraint; she has not rushed forward to say something superlative. Her deputy, the Minister of State, did make some ejaculation, but it was

not couched in terms which I want to castigate. I am glad the Prime Minister has kept her peace. It is necessary for her to keep her peace in regard to a matter of this description.

What has happened is that Hanoi has made a gesture of terrible importance. The Foreign Minister of North Vietnam made a statement in Paris on 8 February where he had made a definite declaration that matters concerning a settlement of the Vietnamese problem on the basis of the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam would certainly take place as soon as the United States had proved that it had effectively and unconditionally stopped bombing and other military action against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. This is something which we should keep remembering.

We should remember also the role of the South Vietnam Liberation Front, the name of which might be unfamiliar to most people in the External Affairs Ministry, because most of the *burra sahibs* there do not care to know a thing about the doings in "native" quarters of the world. Nothing can wipe off the ignominy of the United States' inhumanity in Vietnam and it is a pity that India's stand has been hesitant and half-hearted. I say it because India has repeated, I know, that she wants an end to the bombing. But what was expected of India when the utterest barbarities which were condemned by every side of the House, were reported, when there was an International Tribunal, sponsored by Bertrand Russell, trying the war crimes which were being committed on that area? Has India forgotten her mission of having at least a moral character in regard to her policy? We have not got much of material strength. Whatever we do, we cannot have atomic strength of the type my hon. friend, Shri Sondhi, may envisage to be necessary. We would not have it in any conceiva-

able period of time. But we have a moral position in regard to Vietnam. Yet we were in fear and trembling. I do not know why. Because we were afraid of pursuing our own declaration of having a self-reliant economy? If we really and truly pursued that idea after 1965, surely we would not have had to fear all these big powers of creation; we would not be in fear and trembling before America, and hesitate to condemn the brutalities which took place.

Let us turn to another part of the world. The flame of freedom burns brightly in Africa, more so because of the hideous repression practised by the white usurpers of so-called Southern Rhodesia and the continued inhumanity of South Africa and of Portugal linked today with London, Bonn and Washington in the last-ditch fight for white supremacy in this world. Against them, the African National Congress and the Zimbabwe African People's Union have begun a war of liberation inside Rhodesia in particular and over the whole range of Africa in general. This has the support of the Organisation of African Unity and morally also of the resolution which India supported and largely sponsored in the United Nations.

Now, therefore, will India sternly call upon the United Kingdom to do its duty? When Rhodesia, still technically a British colony, has received troops from South Africa which after having been expelled from the Commonwealth is a foreign country, it is very much more than time that force is used in regard to Rhodesia because the so-called economic sanctions have been futile and have never even been honestly applied. We know the nature of the United Kingdom Government which came out so brazenly in its leprous measure against Asian immigrants, and it is rather sickening to hear Mr. Hanumanthaiya refer to some pleasant experience he might have had in some kind of a Commonwealth conference.

It is a pity also—I am very serious about it—that Mr. Masani—I am sure my good friend Shri Ranga would not have said things like that—chose to speak of Kenya's "black racialism". This is the first time I hear this expression, "black racialism". He chose to speak of Kenya's black racialism and the so called rebuff we have had from that country. If there is anything utterly hateful, it is this Indian pseudo—Nordicism that is to be seen in such admonitions by Mr. Masani to our Government to step into the "power vacuum" supposed to have been left by Britain in the Indian Ocean and some other parts of the world. Such colonialist terminology and utterances are now being erased from history by the action of people. But of course Mr. Masani continues to mough them glibly as long as the going is good.

I know that Mr. Bhagat's visit to Kenya was mismanaged and I accuse this Government. Our ambassador is very much to blame. Why was it that no preparation was made beforehand? Why was it that no prior arrangements had been made for a meeting with the President? After all, any outside observer would say that he was a Minister in transit whose first assignment, his primary job, was to go to Mauritius; Kenya was on the way and he broke journey and he carried a letter. That was all that was to be said. Mrs. Pandit is there; our Prime Minister knows a great deal about protocol. Do we in India expect Heads of State to be waiting to receive any V. I. P. who might be passing through? This is not done. And after all if we were to discuss a very serious matter with the head of that country, a man like Jomo Kenyatta; should we not prepare the ground? Our ambassador is absolutely at fault. Right from A to Z, he had not made any preparation about anything and gave no intimation to this country's Government. This is a matter for which certainly this Government is answerable. Is there any finesse in the External Affairs Minis-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

try? No finesse at all, no kind of refinement, no sophistication and no understanding of what goes on in international relationship. That is what got us into the soup, not the discourtesy of a man like Jomo Kenyatta. We should be very careful and should not try to alienate people by saying all kinds of things which are not true.

In an excess of nationalist zeal, some of us are developing a kind of persecution complex in relation to our neighbours. The uproar over Kachathivu is too petty an issue to quarrel over. (Interruptions.) We are so harassed by hostile neighbours that we see the thin end of the expansionist wedge everywhere. It is wrong. Everybody in Ceylon is not an Indophile, there are Indophobes as well. We should be very careful in regard to Ceylon; we should have a civilised formula to settle these matters without delay.

Along with the Afro-Asian members of the Commonwealth, let us decide at once to give an ultimatum to Britain that we have decided to leave the Commonwealth. It is not a help but a hindrance to our independent functioning in world affairs. There is no advantage, in spite of our Prime Minister saying that we derive some advantage from our association with the Commonwealth. There are blatant disadvantages flowing from such things as the operation of British capital in India and such instances as British capitalists coming to Calcutta and asking for big money in exchange for the junk called the tramway system of that city.

If we want our India to grow on the basis of a largely self-reliant economy, we know where to turn, to the socialist countries who befriend us, and not to the western countries as the UNCTAD conference showed so very clearly. And if we want the Prime Minister should try to understand it—qualitative leap, into a better future we have to take a step which would

strike the imagination of our people and of the world. She may not remember it but Mr. Hanumanthaiya should remember it; Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit knows it very well: when in the days before freedom there was a dispute—and you know it—about complete independence and dominion status, some people used to say they were the same thing and Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose would say that we want to have a break with the past and that is why we want complete independence even though dominion status might be the same thing: a break with the Commonwealth following upon Asian immigration, following upon the White people's crusade, the new-fangled crusade of the white minority, of exploitation against the black and other coloured people: that would be a tremendous act of courage and of spirit and that is what we want to see.

To put our own house in order, we have first of all to restore and fortify friendly relations with our neighbour countries including, of course, Pakistan and China. Whatever the provocations in this regard, new initiatives are wanted in spite of chauvinism raising its head amongst us, in spite of not-an-inch-of-territory-champions who would like India to take on not only our neighbours but also the Nagas, the Mizos and God knows what other people. We cannot do that. Therefore, it is good that with Pakistan some progress had been made recently over telecommunication and talks over Farakka, for instance. But so much more needs to be done.

I come from a part of India where we speak Bengali. A majority of Bengali-speaking people who live in India and Pakistan are Muslims. I cannot get it out of my way of thinking that after all between the Hindus and Muslims in this country the barrier which has arisen lately must go by whichever methods we have to adopt and to-day we hear the cry of anguish from the minorities in different parts of the country. This is the moment, this is the historic moment.—if we have any

feeling for history—this is the time when you should take very special initiatives in order to settle our problems with Pakistan. This is the moment when we should not go about taking demagogic advantage of some indiscretion committed by a man like Sheikh Abdullah who was released only in order to help new initiatives in order to have a settlement over Kashmir and a settlement between India and Pakistan as a result of it. This, therefore, is the position. Let us not merely play to the chauvinist gallery. Let us not glibly say things which do not help us.

I am concluding in a couple of minutes. I want only to say that in regard to Pakistan, in regard to China, in regard to everything, we have a habit now of having a pose of righteous innocence. The world does not understand us, but we understand ourselves. "Know thyself"; that was the teaching of the ancients. We do not understand ourselves but we give ourselves a certificate. The whole world does not understand, but we have a nose of righteous innocence. Something must be wrong somewhere when the world misunderstands us so often and with a spirit of humility we should try to settle the problems with our neighbours.

So much has been stated about nuclear proliferation. I would only say this: this is a country which does not sign on the dotted line. This is a country which need not sign this proliferation treaty. This is a country which goes on carrying on its campaign for nuclear disarmament. We have time; in August 1968 there is going to be a conference; before that let us press for nuclear-free zones. Let us carry on this campaign and let us say we do not sign on the dotted line. If we are alone we shall be alone. We need not sign this nuclear proliferation treaty.

I have no time to refer to other things. I would have very much liked to refer to that very delectable subject the subject of the operations

of our High Commission in London which has had many distinguished occupants. But nobody in India or in England has ever had a good word about the working of the Indian High Commission there which even in its structure has so many defects which have so often been discussed in this country.

I wanted also—but I have no time—to refer to the strange case of a new international city called Auroville which is to be built somewhere near Pondicherry by some internationalists in and around the Aurobindo Ashram. I have nothing against the Ashram, but I do not like the idea of an international city being put up by people, perhaps uprooting many indigenous inhabitants and having their beano, their jambooree, and God knows what. We ought to know a great deal more about this business, but we don't.

I wanted also to refer to what I consider to be the utterly immoral refusal of the Government of this country to give full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic, with which we have so many, fruitful and honourable contacts—cultural, commercial and otherwise. I want the House, however, particularly to concentrate on the most pressing issue, which is now almost a categorical imperative, the issue of our leaving the Commonwealth. I wish the Prime Minister realises that the wishes of our people and the interests of our people require that we leave the Commonwealth and by that act of courage, of understanding and of spirit, we unleash new forces with the help of which alone could we reconstruct our country nearer the heart's desire of our people.

SHRI K. R. GANESH (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Sir, what constitutes the brightest spot in the world situation today—the situation in Vietnam—has been described by the foreign policy ideologist of the Swatantra Party, Mr. Masani, in a pathetic and moaning manner. This House salutes the people of Vietnam for their brave unprecedented and historic struggle against a powerful aggressor. This House also salutes the heroic democratic people of USA who

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

have compelled President Jhonson to change his war-like policies. This brightest situation in the world today has been described by Mr. Masani as a very bleak situation, in which the American foreign policy has reverted to isolationism. I have heard Mr. Sondhi saying that the future talks between the people of Vietnam and the American Government should be held in Delhi. Of course, we will be very proud to have our capital as the venue for this talk to end this massacre in Vietnam. But what he forgets is that the two people in this drama are the Vietnamese people and the American people. It is very presumptuous on our part to ask the Government of India to take the initiative or to have the talks in Delhi, because by saying that Mr. Sondhi forgets that the basic fact of the victory of the Vietnamese people has been their struggle, unprecedented and undaunted, which has compelled the American Government to have talks with them. It has been the swan-song of almost all opposition groups to denigrate this country and to create a picture that our image in the world has slumped. They catch every small incident to buttress their immature psychological theory that our image in the world has slumped. This time they had this affair in Kenya. Now, what is the reality of the situation? Throughout the 20 years of our independence, even after the death of our illustrious leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, this country has played a positive role; maybe, sometimes a halting role, may be sometimes a role in which we had to hesitate because of the complexities of our problem but, by and large, this country has played a positive role in world affairs. They would not mention West Asia because that does not suit them. Even now, whether it is the struggle against racialism, whether it is voicing the wrath of the African people against the barbarities committed in Rhodesia, or any other matter of international importance, this country has played a positive role.

Every country has internal troubles; not only India. Even a big country

like China, with its monolithic structure of society, had its own internal trouble; there was a civil war. Even a big country like United States had internal trouble, the racial trouble which almost compelled the haughty President of the United States to change war policies. There is some sort of trouble in Eastern Europe and there is trouble in Great Britain. No country in the world is free from trouble. We are a big country, a large country, a slave country for the last 200 years. So, the complexities and range of our troubles are far wider and more complicated than that of many other countries. But to create a picture that the image of India has slumped in the world is far from the reality. The opposition will pick up one instance in Kenya.

15-57 hrs.

[SHRI G. S. DHILLON in the Chair]

They will not mention that one of the great leaders of one of the two super-powers just visited this country and had discussions with our Prime Minister, that the President of another big non-aligned country recently visited this country and many other leaders of international repute have visited India.

One major question which we will have to decide is the question of the non-proliferation treaty. Our stand on this question has been clarified by the Prime Minister in her statements, which corresponds to the basic interest of this nation. Throughout the history of free India's foreign policy, this country has stood for complete disarmament, for outlawing of war as an instrument of settling international disputes and for banning all nuclear weapons. We have also unilaterally declared that we shall not produce the atom bomb. But we reserve the right to decide the kind of weaponry which this country might need at a given situation or on given circumstances. We shall use atomic energy for peaceful purposes, because we do not want to be left out in the nuclear age. Also, we do not want to reduce ourselves to second-class citizenship in the

international arena, because, we may be poor today, we may have complex problems, but the fact remains that the bigness of our country, the vastness of our area, our size, our tradition, our history, because of all this we are destined to play a very significant role in world affairs. The non-proliferation treaty, of course, suffers from certain defects that some of the nuclear powers are not participating in the signing of this treaty, that the nuclear powers will continue to manufacture bombs and non-nuclear powers cannot produce or acquire the nuclear weapons.

16 hrs.

Therefore I submit that we need not have any rigid stand on the treaty and we should make all efforts to change the treaty in its clauses in the direction which serves the basic interest of our country. In the interest of freedom of decision at any given moment of time to decide whether we should have the bomb or not although this country, before any other country in the world, has declared that we do not wish to produce atom bombs and on the basis of our national security we should take a decision which does not bind India to any course of action which will infringe our independence of action.

Of course, Shri Masani has referred to the nuclear umbrella and moaned about it, this country will never accept a nuclear umbrella from whichever side it comes, because.....

SHRI PILOO MODY: Umbrellas are out of fashion.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: ... we do not want to be sold to any of the super-powers, because we do not want any bases on our territory, because we want to learn the lessons that if a small country like Vietnam can stand against the mightiest world power and a combination of other powers this big country can also stand on its own legs and defend itself as we have endeavoured to defend ourselves against China and have rebuffed Pakistan.

Another matter referred to here was the question of the South East Asia

Treaty Organisation or the formation of a bloc. Here also the hon. representative of the Swatantra Party moaned for the withdrawal of Britain from the Indian Ocean. It should be a great historical event that the remnants of the British Empire are vanishing, at least directly vanishing from the shores of the South East Asian countries. At a time when the NATO, the SEATO, the Warsaw Pact and the block of countries that fought in Vietnam—all these military alliances—have vanished and have proved to be ineffective in either defending any country or giving security to any country, at such a time to ask this country to join a block of countries for the security of the South East Asia region is to take us back and to ask this country to adopt policies which have failed in the world.

Shri Masani mentioned that these countries want us to join but they are not waiting for us to join and, therefore, we should join them. What he forgets is that if China has to be opposed—I am not using the words "containment of China" because it is a dangerous phrase and this is a dangerous policy which has failed formerly and will fail again—if Chinese aggressiveness, Chinese chauvinism and Chinese subversion of democratic regimes have to be opposed, then there are only two countries in Asia, Japan and India, who alone can do it.

16-04 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

There is no use talking of smaller countries which cannot stand and which could not, with all their resources and with all the resources of America, succeed in Vietnam. They are not going to succeed as far as China is concerned.

Another thing is that this military alliance which is proposed to be formed will have no validity unless it is buttressed by one or the other of the big powers because without that sufficient military strength these countries

[Shri K. R. Ganesh]

cannot succeed in forming a viable military alliance. The only way now for the countries of South East Asia is to develop their own armed strength and their own economy, and to create a society which can stand up to any aggression whether it is from the imperialist powers or from China.

Towards this end, the policies of this country and the countries of the South-East Asian region must be to develop their own internal strength, have a viable economy and a democratic regime which is the only stable guarantee in the world today, when we have that all blocs of alliances have been smashed.

There are two or three more things I would like to mention. I commend that we recognise the G.D.R. because we have very many ties with that country and that we have trade relations with them. The German Democratic Republic is the first anti-fascist and is the first peaceful regime in the aggressive German soil. It is not that if we recognise the German Democratic Republic, the re-unification of Germany will be hampered because the question of re-unification of Germany is a much larger question and it is linked up with the attitude of big powers and it is in our own interest that we also have diplomatic relations with East Germany.

I would also commend, coming to Prime Minister, that she should withdraw from the obsolete Commonwealth of Nations because this Commonwealth of Nations has failed us time and again. It is of no use to us. It has vanished; the British Empire has vanished. Whatever little we could get from the Commonwealth of Nations is no longer there.

SHRI UMANATH (Padukkottai): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, an appraisal of the foreign policy of the Government will be most unrealistic if it is unrelated to one of the most world shaking events of the post-war period which we are witnessing today, namely, the recent developments in Vietnam. In face of these developments, Mr.

Johnson has announced the partial cessation of bombing and withdrawal from the contest in the forthcoming American elections. This, in my view, is certainly an admission of a major setback to the American colonialist war in Vietnam.

As soon as he became the President, Mr. Johnson challenged and declared that he would do what Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy could not do, namely, bringing the tiny people of Vietnam to their knees. Towards this objective, mass bombings were resorted to. In addition to 793,000 puppet and other troops, he pumped in 55,000 American troops. An entire Navy and Air Force equipped with nuclear warheads were stationed by. While our own entire national income amounted to 20 billion dollars, Mr. Johnson pumped in 40 billion dollars, i.e. double our national income in 1967-68 alone. All these acted only as ghee in the fire.

The result was casualties galore all along the line in the war machine of the Americans from bottom to top—I would not say from top to bottom. The first major casualty was the lakhs of American soldiers killed or wounded. Next in the queue was the Defence Secretary of 7 years' standing, Mr. McNamara, who was kicked up to the post of the President of the World Bank. Next, in turn, in the casualty list, was Mr. Westmoreland, the Commander-in-Chief of the American forces in Vietnam who was kicked up to become the Chief of Staff in Washington. The dollar that is the very foundation of American imperialism was pushed to the precipice, about to be kicked down. But the biggest casualty of all was the candidature of Mr. Johnson himself. We have heard of devaluation of the rupee, the pound, etc. But in America, it was President Johnson who was devalued.

I hope you will agree with me now at least that notwithstanding its atomic teeth, American imperialism was after all a paper tiger. That is the power of a people fighting for liberation and unification under the leadership of Communist Party. Here I will be

failing in my duty if I don't draw the attention of this House to the fact that Mr. Masani's Indian frontiers which were on the banks of Mekong river in Vietnam lay dead and buried deep, unnoticed, unsung and unwept. My deep condolences to Mr. Masani and the Swatantra Party for the precious loss that they have suffered in this way. In this entire glorious episode the Government of India's role has been disgraceful. At no stage did it dare demand the withdrawal of American troops. On the other hand, the Prime Minister, on one occasion, called upon both sides to stop war-like acts, thereby justifying the presence of American troops as long as the National Liberation Front does not stop its liberation struggle. That is the implication. At the dictates of the Government of the United States, Government of India stopped all trade with North Vietnam, while maintaining a steady supply of trucks to Vietnam, which could be used for military purpose as well.....

AN MON. MEMBER: No, no.

SHRI UMANATH: You are not there to see whether the trucks are being used for military purpose or not.

While the Government of India prohibited all books containing American atrocities on the freedom fighters, its heart bled white at the sight of the sufferings of the puppet troops and sent medicines worth Rs. 10,000 to bandage their bruises.

Let us take the latest instance. The demand of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam has been total and unconditional cessation of bombing. The Government of India has been saying that they support this demand. Mr. Johnson says that he will continue to bomb certain areas, and would consider the question of total cessation on condition that the North Vietnam Government comes forward with actions which he considers matching. It is obvious that this is partial and conditional conduct. He is going to send another 13,000 troops. And yet, the Government of India

which said that it supported total and unconditional cessation of bombing, suddenly resiles from this position and rushes to the Press to support this Johnson's last-ditch manoeuvre.

Sir, the freedom fighters of Vietnam have made their position clear. For any peace talks with the Government of North Vietnam, there must be total and unconditional cessation of bombing. And, secondly, for a settlement of the Vietnam problem, the only basis could be the 5-point programme of the North Vietnam Government and the 4-point programme of the National Liberation Front, whose essence is withdrawal of American troops and leaving the Vietnam issue to the Vietnamese themselves to settle.

Is the Government prepared even now to come forward to support these demands of the freedom fighters? Or is it going to wait for the next word from President Johnson?

Coming to the West Asian situation, what is the meaning of the latest Israeli attacks into Jordanian territory with tanks, guns and air Force? Time and again, Israel has declared its objective of creating Greater Israel. Israel has decided to annex the areas under its present occupation towards the creation of Greater Israel. This is confirmed by the following statement of the Israel Foreign Minister on 14th September, 1967, as reported in the Keesing's Contemporary Archives:

"The Middle-East Map which existed before June 5th has been irrevocably destroyed. The only alternative to the present cease-fire lines are freely negotiated new frontiers."

This is Israel's Foreign Minister's statement.

In pursuance of this annexationist campaign, Israel has taken over the Sinai oilfields—some outright and some in partnership with Italian ENI Company—and are operating the same, to take away 50,000 barrels a day.

[Shri Umanath]

United States is a treacherous party to this annexation because it is they who are supplying equipment for drilling and production. So also steps are taken to annex Jordanian part of Jerusalem, revenues from which amounted to 40 per cent of Jordan's total revenues. With justified anger and inspired by patriotism, the people in the occupied areas are resisting this annexationist move. The extent of this resistance can be imagined from the fact that two-third of Jordan's population is under Israeli occupation. It is this patriotic resistance that is named guerilla raids and ceasefire violations by Israel. President De Gaulle confirmed this at a Press Conference:

"On the territories she has captured, Israel is organising an occupation that cannot be carried out without oppression, repression and expulsions and a resistance is developing, which Israel in her turn calls terrorism."

This also demands that the Government of India stand four square on the side of the patriotic Arabs, without any compromise, whatsoever, both inside and outside the United Nations.

I now come to our South Asian neighbours. A new commodity is for sale in the Indian market, viz., South Asian Defence Alliance. Mr. Masani tried to sell this idea in this House. India is asked to fill the vacuum that will be created by the withdrawal of British troops from South Asia. Sir, this idea is neither Indian, nor national nor original. It is a borrowed idea.

In February this year, a Seminar was organized at Jaipur with the ostensible purpose of discussing the foreign policies of South East Asian States, but with the real intent of selling Mr. Masani's idea. Prof. Morgenthau of Chicago University opened the Seminar on an anti-China note. The cat came out of the bag when one Mr. Verma read a paper favouring a South Asian Defence Alliance. Fortunately, the patriotic instinct among the intellectuals who attended the

seminar asserted and the portagonists of this idea were reduced to a minority. The game of the organisers and their patrons was thus defeated. And do you know who patronised the seminar? It was the same discredited CIA-financed Asia Foundation and the CIA contributed Rs. 10,000/- for this Seminar through this Foundation. Mr. Heggie, the notorious CIA agent was present at the Seminar for four days waiting to harvest the fruit of South Asia Defence. What Mr. Masani tried to sell to this House is pure American stuff—CIA stuff. But Mr. Birla, in the last week's FICCI meeting echoed the same idea thus:

"The decision of the British Government to withdraw forces east of the Suez by 1971 should *inter alia*, have a bearing on our actions. Perhaps, these British bases in the global context are not of special significance. Even so, situated as we are, we must concern ourselves about how the vacuum created by the British departure will be filled. I do not suggest that we should step in to fill the vacuum but it seems prudent to investigate the possibilities of co-operating in this matter with like-minded countries in this region."

It is the same Mr. Masani's idea in another form he has put. I am not at all worried by what Mr. Masani says, but I am certainly worried when Mr. Birla thinks along these lines, because Mr. Birla thinks today what our Government does tomorrow.

The American game is to induce an arms race in this area so that Pakistan and India will ever remain dependent on America. We must defeat this game. A serious understanding between us and the representatives of the people of Kashmir including Sheikh Abdullah, on the basis of maximum autonomy to Kashmir. will, I am certain, go a long way towards normalisation of relationship between India and Pakistan.

The Government of India's policy with regard to China is spearheaded by the containment of China edge. Even in Australia, a country which is in the anti-China alliance there is a shake-up in their conviction in the philosophy behind this containment of China policy. The Canberra correspondent of the *Statesman* writes on the 28th February 1963:

"Mr. Gorton, the Prime Minister of Australia, has put up a fixed price on the Australian-American alliance which was previously a corner-stone of Australian defence policy, and discarded the theory that Australia is in constant danger of being swallowed by an aggressive expansionist communism emanating from Peking."

Sir, this is the position that the *Statesman's* correspondent is writing from Canberra and yet, Mr. Masani advocates and our Government wants to hold on to a theory which even anti-Communist Australia is said to have discarded. Perhaps, Mr. Masani and the Government are more loyal than the king.

The so-called containment policy has meant a burden of Rs. 1000 crores annual defence budget for us. The containment of China policy has also meant for India the total dependence on the United States of America for food, for aid, for military hardware, etc. I consider, Sir, that immediate exchange of ambassadors between India and China and resumption of trade relations constitute important links in the chain that will lead to peaceful and mutually acceptable solution to our border disputes.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: What about liberation of Tibet?

SHRI UMANATH: Sir, the very fact that many countries who put our Government on the back for its containment of China policy are themselves moving heaven and earth to expand their trade with China, even

though they do not have diplomatic relations with that country. For example, between 1965 and 1966 Canada increased its trade with China by 72%, —it does not have any diplomatic relations—Japan by 32%, Hong Kong by 16%, West Germany by 50% and France by 62%.

A host of countries like France, Poland, Belgium, Japan, the German Democratic Republic and Denmark have already organized their industrial trade exhibitions in China. The United States Department report to Congress says that China's exports to the West which was 1403 million U.S. dollar worth in 1964, increased to 1811 million US dollars in 1966.

Is it not strange that a host of countries with no diplomatic relations and even though separated by vast distance from China are able to expand their trade relations with China, whereas in our case, despite the fact of the existence of diplomatic relations, despite the fact of both countries being neighbours and despite the fact of a crisis in our international trade, our trade with China should remain at Zero?

I understand that Mr. Sathe, our representative in China, when he met our Prime Minister recently, stressed the need for trade arrangements between India and China. I also understand that Mr. Sathe reported that the families of our diplomatic personnel feel so secure in Peking that none wants to come back. All these things show that now is the time to seize the initiative. (*Interruption*). I am stating a fact; let it be corrected if it is wrong. It is time that we now take the initiative to propose exchange of Ambassadors and resume trade relations.

Sir, the latest US-USSR Draft on Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty is a cruel hoax on the sovereignty of non-nuclear nations and seeks to enslave the non-nuclear nations.

[Shri Umanath]

The real guarantee against nuclear danger is the banning of the production of nuclear weapons and destruction of stockpiles. Dr. Kothari, the Chairman of University Grants Commission was right when he said:

"The excessive attention paid to the non-proliferation issue would only divert attention from the main problem of complete disarmament. Non-proliferation treaty would act as a diversion and weaken, if not undermine, the efforts to completely ban nuclear weapons."

The Government protests now against the inadequacy of the provisions of the Treaty. But, if the writings in the Birla's paper is any indication, it is likely to sign the same ultimately. I quote from *Hindustan Times* which says:

"New Delhi should prepare public opinion to accept the inevitable and secure whatever international guarantees and other compensatory benefits are still obtainable within or outside the treaty, in return for its signature."

And, when that day comes, that would be the day when this Government would have doomed this country's future in another important sphere.

Then, I come to the question of the German Democratic Republic. It is what is called the Hallstein Doctrine which has stood in the way of our Government recognising GDR. Recently West Germany and Rumania have agreed to exchange Ambassadors and open diplomatic relations, despite the fact that Rumania has recognised GDR. So also Yugoslavia. The West German Government had cut off diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia sometime back on the sole ground that Yugoslavia had diplomatic relations with G.D.R. Now, West Germany has restored the diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia

despite its relations with G.D.R. I want to know since when this Government's policy of recognition of a country is being determined by a foreign philosophy.

Then I come to the question of the Foreign tours of Ministers. I think the Government must have some morals and ethics in this respect. This question of taking relatives with Ministers, especially important Ministers, when they go to foreign countries should be considered seriously. Shri Morarji Desai, the Deputy Prime Minister who is now in Manila has taken his son, who is a business man, along with him to Manila. Earlier also he has taken his son who is a business man along with him in another visit, and there was a question also which was raised in this House. Now I understand—I am subject to correction—that Shri Morarji Desai the Deputy Prime Minister of this country has taken his son, who is a businessman to Manila and that both of them are there now.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak):
He took him as Secretary.

SHRI UMANATH: I understand that in the UNCTAD conference the Philippines representative had suggested that there is better prospect of trade relations between Philippines and India. Shri Morarji Desai has gone there and his son has accompanied him there, to take advantage of the offer of the Philippines delegation and conclude particular contracts there. I understand that Shri Morarji Desai's son intends to go to Formosa also from Manila. Already, Shri Morarji Desai's statement on the question of Formosa has created some controversies and the Prime Minister had to make a statement, clarifying that our policy with regard to Formosa has not changed. Following that, now, when the Deputy Prime Minister's son, who has accompanied him goes to Formosa, it will be taken to mean that the Deputy Prime Minister's earlier stand with regard

to Formosa is different from the Prime Minister's stand taken in this House, on Formosa. These things should be stopped.

SHRI A. K. SEN (Calcutta—North-west): While I was listening to the speech of the hon. Member who has just concluded, I was reminded of a sad experience which we had been going through all these years, namely that during our debates on the foreign policy of our country we seem to think of everybody else except our own country. Viet Nam is brought into the picture; East Germany is brought into the picture; China is very much boosted up by some, but poor India is forgotten by all.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Not by all.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I am talking of those who criticise Government policy.

AN HON MEMBER: Let him better talk to his side. He is going out of track now, as usual.

SHRI A. K. SEN: If my hon. friends have the patience to hear, let them hear. We have given them a patient hearing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. This kind of interruption is not fair. (Interruptions) I would have accommodated Shri Piloo Mody if he wanted to speak....

SHRI PILOO MODY: My leader has said the last word on the subject.

SHRI A. K. SEN: As I was saying, the problem of India today is the problem of strength. If we are strong, we shall earn the respect of the world and the problem of China and Pakistan would not brook a moment's notice and yet it is this essential problem which we are not seeking to emphasise over and over again. The more we emphasise this aspect of strength, the better it will be for us.

I remember, when our country was attacked in 1962 by China, how the great hand of Friendship which India extended before that treacherous attack across our borders was repaid. That is a reminder for all who still plead for friendship with that country at the cost of our dignity and self-respect. When our country was attacked, so many countries for whom we have fought and beside whom we had stood in their hour of trial had not raised one voice of protest. I do not want to name the countries, countries for whom we have not spared any pain in the past to support their cause. Go to Africa; go to North Africa, and go to South-East Asia; only a few countries stood by us, and not one voice condemned the aggression of China. The reason was that the might of China had frightened our neighbours so much that even when Pakistan had attacked us in 1965, because of its friendship with China very few protests came openly on our side, and yet we knew that justice was on our side and we know very well that we were not the aggressors, and yet in the Security Council we had the wonderful spectacle of that very country Jordan, for whom we have been shouting so much when it was attacked by Israel and rightly so, voted against us. I remember I told the representative of Israel when I met him in the United Nations that I was surprised at his behaviour. He did not say anything then but he only said 'No, sir, we want you to be friends with Pakistan. I said 'Very well so, but we shall be friends only with honour and not by sacrificing our honour'.

Therefore, the problem of foreign policy is the problem of strength and the more we strengthen ourselves, the better it will be for us and for posterity. That underlines, therefore, the need for strong defence.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH (Khailabad): And the bomb.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Bomb or no bomb, I certainly am a supporter of those who feel that the time has come possibly when we must revise our nuclear policy....

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: Well said. At least one Member from that side has said this.

SHRI A. K. SEN:....and we should decide at least whether or not we should embark upon a bold policy of defence against a powerful neighbour which is making no secret of its design to pile up nuclear weapons which every year it is doing in increasing quantities. The Nagas are now being taken to China. The Pakistanis are helping them. And it is an open secret that Pakistan and China have entered into an unholy alliance against us. The only way to meet that challenge is by our own strength. It is not by crawling on our knees before China, as Shri Umanath was seeking to plead. I hope we shall all be dead when that time comes when we shall decide to crawl on our knees and go to China and say 'Sir, we are very happy to be here'. Let that day come to those who hail the advent of such a day. But we for ourselves would rather die with our children and families than crawl on our knees before China.

It is true that we had in the past done everything possible before the Chinese treacherous attack on us to be friends with that country. I remember the tremendous ovation we accorded to Mr. Chou En-lai when he came here. I remember how we suffered the rape of Tibet because we took a very legalistic view.

SHRI VIRENDRAKUMAR SHAH (Junagadh): Connived at it.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Whether we connived at it or not, we did suffer such an ignominious obliteration of a most peaceful country, all in the name of international law and legal

sovereignty. Those who cry against imperialism ought to know that China's claim on Tibet is based on imperialist aggression, the old Chinese Empire throwing its armies of invasion on Tibet and because that imperialist insignia was recognised by other imperial powers in those days in the 19th century, we recognised China's dominant position in Tibet. There was no other claim, there was no moral claim, no legal claim, except the claim of a conquering empire.

Therefore, as I said, I cannot over-emphasise the problem of strength. Take the Arab World, the African world. I have seen their reaction when I went there after the Chinese attack. I am very sorry to say that the world gets impressed with the might of arms even now. We are very proud of our tradition which puts mind over matter, which values the pen in preference to the sword, and we have followed in the footsteps of Gandhiji and Panditji of having friendship and comradeship with all, and yet when we were attacked, we found to our surprise that the respect we should have commanded because of our peaceful philosophy, because of our friendship for the whole world did not have that echo which it should have evoked when we were in danger ourselves.

That again reminded us that there is no alternative but to be strong, particularly when we are faced and surrounded by enemies all around who are scheming all the time against us. I find those who wink at the aggression of China talk about CIA activities in Rajasthan. I do not care what the CIA does, but I very much care what China does on our borders with money and with people who take out banners hailing China. I have seen in the streets of Calcutta myself young boys and girls from colleges waving the flag of China shouting 'Mao Tse-tung, lal salam'.

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: Do something about it.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I wrote to the Home Minister that our legal armoury is not yet so bankrupt that we should suffer the insult of these treacherous people who proudly paraded our streets taking advantage of the liberty our laws give and the rights our Constitution confers on them, with banners of China shouting praise of Mao Tse-tung.

SHRI VIRENDRA KUMAR SHAH: What did the Home Minister do about it?

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Why did he not arrest them?

SHRI A. K. SEN: Ask him, not me.

They do not read Gandhiji's works, they do not read Swami Vivekananda's works, they do not read Aurobindo's works; they are not worthy of perusal. But they read Mao Tse-tung's Red Book and his philosophy. And they are quoted in a language which happens to be my mother tongue. I am surprised that my mother tongue has been sullied by being made the vehicle for the propagation of this philosophy of that country.

I was told by Shri Umanath that we should quit the Commonwealth. Why? The Commonwealth today does not represent Britain. There are more non-white races represented in the Commonwealth than white races. It is true that the Commonwealth has not solved anybody's problem. But has it done any harm to anyone? I remember Panditji saying when he was alive: I am one of those who always believed in cohesion of these forces which work for a common end. If the working does not achieve ends at the moment, that does not mean that cohesion must be given up for good.

Lastly, about Viet-Nam. I hope that the sympathies which this country has shown for the people of Viet-

Nam will be returned when we are in danger and the days of agony for Viet-Nam are over. Because, I remember that when we were attacked, not a tear was shed in Viet-Nam or anywhere else in that area; it will never be shed perhaps. I think that the tears that we shed from here for South-east Asia swelled some rivers, the Red River or the black river or whatever it is. I for one must welcome the new change in the American policy. I think, My Lord... (Interruptions.) I am sorry; I do the same thing there sometimes, I say, Sir; this is a force of habit. As I was saying, Sir, this is a remarkable change and I think our Government and the Prime Minister deserve congratulations for the initiative she has taken in exploiting the new change in the international atmosphere so that India's lead in this hour of need may again be felt; I hope we did give a lead in 1954 when peace was brought to that country. I hope that this remarkable act of statesmanship which Mr. Johnson has shown will be reciprocated everywhere.... (Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Mody has become a sort of distraction.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I applaud when somebody talks sense.

SHRI A. K. SEN: I envy him; he is a showman here. He steals all the attention and we poor people are not looked at even if we talk sense.

As I was saying the Prime Minister needs all the help and support behind her and I hope the House will not deny that support to her and I wish her success in her efforts.

One word more before I sit down. A lot of things have been said about Mr. Bhagat's visit to Africa. I know how well he has done and I know by his persuasiveness he has done a wonderful job. People must not forget that we cannot have everything on our own in Africa. The Africans have a mind of their own today and

[Shri A. K. Sen]

the new generation of Africans have certainly come to think that there are some fields of economic life where possibly the Indians are offering them competition. That reality must be recognised. We could not solve that very ticklish problem just by preaching our own terms here or brandishing our lathis here. I think it needs quiet, persuasive diplomacy. Let not the African world feel that India is trying to bully them. That is a feeling which we must never allow to creep into the African mind. The African mind is a very touchy mind and they have been exploited much more than ourselves possibly. Even today there are parts of Africa where seeds of exploitation are still thriving. Therefore, if India has to be the champion of the oppressed—we always had been—we must not alienate the Africans and we must not create a feeling in the African mind which is not there that we tend to care for our own interests and ride roughshod over the genuine interests and grievances of the Africans. I congratulate Mr. Bhagat for he has done an excellent job.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Bhagat.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, before he speaks, I should be allowed the right to applaud when he says a sensible thing. As you know, I rarely applaud.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It must be done in a way that would not disturb the proceedings.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with your permission I crave the indulgence of the House for a brief intervention because I see that the debate will close today at 5 O'clock. In the short period that I have at my disposal I will try to deal with some of the problems raised. I have very carefully listened to the debate and

the contributions made by the leaders of the Opposition yesterday and today. I must confess that this year something has happened in regard to the distinguished colleagues of mine on the other side that instead of very rationally, objectively and analytically dissecting our foreign relations and the policy that we pursue, they have chosen to indulge in subjective remarks which are not well-digested and do not reflect any study or knowledge in depth. (Interruption) I will prove it. I am on very real ground.

16.41 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The hon. Member when he initiated this debate yesterday said that our foreign policy has failed and he gave two examples for it: one the "failure" of the UNCTAD session and the other my visit to Kenya. On both these points, the failure or success is not related to foreign policy. The UNCTAD session is not related to the foreign policy of the country in which this session was held. If you attribute any such failure due to the failure of foreign policy of India, then I think on the same token, in the General Assembly of the United Nations, if they do not achieve the desired result, it may be attributed that the foreign policy of the United Nations has failed in the General Assembly at New York!

AN HON. MEMBER: The United Nations has no foreign policy.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Similarly, about my mission to Kenya, I have nothing more to add. The House has discussed it. I will only say that the statement made by the Foreign Minister in Kenyan Parliament states the fact that they not only attach great value to the friendship and good relations between Kenya and India, that Kenya has with India, but they say that this is as strong as ever, and it states the fact that the friendship and relations between India and

Kenya are strong. Anything we say here is not in consonance with that spirit and that image.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why did he not see you?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: That has been discussed. Then, another hon. Member, Shri Mukerjee, said that our foreign policy is in shambles because our internal policy is in shambles. There is a co-relation between the two in that our internal economic strength does reflect on the strength and efficacy of our foreign policy, but to correlate the two in this manner is, I will say, subjective. We all believe, and let us pull together to make this country stronger and make every effort towards it. Just because in one or two years, if our economic policies have failed and so our foreign policy is in shambles—to say so, does not reflect any knowledge or study in depth of our foreign relations.

The hon. Member who spoke just now said that we speak with somebody else's voice. He quoted some industrialist's name. I do not know; the House will judge. (*Interruption*) I do not want to name him. But I will only say this: it only shows that the hon. Member is so obsessed with somebody else's conscience in his mind that he always thinks with everybody else's voice, and not with his conscience, but with somebody else's voice. He judges foreign policy on that basis. (*Interruption*).

Now, the only intelligent intervention, or rather the best and the intelligent intervention came from my friend Mr. Sondhi. He did show an intelligent appreciation of some aspects of our foreign policy. For once, he remembered that he had spent a few years in the Foreign Office and he spoke with knowledge and depth. I compliment him for that.

In the short time at my disposal, I will make a survey of the countries

near about us and also a little distant countries and point out how we have tried to implement the basic policies we have propounded. Some hon. members may say that we have not tried to dramatise things or throw our weight about in the manner they would like. But that is not our basic posture. It goes against our culture. We believe in a positive foreign policy and in implementing it adequately and quietly in co-operation with the countries of this region, because our policy is basically a friendly policy.

The basic concept of our foreign policy is based on reciprocal friendship, on peaceful and cooperative co-existence with countries that may follow different social, political, ideological and economic systems and on maintaining our national self-respect, our integrity and sovereignty, while at the same time helping towards the maintenance of peace and stability in Asia and in the world. In trying to achieve these objectives, we have not succumbed to the pressures of other countries, but followed our own independent line, which sometimes coincides with the line adopted by some countries and sometimes with that adopted by other countries. Independence of judgment and action is the essence of our policy of non-alignment. Peaceful and active cooperation is the method we adopt in implementing this policy.

Let us briefly survey how we have implemented the policy in some regions near about Mr. Masani expressed deep regret that some of the big powers are withdrawing from this region and this may spell disaster and create chaos and difficulty in this region. I can assure him that neither the people in this country nor in the countries of this region believe in that. Situated as we are, considering our national ethos and the way we have become independent and playing our role in the last 30 years, we welcome the withdrawal of the big powers. We welcome withdrawal of

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

all vestiges of foreign domination and interference in our region. We do not believe in the vacuum theory or the domino theory. We have full faith and confidence that the peoples of the various countries in Asia—big and small—will jealously safeguard their hard-won independence and not allow any country, Asian or non-Asian, to interfere in their internal affairs. The greatest force in Asia and indeed in other continents of the world today is that of nationalism—nationalism not in its narrow sense of chauvinism, but nationalism in a more positive and broader sense of patriotism, of self-respect, of independence and of freedom.

I am glad to say that we have been devoting much more attention to our relations with our neighbours in Asia and particularly in South and South East Asia during the last few years. These efforts have borne fruit and I am happy to say that today our relations with all our neighbours, barring Pakistan and China, are much better than they have ever been before. We have developed bilateral talks with Nepal and Burma, Ceylon and Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand, with Laos and Cambodia, with Philippines and Japan and other countries of this region. We have also offered a large number of scholarships, of training and credit facilities and made a small beginning in starting joint ventures to strengthen our economic and cultural relations with these countries, and these efforts have been greatly appreciated by the countries concerned. We have also told them publicly and privately that we would be glad to contribute our mite in developing economic relations, of this region on a broad-based and multi-national basis without any political or military strings attached to it. Even with those countries which are farther away from us, like Turkey and Iran, we have made fruitful contacts. The Foreign Minister of Turkey was here and we have explored the areas where we can agree. The

Shah of Iran was also here briefly. So, with all those countries with which we had not so close relations, we are now developing close relations. I am glad to say that this hand of cooperation which we have extended to them has been welcomed by almost all of them. We do not wish to drain away the benefits that these countries would get from a regional organisation but rather we wish to contribute to it through our technical knowledge and expertise through the development of trade and commerce through the reduction of artificial barriers and so on.

Coming to our two neighbours, Pakistan and China, even with Pakistan our relations today are better than they have been during the last few years. We have been able to solve some of the peripheral problems like telecommunications. We are willing to talk with them in the letter and spirit of the Tashkent Declaration on any subject of mutual interest. Unfortunately, Pakistan's response has not been as forthright as we would have wished, but we are confident that sooner or later Pakistan will also realise, as we do, that it is in our common interest to improve our relations and develop cooperation in various fields to our mutual benefit. In this respect, I very much regret to notice some new trends which will not help friendly relations between India and Pakistan. I am referring to the arms aid which Pakistan is receiving which the Defence Minister declared the other day while replying to the Grants of the Defence Ministry. In this matter we have tried to convince the United States Government that they have been changing their policy. They first said that they will give only non-lethal weapons which had no relation to military hardware. Then they started giving lethal weapons. Now the recent report about 100 Patton tanks being given to Pakistan or the reported decision of supply of another variety, M-47 tanks, that is definitely going to damage or upset the military balance between India and

Pakistan. This is a very serious situation that has developed and it neutralises all that we are trying to build up and it affects our close relations with Pakistan. It will be our efforts to bring it home to the Government of the United States that this particular factor is going against the spirit of Tashkent and is coming in the way of having friendly and good-neighbourly relations with Pakistan.

With China, unfortunately, all our efforts to localise problems and not to allow them to worsen our relations have not borne fruit. Hon. Members have tried to say that we should develop more relations. The hon. Member, Shri Sondhi, said that we must try to have a new look on our policy with China. We agree. But the situation is such that it is China which has to change its policies. They have to change their posture of hostility. An internal upheaval has been going on in China for the last few years. So far as it is internal, it is not our concern but in so far as it has an effect on China's external relations, we cannot but be concerned with it because it affects us as well as some other peace-loving neighbours of China. Unfortunately, the result of this internal upheaval in China has been a stiffening in their external policy which does not show any possibility or probability of improving our relations with them in the near future. However, we have adopted a policy of reciprocity and firmness without giving any provocation towards China. We have made it clear that we shall not tolerate any breaches of our territorial integrity or sovereignty and that we are determined to safeguard our national interest. If and when China changes her policy towards us, we shall not be found wanting in making a proper response to it.

Lastly, I will come to the question of the military arrangements that was propounded by Shri Masani for the South and South East Asian countries. All those military pacts are

dead and whatever remain, they are the ghost of the past, even the theory of filling up the vacuum.

Shri Masani suggested that there should be a defence arrangement, that we should enter into defence arrangements with other countries of South East Asia. He mentioned the dangers that may arise after the withdrawal of America from Vietnam and the possibility of America going isolationist. I should like to inform our friend, Shri Masani, and others who think like him that the countries of this region are not worried so much by the possible threat of invasion by China but rather by the threat of sabotage and subversion because of economic backwardness and political instability. In our opinion, the answer to meet such a situation would lie not in defence pacts or defence arrangements but rather in the strengthening of economic viability and political stability of these countries. This can only be done by the countries themselves, but we shall certainly help them in any way we can, particularly in the economic field. If there was a defence arrangement it would only mean India committing her manpower to the defence of areas which is beyond our capacity at present. We have enough troubles of our own. Our security forces are fully committed to the defence of our own borders and of some of our immediate neighbours. If we dispersed our efforts and took on responsibilities that we are not capable of shouldering, it would not only weaken our own defences but would create a false sense of security and might even provoke greater tension in this area.

In this respect I can say that this is the feeling of the people and the governments of the region as a whole. Even if a similar situation arises in countries like Iraq, Kuwait or some of the Persian Gulf countries, the same policy remains that it is the countries of the region who by strengthening their economic and other relations and by co-operating with each other can meet the situation created by the

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

withdrawal of these big powers from the region.

Shri Masani again referred to the Council of Asia, a theory which was propounded by the former foreign Minister, Shri Chagla, and asked what we were doing about it. He charged us that having developed this theory we are just sitting idle. This is not a fact. This again goes to our approach to the question. The basis of our approach is co-operation of the people of Asia. What we want is a broadbased economic organisation of all countries in Asia so that no single country or group of countries from Asia or outside can dominate any country in Asia. We do not want such an organisation to have any political undertones or military overtones, for that would only divide Asia into conflicting groups and make them the camp followers and satellites of bigger powers. At the same time, we do not wish to gatecrash into any regional organisation that may be there.

Very soon the ministers of some of the countries of the South and South East Asian region are meeting in Singapore and if a consensus emerges that India should also send an observer, we will send our observer there only to demonstrate that in any effort of closer economic organisation and coming together in a friendly and peaceful manner to solve the basic problems of this region we will play our part. In the whole concept of this Council of Asia this fact remains.

Therefore, by taking these instances I only say that the basic policies of reciprocal friendship, friendly co-operation with other countries and each country depending on its own right to free decision based on co-existence and non-alignment—all these policies are the basic policies of our foreign relations—stand vindicated in the changing world. Those who raised fingers and doubted all these policies have been proved wrong; history has proved them wrong. These policies have stood us well and based on these we are

trying to implement this policy. Today our relations with our neighbouring countries are closer. They understand us better. I think, if we pursue this policy, the day will not be far off when we will be able to create a viable area, free from conflict and free from any political or military pressures, which will be viable economically and politically. I think, to describe our foreign policy either as shambles or a failure, as I said, to say the least, is a subjective remark and it is not in the national interest to say that because, basically, our policy is that we are going forward in our attempt of projecting our correct image and of foreign new links in our foreign relations. There may be some dark areas, there may be areas where we may not have succeeded. But to completely brush it with tar, I think, is not fair. Therefore, I state again that we have followed the right policies and that the policies are paying dividends and it is in our national interest that we pursue these policies.

17 hrs.

DISCUSSION ON STATEMENT BY HOME MINISTER RE. INCIDENTS RELATING TO HARIJANS

MR. SPEAKER: We now take up discussion under Rule 193 regarding certain incidents relating to Harijans. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central): Sir, last time, I had mentioned regarding the motion which was already before the House regarding the atrocities committed on the Harijans of Madhya Pradesh. You were kind enough to say that it would be taken up in the House. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I will give you a chance. We will conclude the other

SHRI S. XAVIER (Tirunelveli): I had given notice. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It depends on your Party. I have no objection. There is