

122 relating to the Ministry of Agriculture."

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Grants, which were adopted by the Lok Sabha, are reproduced below—Ed.]

DEMAND NO. 28—MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,10,55,000 including the sums already voted 'on account' for the relevant services be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Ministry of Agriculture'."

DEMAND NO. 29—AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,38,79,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

DEMAND NO. 30—PAYMENTS TO INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,51,42,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Payments to Indian Council of Agricultural Research'."

DEMAND NO. 31—FOREST

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,44,95,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Forest'."

DEMAND NO. 32—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 66,93,76,000 including the sums already voted 'on account' for the relevant

services be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Agriculture'."

DEMAND NO. 122—PURCHASE OF FOODGRAINS AND FERTILIZERS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 82,24,41,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Purchase of Foodgrains and Fertilizers'."

DEMAND NO. 123 OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 62,69,75,000 including the sums already voted 'on account' for the relevant services be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Agriculture'."

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 11 and 12 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which 6 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House who are desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND NO. 11—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,99,92,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 12—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,66,91,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah) : Mr. Deput Speaker, Sir, when we are debating on foreign affairs here big events are taking place outside.

15.15 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARI in the Chair]

The projected visit of President Nixon to China has been hailed by various countries though there are cases of demoralisation also. There are some States and some parties which have been upset at this development. Sir, whichever may be the motive behind Nixon's visiting China it is a fact that the anti-China policy so long pursued by American imperialism has been complete failure. After so many years opposition to inclusion of China in the U.N. and persistent anti-China policy new wisdom has dawned on American that no durable peace is possible without the participation of 750 million people of China. Sir, the reality has asserted itself. It is such a big reality that China, the first country in the world in population, is now not only a socialist country but also a very big power.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY : But moving towards capitalists.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : And it is growing gradually. In future, when the whole world is advancing towards socialism, the role of China is bound to be far more important. That is why signs were evident that various countries were trying to improve relations with China.

But, unfortunately, it is India, even nothing these developments, that was pursu-

ing the old anti-China policy. They have not seized the opportunity and initiative to come forward to normalise relations with China. One after another countries have entered into trade agreements. England, Canada, Yugoslavia, Malaysia, Japan and various other countries, one after another, are coming forward to normalise relations. At last that US Government has taken this step to normalise relations.

Now the time has come when the Government of India should review its policy take proper lessons and seize the initiative to normalise relations with China. It is due to the failure of the Government of India to improve relations that, as regards Bangla Desh, we see that China is siding with Pakistan. The Government of India should take advantage now to improve relation so that on the issue of Bangla Desh also China does not stand firmly for Pakistan.

This development is not an accident. It is not only the failure of the anti-Chinese policy of American imperialism. Behind this development there is a big contribution of the freedom struggle of the people of Vietnam and Indo-China. There the American imperialists are meeting with fiascoes and now they have been forced to sit on the table for peace negotiations. The stage has come when they are to withdraw from the land of Indo-China. So, a face-saving device also is necessary. That is why they are also forced to come forward to improve relations with China.

Very recently the Pentagon reports have thoroughly exposed the heinous motive which prompted American imperialism to start aggression against the people of Vietnam and Indo-China. This through exposure and the opposition of the American people to the Vietnam and Chinese policy of the Government of US has forced the American Government to take these steps.

Moreover, the presidential election is also coming and to face that presidential election Nixon is utilising this.

But despite all these things, which may be the ulterior motive behind all this, it is a big fact that this normalisation of relations between China and America has an international significance which must not be ignored in the case of India's foreign policy.

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

As regards India's foreign policy so far pursued, there have been discussions in this House several times. On 16th of this month, on the question of recognition of South Vietnam, Provisional Revolutionary Government, People's Democratic Republic of Korea and German Democratic Republic, the answer which we have got from the Foreign Affairs Minister is disappointing. He has said that we can give recognition, consider the question of recognition, on the overall consideration of the settlement of the Indo-China problem. If the overall settlement is achieved and all the States of the world give recognition to that Government, what is the utility of India giving recognition? After their glorious victory and complete driving out of the American imperialism from the soil of Indo-China, recognition has no other significance. Because you are bound to recognise at that stage. Your policy is quite clear that you are apprehensive of incurring displeasure of American imperialism if you give forthright recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam.

Similar is the case of Korea. He has said that, in the context of the unification of Korea, after the unification is achieved, the Government of India will consider and give recognition to that Government. This answer clearly signifies that when the South Korean is a stooge Government, where the army of American imperialism is stationed, this stooge Government is being given equal status with the Government of Democratic People's Republic of North Korea which has fought against American and Japanese imperialism and which has driven them from that land. Even the heroic battle which they waged, Korean War, has opened the eyes of the entire world and the Asian people as to how a small country like North Korea can defeat such a big power like American imperialism in this Korean War? So, the stand taken by the Government of India in relation to imperialism and the people's fight for liberation stands equi-distant which means indirect accomplishment of the imperialist actions. This is inconsistent imperialistic stand. That is why the Government of India's prestige has gone down before the eyes of the progressive forces throughout the world.

What should be the main principles on which the foreign policy of our country

should be based? The principle should be that our country should move independently. But from all these facts, it is quite clear that India is failing to pursue any independent foreign policy. Our attitude to imperialism is not consistently anti-imperialistic Vietnam, North Korea, East Germany, all these, are clear examples where we see that Government of India is not consistently anti-imperialistic and their support to the National Liberation movement is also equivocal ..

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Israel ?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : Israel is a stooge Government of American imperialism.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Not free like the Czechoslovakian Government.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : Everybody knows that. Israel is the creation of American imperialism. I am not going into any controversy. Our opposition to Israel is correct. But Government of India should take effective steps to counter Israel and give support to Arab States. Our foreign policy should be based on good neighbourly relations with our surrounding States. There, the Government of India, has failed considerably, particularly in the case of normalising relations with China.

SHRI PILOO MODY : More so with Pakistan.

AN HON. MEMBER : West Pakistan.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI : There is no East Pakistan now.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : As regards, England. Britain, you know, Sir, has since 31st January 1969 introduced new rules for Indian immigrants. They are based on racial hatred, racial restrictions and some peculiar provisions have been made in those rules. British-born coloured girls returning of their native land for marriage cannot take their husbands back. That is the Rules they have made. But the husbands of white girls are permitted to go and stay in Britain. These restrictions cause great hardship to those Indians who

are staying in Britain and there our protest is virtually formal. No effective protest has been made which can compel the British Government to change these laws.

Even in the case of the abrogation of the 1939 trade agreement, our protest has not been so much powerful and effective.

You know, Sir, the British Government are selling arms to South Africa. Throughout the world it has been condemned. Even the Government of India protested, but, still, the Government of India is remaining a member of the Commonwealth. They have not come out of the Commonwealth and they have not made serious protests which can force them to stop selling of arms to South Africa.

Another case of submissiveness to America is the question of Cuba. Indian Government has sent no delegation to Cuba because there is the American blockade around Cuba. Indian Government is passively supporting that and there is a case where according to the Journal of Commerce, May 7, 1971, two Indian cargo ships belonging to the Eastern Shipping Company of Bombay were sent to Cuba from some country. Immediately, American imperialists announced the blacklisting of that company and it is a great shame for us that the Indian company apologised to American imperialists for taking cargoes to Cuba and promised not to do such things in future. This is how our independent foreign policy is pursued.

In America the torture on the basis of race is so severe that black people have started a revolutionary fight against it. I will ask the Government of India to demand the release of Anjela Davis. She is a world-famous leader who is now in prison because she gave the lead to the black revolutionaries in their fight against the racial tortures.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : Now, on the question of Bangla Desh, already four months have passed but the Government of India is still not firm in giving recognition. Still, they are looking for American help and at the time when

American arms are pouring into Pakistan, we saw in the paper that new agreements are being signed by India and America. Even some money has been allotted for arms help to India. If this is the relation with America there is no hope that this Bangla Desh problem can be solved. America, despite promises that they will stop sending arms are regularly sending arms shipments to Pakistan. The question before us is, how long this policy of vacillation, this policy of drift, this policy of submission to American pressure will continue. Serious damage is being done for the freedom-fighters of Bangla Desh. That is why we want to say that a time has come when the Bangla Desh Provisional Government should be given open recognition, and all possible help must be sent to the freedom-fighters. Otherwise a great damage is apprehended and the people will have to sacrifice far more to pay the price for this drift of the Government of India.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barnar) : While this august House is debating the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, it is quite natural that our thoughts should first of all go to the valient, heroic people of Bangla Desh.

What is the perspective we have about Bangla Desh ? There are certain sections in our country who are day in and day out criticising the policies of the Government of India creating an impression as if the foreign policy of India has failed and floundered, and the whole gamut of India's foreign policy must be reviewed. There are others who think that India's policy about Bangla Desh hinges only on recognition of Bangla Desh. Then there are people who openly advocate active intervention in Bangla Desh.

The basic question is whether we have an absolute faith in the people of Bangla Desh or not. I am convinced that temporarily the army of Yahya Khan may have succeeded in suppressing the freedom struggle of the people of Bangla Desh, but it is impossible to conquer the will and the determination of the victorious, invincible people of Bangla Desh. They cannot be ruled. They shall be free. They shall be independent. It is very heartening that the movement of the guerillas and commandoes in Bangla Desh is gaining strength day by

[Shri Amrit Nahata]

day. We can be sure that the activities of the guerillas and commandoes will increase and a time will come when people of Bangla Desh shall rule and determine their own destiny. This Government is duty bound, under the Resolution adopted by this House to extend all possible help, moral and material, to these valiant freedom fighters of Bangla Desh. And, I am sure, the Government is doing its duty in this regard.

I also agree with the efforts of the Government of India in mobilising world public opinion in support of Bangla Desh. It is considerably due to the efforts of the Government of India that today in Europe, in UK, and USA, in Canada, in Australia, in countries after countries, important public figures, Members of Parliament, Press, non-official agencies, voluntary organisations and others are now realising the gravity of the situation.

They are now realising that it is not an internal matter of Pakistan, but it is outright genocide. They are realising that the people of Bangla Desh have a case and that the atrocities being perpetrated by the Pakistan Army must end and that the elected representatives of Bangla Desh must come to power. With this fund of goodwill we should see to it that more and more responsible people, public representatives and press people come to India and visit the evacuees from Bangla Desh and if possible they should be helped to go into the territory of Bangla Desh and see things for themselves and go back and tell their people what the reality is.

Let us not forget that on the question of Viet Nam, it was the pressure of public opinion in America that has compelled the Nixon Administration now to come to a settlement on Viet Nam. The pressure of public opinion, press and other voluntary organisations is a material force these days and we should try our best to educate them and to inform and generate this public opinion all over the world in support of Bangla Desh. Therefore, I entirely endorse the direction in which the Government of India's policy is being pursued as regards Bangla Desh.

In this context, our attention naturally goes to the proposed visit of Mr. Nixon to Peking. I am personally not surprised.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras North) : Why ?

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : I am not surprised at this because for the last ten years I have found that there is no essential conflict between the interests of China and those of the U.S.A. anywhere in the world. During the last ten years, even on Viet-Nam we should not be misguided by the words of Peking. The Chinese say something but never act up to it. They make so much of anti-imperialism, but they have been political and economic allies of all the Western countries and their dictatorships and their puppets. They have trade relations with South Africa. They have trade relations with Portugal. They have trade relations with Israel. They have supported Pakistan. They have stopped all talks of liberating the Matsud and the Quemoy and other off-shore islands. Even on Viet Nam, is it an accident that while North Viet Nam has been bombarded so ruthlessly by American planes, not a single violation of Chinese air space has even taken place? Thousands of secret meetings have been taking place all these years between American representatives and Chinese representatives in various European capitals. So, where is the conflict between the interests of China and those of America? It is not only a trade matter. The main enemy of China is not India but the Soviet Union. The main friend of China is not Pakistan but the United States of America. We must understand it very clearly. For the last so many years, China has been persistently moving in the direction of be-friending America, of winning over America of acting as America's wishes wanted it to act. China has succeeded in things in which America has failed. The external policy of America was to contain communism in Asia. China has succeeded in destroying it. The Communist Party of China has been completely liquidated. The Communist Parties of various Asian countries have been buried, thanks to China. The various progressive anti-imperialist movements have been split, weakened or even destroyed, thanks to China. While Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru liberated Goa, he was called a stooge of American imperialism. But on the Chinese mainland, there are pockets of imperialist countries and China has never raised a finger of protest against it.

So, Sir, let us not be cheated by the

pretensions and words of China. I am convinced that for the last so many years there has been an active collusion between China and United States of America and, therefore, let us not be surprised or shocked at these developments. What we have to see is, and we must have considered since long back, the implications of this close collusion between China and America.

Sir, our people and our newspapers often talk of power politics, balance of power, power relations, alignment and re-alignment. This is a very out-moded mode of thinking. I know, there are people in our country who never like non-alignment. Right from the Dulles days till this day they have considered non-alignment as a sin. At every opportunity, they attack the policy of non-alignment; whether it is Rabat, Czechoslovakia, whether it is Vietnam, whether it is Nixon's proposed visit to Peking or Bangla Desh, they say, non-alignment must be given up.

What is the meaning of non-alignment? It means an independent foreign policy. Should we give up the independent foreign policy? Non-alignment means that we are not aligned to this block or that block; we are not a member of any military pact, that we have not cast our lot with any particular country and that we will not say 'yes' if a particular country say 'yes' and we will not say 'no' if a particular country says 'no'. We will decide international issues on their merits. Our judgement may be wrong; we may be guilty of an error of judgement, but we shall decide things on their merits, we shall take our own stand. That is the meaning of non-alignment; that is the meaning of independent foreign policy. I just cannot understand why people should oppose this policy of non-alignment. One can disagree with a particular decision of the Government of India, one may say that this particular decision is wrong, we should have taken this attitude or that attitude on this particular issue, but to attack non-alignment means to attack the very foundation of our foreign policy, namely independent foreign policy.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : Who are those people attacking non-alignment?

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : If you read through almost all the editorials and write-

ups in the dailies, you will find that there is a hue and cry against non-alignment. They say, every country is permanently aligned with some country. The question is not of non-alignment, but the question of re-alignment and alignment, it is making a mockery of words and nothing else.

Similarly, there are people and parties and sections in our own country, who have a fixed policy and they always project that policy on every occasion. Take the Arab countries, for example. It is true that we had expected support and sympathy from our Arab friends on the question of Bangla Desh. We have been sorely disappointed and we feel it and we must tell them very frankly that they are being misguided, they are being misled by Pakistani propaganda.

AN HON. MEMBER : Intentionally they are doing.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : This does not mean that we should jump from one end to another. Take these countries, U.A.R. for example. She is embroiled in her own troubles. Let us not forget that there is a revival of pan-Islamism in U.A.R. itself. Old Muslim brotherhood is being encouraged and supporters of Nasser are being put behind the bars. Naturally, when there is a reversal in the internal policies of U.A.R., there is bound to be a reversal in its external policies also. But foreign policy is not a bania shop. We have to watch our own self interest. We have to watch our own national interests.

SHRI PILOO MODY : That is what a bania shop does.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : No, it does not do that. The bania shop is prepared to suffer some losses in the hope of future gains. It always believes in give and take. There is a saying that a nation has neither permanent friends nor permanent enemies; it has only permanent interests. I doubt whether even interests are permanent. Even interests are changing. Therefore, if we feel—and we should feel—that it is in our interest to keep friendly relations with Arab countries, we should not jump to the conclusion from one extreme to the other, from saying 'bhai, bhai' to dushman, dushman'. International relations today are getting de-emotionalised. This is not the time

[Shri Amrit Nahata]

for shouting 'bhai, bhai' or 'dushman, dushman'.

When this question of Peking-Washington *rapprochement* is coming, there is a demand in this House and outside that we must go nuclear, then only shall we be respected in the world, then only shall we be considered by the world as a big power. Because China is a nuclear power, Washington is rushing to Peking. If we have nuclear power, we shall be a big power in the world and then we can align ourselves with the big powers of the world. It is true that we are a vast country. Our size and population cannot be ignored (*Interruption*). I am coming to the nuclear bomb. In the face of our economic problem today, can we afford a bomb? The bomb is not easy to make. It is not enough to make one bomb. After the bombs, the delivery system has to be perfected. With this refugee burden on us, our economy cannot endure this burden. Moreover, the bomb is not a defensive weapon. Let us not think that China has become a big power because of its nuclear capacity. Let us not think that America is going to China because the latter is a big power. There are other factors. It is because China has for the last many years been following a policy which America has approved and supported. That is why now the *de facto* collusion between the two is taking *de jure* shape. The nuclear question should not be brought into this at all. Whether India goes nuclear or not is not the important thing. Once India asserts its independence in the councils of the world fearlessly and takes steps in support of the freedom struggles of Bangla Desh, in the Portuguese colonies and of the people of South Africa against apartheid, only then shall our voice be heard in the world, then only shall we become a really big power.

SHRI SAROJ MUKHERJEE (Katwa) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to recognise fully the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and the German Democratic Republic and establish fullfledged diplomatic relation with ambassadorial status (13)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to give recognition to the Democratic Republic of Bangla Desh (14)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to state categorically that the U.S.A. imperialists are the aggressors in Vietnam and Laos and boldly ask U.S.A. Government to immediately quit these countries (15)].

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure of the Indian diplomacy in arousing world conscience over Bangla Desh (16)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure of India's West Asian policy (17)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100"

[Failure of India's Foreign policy in South East Asia (18)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[India's policy in Singapore (19)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[India's policy in regard to the Indian Ocean and the big powers politics there (20)].

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Rs. 1."

[Failure to give up the weak-kneed policy adopted from time to time towards America and other imperialist countries (44)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Rs. 1."

[Failure to put up a determined fight against American imperialism (45)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to make the anti-imperialist and peace loving policy more effective and dynamic (46)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to oppose openly military blocs like NATO and SEATO (47)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to grant recognition to the German Democratic Republic (48)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to help Latin American, Asian and African countries in their fight against imperialism (49)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to support the recent seven-point peace proposal of Vietnam (50)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to grant recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam (51)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to sever connections with the British Commonwealth (52)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to criticise American imperialists's policy of bombing Vietnam (53)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to start a dialogue with China to resolve our differences with that country peacefully (54)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Need to grant recognition to Bangla Desh without any delay and to extend all possible help to that country (55)].

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs 100."

[Failure to protect the interest of Indians in the Middle East (56)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to protect the interests of the

people of Indian origin holding British passports (57)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to establish full-fledged diplomatic relations with German Democratic Republic (58)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to keep our embassies in foreign countries properly tuned to help our export trade (59)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure in canvassing support of other countries for the Bangla Desh issue (60)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Undue delay in giving recognition to Bangla Desh Government (61)].

SHRI D. K. PANDA (Bhanjanagar) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to bring efficiency in our Embassies in African and Latin American countries (62)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure of our Embassies in African countries to develop exchange of cultural experiences with their people (63)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to check the extravagant activities of Indian Embassy in U. S. A. (64)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure of the Indian Embassy in America to send timely intimation to our Government regarding the shipment of arms to Pakistan (65)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to lend effective support to the liberation movements of the people of all the countries suffering under colonial oppression in general and Africa and Latin American countries in particular (66)].

[Shri D. K. Panda]

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to follow a consistent anti-imperialist policy (67)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to give recognition to Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam (68)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to pressurise the USA Government to withdraw its armed forces from Vietnam (69)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to condemn the USA Government for arms supply to Pakistan military regime for suppression of Bangla Desh movement (70)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to recognise the German Democratic Republic (71)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to effectively defend the democratic rights of the Bangla Desh people against the inhuman onslaught of the Pakistani military regime (72)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to give recognition to Bangla Desh Government (73)].

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY (Kendrapara) : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for re-shaping the country's foreign policy on more realistic and pragmatic basis in the changed international context (74)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for defreezing relations with China (75)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to establish better understanding with Nepal (76)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for according immediate recognition to Israel (77)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to project issues involved in Bangla Desh in international context on diplomatic front (78)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure of our Embassy in U. S. A. in keeping abreast with development in that country *vis-a-vis* Bangla Desh (79)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to accord recognition to Bangla Desh (80)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Shifting of emphasis from the creation of an autonomous Republic in Bangla Desh to the return of Bangla Desh refugees (81)].

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI : I beg to move :

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to carry out proper publicity in respect of liberation movement of Bangla Desh and other matters connected there with in foreign countries through Indian Embassies abroad (82)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to establish effective contact with the Liberation Front constituted recently under the leadership of Maulana Bhashani in Bangla Desh (83)].

"That the Demand under the Head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to appoint such persons on the posts of ambassadors as are wedded to the establishment of the socialistic pattern of society (84)].

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Cut motions are also before the House.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North East) : Mr. Chairman, I have taken part in this debate almost every year during the last two decades, but never before have I felt so grievously the lack in India's

foreign policy of grit, of courage, of initiative. Too often we let flow a spate of brave words, but we fight shy of action. We hardly ever take a positive stand, and when problems come to a head, we find ourselves in a mess.

The Bangla Desh issue, which for us in India overshadows everything else, is a merciless illustration of our floundering foreign policy. In the new Lok Sabha, Government brags about a massive mandate from the people, but it gives no sign of a new shine or spurt in domestic development, with the result that foreign policy which is at bottom an aspect of domestic policy suffers inevitably. It is a pity that this country does not have a role in world affairs at least remotely commensurate with its size and its population.

Today Nixon rushes to Peking, so long anathematised, but ping-pong paves the way for political parleys, and the United States, sure of New Delhi's virtual subservience, does not hesitate to stab us in the back from time to time as over the arms which it has given to Yahya Khan and his yahoos, and at the same time has the gumption to give us a pat on the back also from time to time and we swallow it.

This Report of the External Affairs Ministry, 1970-71, it pains me to have to say, is an ignorant, irrelevant document, full of complacency about the world scene, with not one comment which is worth writing. It refers to the United Kingdom and says that our relations are "on an even keel." There is no reference to the problems of immigration, Britain's talks with Rhodesia, her arms sale to South Africa, the Common Market, nothing at all. There is no inkling that in Latin America the set-up in Chile means something. There is hardly a mention of Cuba. There is vacuous profession of friendship for everybody and a list of dignitaries who came to this country and who went from this country abroad.

This is in line with the way Government operates. Only on Friday there was a non-official Resolution asking Government to give full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic, to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to give recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Viet Nam. What was Government's answer? Govern-

ment has the best will in the world about these matters and Government is "considering" every issue in its leisurely way. I discovered a priceless sentence in the latest Home Ministry's Report at page 65 and I am quoting :

"The unemployment problem continued to engage the attention of the Government during the current year."

Problems continue to "engage the attention" of the Government! The Government is "considering" everything, Bangla Desh or whatever else. Government is considering the tightening of relations with the GDR or DRVN. What is the reason?

What is the fact of the matter? The fact of the matter has got to be confronted. If we do not, we shall have to pay for it later. The fact of the matter is that Government has got cold feet. It is not forbearance, it is not wisdom, but sheer cold feet. In spite of the Pentagon Papers revelations, we cannot stand up to the United States and the other imperialists. That indeed is the fact of the matter.

And this is illustrated most of all in the case of Bengla Desh. You may have noticed that Mr. Harold Wilson in Great Britain made a belated discovery of a Pakistan Lobby in White Hall. I am sure there is in South Block an anti-Bangla Desh Lobby. I am sure the Anglo-Mandarins who infest that place are unhappy over the resurgence of East Bengal. I am sorry to have to add also that I have my doubts about the External Affairs Minister's own interest in regard to the freedom movement in Bangla Desh. His allergy has been quite a well known feature of our Parliamentary experience in the last four months. Recently he has been making futile efforts to try to shed that allergy, but I would like him to tell us, I do not know if it is correct, in regard to a speech which he is supposed to have made on the 17th June in Washington to the National Press Club, where he talked about a "political settlement," where he talked about a "united Pakistan," where he said that the refugees would be sent back even before there was a political settlement under "guarantees" from the Government of Pakistan, meaning the Government of Yahya Khan in Islamabad.

I am told that in that speech he expressed himself in favour of an agreement between Pakistan rulers and the "moderate

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

elements" in East Bengal. I do not know. The External Affairs Minister has displayed in this House over and over again an allergy to the issue of Bangla Desh, which is in keeping with the existence of—what I am absolutely sure about—an anti-Bangla Desh lobby in the South Block. I find the Prime Minister as the public relations woman of the Cabinet from time to time trying to put up a brave face ; but it does no good.

Occasional consultations with the leaders of the House we know what sort of consultation it actually is—are not enough. The External Affairs Ministry never had the time to have a meeting with the Consultative Committee ; it was also formed very late.

I also charge the Government of India with propaganda failure, which was either deliberate or due to political illiteracy. Our men on the job everywhere let sleeping dogs lie on the issue of Bangla Desh ; no lead really was given from Delhi. I do not know why no special effort was made in the Arab world, why it was not sought to be explained that the Islamic principles of democracy and social discipline as sought to be applied in East Bengal by a preponderantly Muslim population had led to tremendous democratic upsurge of which to country like the UAR ought to be proud. I am sure nothing of the sort was sought to be purveyed to the Islamic countries.

I should like to know why there was no contact sought to be made with China. There is some talk about China showing some signs of thawing towards us. Why did not we take initiative in regard to Bangla Desh ? Why cannot we go to China ? Why cannot we ask them to put their views on paper much more clearly and unambiguously than they have done so far ? Have we no sort of diplomatic role to play ? We sent a lot of Ministers on globe trotting expedition. It is such a ridiculous operation that I do not wish to refer to that matter over and over again.

Why was it that we went out of our way to help the Government of Ceylon to suppress an internal insurrection and never even insisted in a diplomatic fashion on some kind of a *quid pro quo* ? Our friend Ceylon gave facilities for the murderous assault on the people of Bangla Desh.

I say our propaganda failure is very clear. It is not the propagandas success of the Government of India that has brought

about the humanitarian sympathy of the world ; it was cholera which did it ; it was the television system in those countries. . . . (Interruption) It was cholera rather than the official propaganda apparatus of Sardar Swaran Singh which did it. It was the intrepid Press correspondents and photographers who gave to the people of the world some idea of the enormity taking place in Bangla Desh. It roused the conscience of humanity ; the world conscience was roused. But the conscience of the World Powers is still in a coma which not all the visits of Sardar Swaran Singh and company have been able to cure.

In regard to our approach to the United Nations and other international forums, even Sir Alec Douglas Home in the British House of Commons said it was for India and Pakistan to go to the United Nations or to the Security Council because some British Members of the House of Commons had asked for a reference to the Security Council or to the United Nations.

The refugees are coming. Ten million of them are likely to come, althogther. Or even more, perhaps. We are getting only fifteen per cent of assistance from the world community. It is a running sore in our body politics which is developing into a gangrene which is going to prove fatal and we do not know what we are going to do about it.

Government, I say in accusation, made no important diplomatic gesture ; never recalled our High Commissioner in Islamabad except once for a very short while ; never asked for the winding up of our Deputy High Commissioner's Office in Dacca but waited for the Deputy High Commissioner to be kicked out and now to be made a prisoner ; and when Pakistan sent a man called Mehdi Masud to Calcutta, gave him VIP treatment ; we never declared one single person in the Pakistan High Commission, including the man whom I had named, the military officer who was responsible for the torture of Mujibhur Rehman in the Agartala conspiracy case, as *persona non grata*.

16.00 hrs.

This is the way in which our Government have behaved. We made no propaganda, properly speaking, for recognition as far as Government's agencies are concerned.

I have here an analysis of the *Indian and Foreign Review*—issues for April, May, June and July—these four months. There is one article on recognition by Mr. Justice Tek Chand, a former Member of this House—the prohibition report man—and that was against the idea of recognition,—the only article which appeared in the *Indian and Foreign Review*. Whoever might be responsible for it, should get the order of the boot straightaway. Here is a paper which prints only one article on recognition and that is against the idea of recognition.

Then we have soft-pedalled our protests to the United States over its treacherous arms supply. It was only later that Sardar Swaran Singh's own language became a little warmed up. But when he began, he was very gently asking the United States to behave in conformity with the great democratic traditions of that country. Then we went out of our way to welcome that man, the Kissinger of Death. We were unable even to conceive his blackguardly schemes. The Prime Minister goes out of her way to receive him. He could have been received by the Cabinet Secretary and left at that. If Sardar Swaran Singh wanted to talk him, he was very welcome, but there is no reason for the Prime Minister to go out of her way. The Commander-in-Chief dines and wines with that person at a time of political, military, diplomatic and other kinds of tension in this country. The big guy goes out to Yahya Khan, and faking a tummy ache, pushes over to Peking and a new pseudo-thriller is supplying material to the press. Now, Nixon and Mao are to have their pow-wow very soon, and our cold feet are already nearly frozen, and I had better ask Sardar Swaran Singh : you get out of this fright, this spineless indecision and fear of the world around us.

It so far as the proposed Nixon pilgrimage to Peking is concerned, in so far as its confession of the failure of American policy in Viet Nam and elsewhere is concerned, it is certainly a very good thing. But in so far as the incalculable, opportunist and reactionary implications of a new combination of reactionary forces and a new Peking-Washington axis is concerned, we have to be extra careful, and that is why at this point of time we must not just think of our problems and tasks as inconsequential. We must not think that big things are happening in the world, and this Bangla Desh and

all that sort of thing is very small fry and so let us not worry about it ; let us therefore loll back into passivity and pious declarations which have been meat and drink as far as our foreign policy spokesmen are concerned.

Therefore, the conventional, lifeless, *status quo* diplomacy, operated by a supine bureaucracy and directed by a timorous government has landed us in this soup. This must give way to a dynamic, progressive and daring and principled policy. There must be—and this is what the country stresses—immediate recognition to Bangla Desh, accompanied at the same time, with an assurance that all civilised facilities and assistance—economic, political and diplomatic support—would be given to Bangla Desh including help about training and equipment of young and able refugees so that they can go back, join and fight in the freedom movement.

At the same time, we have to emphasise to ourselves and to the world that recognition does not by any means imply a war or even a confrontation with Pakistan. We exert diplomatic and political influence to secure other government's recognition of Bangla Desh also ; we exert public and private pressure for the release of Mujibur Rahman Khan ; we tell the world at the same time that India under no circumstances would take the initiative for a war with Pakistan. We tell the world that our role is strictly limited to help and support of Bangla Desh born out of historic necessity and the most massive popular resurgence and freedom struggle which is now finding shape in a combined force—with the National Awami League, the communist party and other forces, all combining in East Bengal.

We have also to tell the world about a guarantee which we give that on no account Indian Muslims would suffer by reason of the conduct of the West Pakistani Government. We have to tell the Arab world in particular and other Islamic countries that if they really and truly care for the principles of Islam operating in social and political life, they should come to the support of Bangla Desh.

We should tell the so-called democratic countries which appear to believe in the ballot box that if Bangla Desh fails under the Yahya jackboot, good-bye to all talk

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

about Parliament, about democracy and about elections in our part of the world. The world should know that if that happens in East Bengal, in West Bengal and the rest of India, the infection would spread. There is no doubt about it. If the experiment of something like revolution by consent in Bangla Desh fails, then all talk about democracy and parliamentarianism is so much moonshine and nonsense.

At this turning point, therefore, in South Asia's history, India's role is crucial. Howsoever we may suffer from an inferiority complex, we have to play that role in our own interest, as that of democracy, secularism and socialism everywhere. You, Sir, are learned in the lore of our country :

वैद्व्यं मा मम गमः पार्थः ।

That was the Gita injunction : Let us not give way to impotence. Let not our hands and feet be tied. Let us not be inhibited in the manner we have been. I discover, on the contrary, complaisance everywhere and in this miserable rag, *Indian and Foreign Review* on the 1st April, 1971, in our sycophantic country and the atmosphere of flattery, there was published a Sonnet to Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Two of those lines were :

"This year of nineteen seventy-one shall mark

Unerringly, your tryst with destiny."

I hope the tryst with destiny is met. This is the kind of talk which is indulged in ! But let there be some little action to give some substance to this idea of tryst with destiny. Government must give up its weak-kneed stand. Our people must get the feeling, which I am telling Sardar Swaran Singh, they have not got today, that this Government, especially the External Affairs Ministry, can be trusted to look after the legitimate interests of the country and the honour of our India. That is the problem before us. That is why at this point of time India must do her duty. India must be brave and courageous and everything else that is worthwhile will follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri K. R. Ganesh.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R.

GANESH) : Shall I lay them on the Table ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes ; you may lay them on the Table.

16.07 hrs.

MYSORE BUDGET, 1971-72

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH) : I beg to present a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the State of Mysore for the year 1971-72.

Statement on the Budget of Mysore State for 1971-72

Sir,

As the House is aware, following the Proclamation issued by the President on the 27th March, 1971 in respect of the State of Mysore, a 'Vote on Account' was obtained for a period of four months to enable the Mysore Government to incur essential expenditure and carry on administration and development. The period is coming to a close. Accordingly, the State's Budget for the full year 1971-72 is now being presented to Parliament.

The revised Budget Estimates for 1971-72 show a surplus of Rs. 7.78 crores on revenue account as against a deficit of Rs. 2.88 crores anticipated earlier. This is largely due to several steps taken recently to improve resources and effect economies in expenditure wherever feasible. The total revenue receipts are now estimated at Rs. 281.57 crores as against the earlier estimate Rs. 273.05 crores. The improvement of Rs. 8.52 crores is mainly due to larger devolution from Centre (Rs. 2.23 crores) and better collections expected under State taxes, particularly State Excise Duties (Rs. 2.93 crores), Sales Tax (Rs. 1 crore) and Electricity Schemes (Rs. 2 crores). The expenditure met out of revenue is now placed at Rs. 273.79 crores as against Rs. 275.94 crores in the 'Vote on Account' Budget. The reduction of Rs. 2.15 crores is the net effect of economies in departmental expenditure under Land Revenue, Police, Education, Public Works and Forests, partly off set by additional provision of Rs. 1.68 crores which