

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948."

* SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI: I introduce* the Bill,

12.33 hrs.

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we take up the discussion on the motion re. international situation.

Shri Hari Kishore Singh was on his legs.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Puri): Yesterday, while I was referring to the role of the big powers in relation to the sub-continent, especially to India, I had suggested that while the role of the Soviet Union has been constructive and a stabilising one, but the same cannot be said about the role of United States of America.

The role of the U.S.A. has been one of creating of tensions in the sub-continent and fishing in the troubled waters. This policy of the U.S.A. is a hang-over of the imperialist posture of the British Empire. It was pursuing the policy of power-balance between India and Pakistan in pursuance of this policy, America went out of its way to give military aid to Pakistan both directly and through the regional military pacts. This created bitterness and certain apprehensions in our minds. The relations between India and USA deteriorated. And finally came the crucial question of Bangladesh.

The whole policy pursued in relation to Bangladesh by the USA has been condemned by this House and rightly so. Since then, that has been the main bone of contention between the two countries.

Now, the question has arisen whether

it should be advisable for us to have friendly relations with USA or not. I think it is a good thing to have friendly relations with the USA. But, that should be based on our national interest and dignity and the first test of the response of the USA would be this. The USA should recognise the reality of the situation in this subcontinent and that reality of the situation is that the USA should cease to play the balancing role between India and Pakistan, equating Pakistan with India. That is the first test. It should stop supply of arms to Pakistan directly and also through third countries. It is no use stopping direct supply of arms, but supplying them through the third countries, because, we were seeing military hardware being supplied to Pakistan through third countries. Therefore, this supply of arms and ammunition through third countries should also be stopped.

Thirdly, the USA should also help in keeping the Indian ocean an area of peace. For free movement of cargo, the Indian ocean should be a free zone of peace. The Indian ocean should be free of power rivalries. If it is free then we will not worry about our day to day problems of safeguarding our coastline. And, in this regard, the crucial test in this, namely, the USA should not have any naval base in the Indian ocean. Further, the USA must recognise our legitimate role in the affairs of Asia. And, in this regard, the crucial test is the negotiations which are going on regarding Vietnam. We had played some constructive role in regard to Vietnam in 1954. The USA must recognise our role in the current developing situation in Vietnam and in West Asia. If we are deliberately denied our rightful role in the context of Vietnam and West Asia. I would conclude that the USA is not sincere in making friendship with us. If the response of the United States is positive then our Government should also make similar gestures to the USA.

*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Hari Kishore Singh]

In our relations with the outside world, the position of China assumes great importance. This question has been raised in this House as well as outside, that is, what should be our attitude towards this power which had not only been hostile to us, but had also tried to create tension in our own country, and in the sub-continent, and had also grabbed a considerable portion of our territory. This House was greatly exercised over the issue and had resolved to vacate the aggression committed by China.

Our relation with China should be viewed not only in the context of our own interests but also in relation to the expectations and aspirations of the Afro-Asians from both these countries. It is we who tried our best to provide a respectable place to China and an opening for it in international world. An outstanding example of our efforts in this regard was the Bandung conference and also the doctrine of panchsheel. But, the Indo-Chinese relationship unfortunately, had been a classical example of ingratitude of China in international diplomacy. Our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, went all out of his way to build bridges of understanding between India and China, but that was not reciprocated, and we had the rude and crude shock of 1962. And again, when the Bangladesh crisis came what happened? The attitude of China had been similar to that of America, perhaps more hostile.

It is a great tragedy of international situation that a country which was denied membership of the UNO for nearly two decades should exercise its first veto against the admission of a sister country of Asia. That is the great tragedy of the situation. Now the question is this: Are we going to remain in a very hostile posture with China?

Or, are we going to have friendly relations with it? This is the question. I am all for friendly relations with China. We must have friendly relations. But, it must be in keeping with our dignity and national interests. And, China should also realise that the days of big-power supremacy in Asia are gone. They cannot just overlord Asian nations as the Imperial powers were doing. This must be made clear to the Chinese. They must also realise that they can play a very constructive and friendly role in Asia and they can shape the situation in Asia only in cooperation with other fellow countries in this region. They should not assume the role of the colonial countries and super-powers.

There are two or three conditions on the basis of which better understanding between India and China is possible. Firstly, it is the Panchsheel doctrine. This doctrine which sometimes has been described in this House as dead and gone, is still a valid document. It was conceived to promote friendly relations which the nations of Asia. The first and foremost conditions for a better understanding between China and India is that China should subscribe to the doctrine of Panchsheel. China must give up its attitude of super-powermanship and be content to be one of the nations of Asia, a big one, but an equal one.

Secondly, it should exhibit its interest in promotion of good-will towards India and among the countries of Asia by sponsoring the admission of Bangladesh into the United Nations, and should not put forward lame excuses like the Indo-Soviet treaty of Peace and friendship and the presence of the Tibetan refugees as big obstacles in the restoration of friendly relations with India.

Now, I come to the South-East Asian countries. We have to live

with them, and our policy in this area should be more dynamic and more forward-looking. I think the Government of India should make more vigorous efforts in regard to economic co-operation with countries in South and South-East Asia, and avenues of joint ventures should be explored with these countries

A point which is worth considering in this direction is that it should be explored how far our own development efforts are meaningful to the development activities of the countries of South and South-East Asia and of other neighbouring countries. This is important because the countries in this region including our own have limited resources and tremendous problems in relation to the poverty of their people. If we are to make an effort to better the lot of the people both inside and outside in this region, it is essential that our development efforts should have some relation to the development activities going on in these countries, and some positive efforts should be made in this regard by Government

With these words, I commend the policies of the Government which have been very positive and dynamic and which have enhanced the prestige of our nation in the comity of nations.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, only a few minutes are left in the time allotted for this debate. I shall call upon Shri Shyamnandan Mishra to speak and after that, I shall call the hon. Minister.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Is my name there?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANI-GRAHI (Bhubaneswar): Is my name also there?

MR. SPEAKER: No other names are there on the list

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY: (Nizamabad): Is my name there?

MR. SPEAKER. No. I shall now call Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, and after him, the hon. Minister may reply to the debate.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that it is no more rhetoric to say that we are living in a revolutionary period of international relations, a period of great leap forwards, a period of giant strides, and not of slow and sodate trots. Never had the great powers shown such flexibility, accommodation and resilience in the relations among themselves as they have been showing now. Thus, a process of transformation of the world scene is under way.

But I do not mean to suggest, on that account, that spring has already descended upon the scene and everything is going to be lovely in the valley. One can only say that the ice has begun to melt in some of the areas of chronic conflict and it may well be that these areas might taste peace after the bitterest experiences extending over years. It is also possible that the conflicts which promise to disappear from these areas might have their proxies ready in certain other areas. For, the big powers, now, because of some very urgent domestic problems, seem to be completely adverse to, they want to avoid, direct confrontations altogether and they are in search of their proxies. It may well be that we would be conforming, the world will be conforming, to the old dictum that the more things have changed, the more they have remained the same

However, the point that I want to emphasise in this context is that in this terrifically dynamic world scene,

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

India seems to be presenting a static picture of frozen diplomacy, attitudes and postures.

Perhaps, in this context, it is necessary to mention, when I am speaking of the transformation taking place in the world scene, that the greatest event of the recent times is the coming together of the superpowers and also of the potential superpowers like Japan, China and the European Economic Community.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY:
What about India?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
India is very low on the GNP map of the world, and we cannot have more manoeuvrability and amplitude and play in international affairs than our GNP permits.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY:
That is not correct.

SHRI SHYAMANDAN MISHRA:
This has created an entirely new situation in which many of the old theories and slogans seem to be losing their meaning. It is difficult to say now who is aligned and who is non-aligned. That is the kind of situation that seems to be developing.

The first major result of this coming together of these superpowers has been that peace in Indo-China, which seemed to be so obdurately elusive, seems to be somewhat within sight. I would not share the pessimism of the hon. Member, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon that it might well be that peace would recede like the Tantalus cup in Indo-China. Peace seems to be dawning not only on Indo-China, but earlier in the year, when the American President visited Peking, the process of coming together of the two Koreas had begun. Our policy planners should not fail to notice that both Moscow and Peking have been putting great pressure on Hanoi to come to terms with the United States. This appears to have created almost a state of near-revolt

in Indo-China, in Viet Nam particularly. The *Le Monde* recently reported the precise details of how a section of the North Viet Namese forces and the NL wanted to capture the headquarters of the NLF and how a veritable coup was prevented at the last moment. You can, therefore, see how the influence of the superpowers works even in the national affairs of a strongly self-reliant country. Let the experience of Hanoi be a lesson and warning to our policy planners here. Let us also be aware of the fact that the intensive bombing of North Viet Nam by the United States did not come in the way of Moscow giving a red carpet welcome to the President of the United States. The result was millions of tonnes of wheat and millions of dollars to the Soviet Union and a fabulous commercial deal for the United States of America. That is what has been happening at the present moment.

Following these top-level negotiations, the South East Asian region has been put in an entirely new context. Those who sought security through alliances, military alliances and so on are now seeking an entirely different kind of arrangement. A new situation is developing in Indo-China with the possibility of Hanoi and Washington coming closer. The draft peace proposals revealed by Hanoi even had a clause by which North Viet Nam accepted American aid for the re-development of North Viet Nam, the economy of which was shattered by the American bombing. Have we grasped the significance of all these developments? That is the natural question that arises in one's mind.

The well-known humorist Art Buchwald has written that in the year 1995 it might well be that the North Viet Namese would have erected a statue to Kissinger and they would be selling taperecorders to the United States.

We have not only understood the significance of all these changes but

we have become staid and go on mechanistically repeating some of the formulas and dogmas, simplistic formulas and dogmas of the good old days. For instance, we seem to be still supporting the Seven-point peace programme of Hanoi which North Vietnam itself discarded in October this year to pave the way for the draft agreement. The result is that even North Vietnam did not seem to be quite keen to keep India in its peace-keeping role in Indo-China.

It appears that whereas in Europe tensions are more or less eliminated on Europe has become virtually free from tensions—the seal has been put on it by the treaty between the two Germanys and further by the re-election of Willy Brandt—Asia might well become the cockpit of most of the conflicts and might become more distributed. And this, not because of the old US-USSR tension but because China is becoming greatly powerful and Japan which is already a super-economic power has become free from American influences. Does this House realise what the strength of China at the present moment is? China has now 20 medium-range ballistic missiles operational, and TU 16 medium bombers capable of delivering a nuclear strike are being built at the rate of five per month. China has already 30 of these TU 16s. Thus the Asian scene might be disturbed. That is our apprehension.

In this context, I would like to point out that one tremendous fact that seems to have been lost completely on the Government of India is the emergence of Japan on the world scene in a really big way. What is our response to the tremendous economic and political potential of Japan? We have heard absolutely nothing from the Government side so far. They do not seem to have any forward planning in this respect. Japan has already become a super economic power and it only needs to take a decision to become a really super power in the military

sense. Japan, as you know, has got tremendous stakes in the Indian Ocean and when I say that the Asian region might possibly become disturbed, I have in mind the developments that are taking place in the Indian Ocean. Japan has tremendous stakes in the Indian Ocean. Japan gets 70 per cent of its raw materials from outside and most of these raw materials have to go *via* the Indian Ocean. So, it has got great stakes in the Indian Ocean and Japan might make its presence felt as other big countries are doing.

Now, I must come to the most interesting aspect of our foreign policy. At the present moment, it seems to me that we are passing through an era of love calls in our foreign policy. So, one love call, as the *New York Times* has characterised it, has gone to the United States and another love call has gone to Peking. My submission is that in the current move to restore friendly relations with the United States, there does not seem to be much evidence of maturity. Coming these moves as do after so much hullabaloo about the CIA, they appear to be fantastic. So, indeed are love calls. There does not seem to be any logic behind them and they reflect all the attributes of adolescence. They also conclusively prove that this CIA bogey was raised purely for domestic purposes. Otherwise, if really the United States posed a great threat to us, why was this love call extended to the United States recently? It proves conclusively, I repeat, that is for domestic purposes. Some leading foreign newspapers have interpreted these moves as a reaction to the possibility of food scarcity in this country. No two mature country could have such wide fluctuations in its relations, as India and the United States have shown. There must be a minimum of stable rhythm in the relations of mature countries whatever the differences cropping up from time to time.

We are prepared to welcome the effort at reestablishment of friendly

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

relations with the United States, but, our submission is that it must not be on the basis of panic or imitation. I say 'imitation' because it is only after Russia, China and the United States met, ironed out their differences and even struck fabulous commercial deals that we have thought it necessary to initiate these moves. So, this is another aspect of the matter which I want to emphasise.

Coming to the love call which has been extended to China. Probably, it was done in no uncertain terms yesterday when the hon Minister for Foreign Affairs said that it is more than a desire.—What is love except that it is more than a desire.—So it is more than a desire for developing relations with China. Now, we have had some kind of a response from the United States, let us hope that the other partner in this case also might relent sooner than later.

My submission again is that instead of planning our relations with these big countries, we seem to be dependent more or less on astrology and, we have got definite proof about this. Sometime back, there was a report in the *Guardian* by Peter Jenkins that the Indian Embassy in Washington was the only one which believed in the victory of Mc Govern because its astrology forecast this victory. One wonder whether our Embassies keep astrologers on their pay-rolls. So, it seems India was not prepared fully to have a dialogue with a re-elected Nixon.

Now I come to our failure at the United Nations. We have failed to carry the United Nations with us on more than one occasion during critical situations. Last year, during the war with Pakistan, UN gave an adverse verdict. This year the recognition of Bangla Desh has been linked up with the release of POWs against our wishes. Pakistan had tried to bring this about with great effort and it seems to have succeeded. The President of the UN General Assembly had also spoken of the inter-dependence

of the two resolutions. My submission is that it requires a deeper analysis and assessment why we keep on falling consistently at the United Nations and whether our permanent mission at the UN requires to be strengthened a bit so that we do not again face situations like this.

So far as the recognition of Bangla Desh is concerned, it will come and it is bound to come. Already 95 nations have extended recognition and the rest cannot hold out for long. But the question is: whether after Mr Bhutto has made it public—he has made his intention public that he wants to recognise Bangla Desh, he has been going round his country, addressing a series of meetings and telling his countrymen that the reality of Bangla Desh cannot be wished away and he has been saying that it is in the interests of Pakistan to recognise Bangla Desh—when the position has been made so clearly and publicly, the question is whether we should stand on prestige to bring about some kind of a settlement. When this settlement involve so many things and so high stakes,

13 hrs.

Now, finally, I will have a word about Uganda. Only one word. One feels that there should be more active diplomacy to protect the legitimate and even the basic human rights of the people of Indian origin now living in many foreign lands. These people had tried to put in their best to develop these countries. They worked in jungles to build roads and railways in the most trying circumstances. Many of them did not stint on contribution to the national movements and so on. And yet there are some people who say that they were not identifying themselves with the peoples in those areas. I think there cannot be a more fantastic nonsense than this. They have put in their best; they have made the highest sacrifices to build those countries. and it is only to hang the dog that it is being given a bad name. I repeat, we would like the Government of

India to pursue an active diplomacy to protect the legitimate interests and human rights of these people of Indian origin.

MR. SPEAKER. How much time the Minister will take for reply?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): About three quarters of an hour

MR. SPEAKER: We have already exceeded our time. Five hours were allotted; we have taken more.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I will try to be brief, taking even less time

MR. SPEAKER: The Opposition list is almost complete. They have taken more than their due.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: You may give some more time to this side.

MR. SPEAKER: For you 5—7 minutes, then Shri R. K. Sinha—not more than 15 minutes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour). Some time may be given to movers of substitute motions

MR. SPEAKER: No.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I seek only 5 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: You have had your full quota. Anyway, 3 minutes. So Shri Panigrahi 5—7 minutes, then Shri R. K. Sinha, then Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and then the Minister will start at 2.20 P.M. and conclude by 3 P.M. as there is other business thereafter.

13.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at four minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) About the shooting of the Harijan leader, that came up before the House, we expected a statement from the Government. Also about 70 Muslim houses looted and burnt, you in your wisdom had expressed your comments. Mr. Raj Bahadur had said that the Government were looking into it. Four days have passed. I have written a letter to the Speaker also. What is going to happen? You also made some observations.

SHRI R. P. ULAGANAMBI (Vellore) It is a serious matter.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is a serious matter?

SHRI R. P. ULAGANAMBI: A few days back a Harijan leader was shot and four others were injured.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Not the same thing. It becomes a debate then and I cannot allow it. Normally I allow Members to make one or two points. It should not assume the dimensions of a debate or discussion. You have mentioned this before; you have reiterated it. Government have heard you. There should be some other means, not just bringing the same matter again and again before the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Let the Government say something.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I cannot compel, if they do not have anything to say. (Interruptions) Order, please. He has heard you. If he does not respond there should be some other means.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: There is something wrong with him, in

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

that case; I take it that something is wrong with the Government too.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before we resume the discussion on the international situation, I should like to say that today is Private Members' Business day and we have fixed that it should be taken up at 3 p.m. Three more Members would like to make their observations, two from the Congress Party and Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu for whom permission has been signified by the Speaker. The Minister has yet to give his reply. I do not know how they are going to complete all that before 3 p.m. I would not like to interrupt the hon. Minister's speech halfway; I would not like the Government to present a truncated case. But I think it will still be possible to complete this business in time if the Members co-operate. Mr. Chintamani Panigrahi and Mr. R. K. Sinha have been told that they would be getting ten minutes each. If they keep within that time—Mr. Bosu had been told he would get only three minutes—and if he keeps to that too, perhaps the Minister can also do it within 3 p.m.

14.07 hrs.

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION—*contd.*

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar): Some friends in this House have argued yesterday and today that India pursues a foreign policy, not with any kind of formulation of its own but with certain ideologies, ideological grounds; it does not follow its policy on the basis of its own national interest. I should say that such an understanding of the foreign policy of our country is really non-sense and fantastic. To begin with, I should like to quote two passages from a very interesting article written by our Prime Minister, captioned 'India and the World'. It is

one of the latest articles and there she said:

"Our first concern has been to prevent any erosion of our independence. Therefore, we could not be camp followers of any power, however rich or strong."

In another passage, she says:

"Agreements which promote the doctrine of balance of power or mark out spheres of influence are bound to increase tension and invite instability. No nation will be happy in a subservient role."

I think these assertions, these enunciations of our foreign policy go to show that we are neither subservient to any power, rich or strong, nor is our foreign policy static. It is dynamic. Preserving our national independence and integrity and our sovereignty are the first charges so far as our foreign policy is concerned. At the same time I am reminded of a famous quotation of Pandit Nehru.

"India has a bigger rôle to play, as India is the pivot of Asia."

Today we are destined to play a bigger rôle. After the birth of Bangla Desh as an independent republic, India is really playing its destined rôle so far as this part of the world is concerned and also in the world as a whole. When we are thinking of our foreign policy, we must take into account certain factors. Today the entire world is moving away from confrontation and tension.

In this general background, our country is following the right path in trying to have bilateral negotiations with Pakistan and seeing that peace prevails in the sub-continent, adding to the forces of peace in the world.

Some friends are arguing that Pakistan is not going to understand this policy of ours. The military rulers of Pakistan for the last 25 years were not able to understand our policy. But we waited and the situation developed in such a way in that country

that the military rulers of Pakistan had to realise their mistake. If not today, at least tomorrow they will realise that peace is the only alternative to war and tension. India is following a right policy, which will help the people of Pakistan, India and Bangladesh to prosper. I am very optimistic and today's news shows that India's policy is correct, and the people of Pakistan and the rulers there are trying to come to an understanding with India so far as delimitation is concerned. I hope tomorrow or within 10 days more good news will come, so that all the people who wanted to perpetuate tension in the sub-continent will know that the policy we have pursued has resulted in peace.

There is no point in saying--as Mr. Vajpayee and some said--that Simla agreement has belied our expectations. It has not belied our expectations. It has rather belied the expectations of those forces who wanted to see that there is perpetual tension in this region. They wanted that this sub-continent should be opened up for super power rivalry and it has become our duty to thwart those forces. The Simla agreement represents the dynamism and initiative in our efforts for reducing tension in this sub-continent. It represents not a kind of static outlook but a dynamic approach in our political outlook to new problems that we are facing today in the sub-continent.

The compulsion of events is now driving the super powers to develop new relations and to expand their horizons of understanding. India was ceaselessly working for this new orientation in the foreign policy of the big super powers all these years. When the desired change has come about all over the world, should we expect our friends to say that India should close its eyes to the realities of the situation in the international horizon? India has woken up to these new realities, which we were striving all these years to achieve.

There are certain friends in our

country who have only one eye—I do not know if it is a parliamentary expression--in their view of things so far as the international situation is concerned. They do not see anything wrong if Mr. Nixon goes to Peking and embraces the leaders there. They do not see anything wrong if Moscow and Washington normalise their relations. But they are alarmed if India, while maintaining the friendliest and closest relations with the Soviet Union, wants to normalise its relations with the other super powers, that is, USA and China and other countries. I am really astounded at this way of viewing international developments. Mr. Mishra was saying that the two big super powers are trying to suffocate Vietnam with their pressures. I will quote one of the famous sayings of one of the high ranking Vietnamese officials belonging to North Vietnam. Some journalist asked him, "How do you manage both China and Soviet Union and yet you are fighting with the United States?" He said,

"If one day a great brother country requested us to negotiate and if we thought that the moment had not come to do so, we would not do it. If one day another great brother country requested us not to negotiate and if we thought that the time had come to negotiate, then we would negotiate."

Vietnamese nationalism reinforced by the will to total revolution has charted its own valiant path of fighting the mightiest war machines of our planet and is going to achieve victory soon. Therefore, India also has learnt how to live with the super powers. It has developed such a foreign policy that we can live in a friendly way with all the super powers. So, if any effort is made to develop our relations with the other super powers, I hope there is nothing wrong in it. It is surprising to see some people saying that we want aid from the United States and that is why we are trying to develop our relations with them. Sir, in the most critical times, when the Enterprise came to the Indian Ocean, the

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

people of India and Bangladesh said together, "Enterprise or no Enterprise, whatever comes, Bangladesh will be free". And, Bangladesh has become free. So, knowing fully well what India stands for, if anyone says that we are trying to develop relations with the United States because we want aid, he is completely misreading the new developments that are taking place.

Lastly, coming to the question of prisoners of war, I thought Mr. Shamim was a good speaker, but today I could find both sides of Mr. Bhutto in him. He blows hot and cold at the same time, as Mr. Bhutto does. He went on praising our Foreign Minister and our foreign policy like anything but at the end, he said that India has delayed the release of the prisoners of war and therefore the relation between India and Pakistan has gone wrong and the entire world is accusing India. This is a complete misreading of the facts. I must say that the Government of India has tried its best to see that the prisoners of war are released, but the Pakistan Government perhaps are not willing to see that the 90,000 prisoners of war are released because that will create new problem for them. So, the delay is not because of us but because of the Pakistani administration. Though it is not very relevant here, I would like to quote what Mr. Tariq Ali said:

"In West Pakistan too, there is growing disillusionment and the general malaise will undoubtedly affect the peasants in uniform who form the backbone of the Pakistan army. In a situation where the deepening social crisis is affecting the majority of the population, it will only be a matter of time before the common soldiers are also affected."

Therefore, on the question of release of prisoners of war, India's stand is correct and India will see that Pakistan conforms to the principles that India stands for in this neo-pact.

SHRI R. K. SINHA (Faizabad):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the speeches during the debate on foreign policy of India from the Opposition side have been rather on a low level because of the success of our foreign policy and its exposition by our Foreign Minister.

The Marxist Member of Parliament, when he spoke during the debate, said that except for mildly worded and belated mumbled phrases of unhappiness, India has scrupulously avoided taking a principled line on Vietnam. I want to tell the Marxist Member that there is the real basic strength in our foreign policy when Mr. Nixon is compelled to say that the greatest power in South Asia is India. It was mentioned in the speech of the Foreign Minister in the Rajya Sabha that it is the liberation of Bangladesh and Vietnam which is the basic hindrance in the development of the relationship between the United States of America and India.

Our Marxist Member might abuse the capitalists of the world, the capitalists of the country and the private sector, and imperialism. But our Marxist Member should know that the C.I.A., the international reactionary counter revolution of imperialism took Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her Government to task. Therefore, their enemies' enemies are friends.

As far as the question of challenging imperialism is concerned, this country stands at the bar of history as second to none in the world. They do not understand the basic moorings of history. There is an imperialist change which surrounds the world and that change was brought in the Indian sub-continent through the liberation of Bangladesh. The liberation of Bangladesh is something whose significance has to be understood except by jaundiced eyes.

The Indian sub-continent has been taken out from the area of super-power politics, from the area of cold-war and from the area of imperialist

exploitation. To that extent, imperialism all over the world has been weakened. As a continuation of that policy, if our Prime Minister at the Simla Summit comes to an agreement with the President of Pakistan, we should see a further continuation of our policy of peace and friendship. If Bangladesh, India and Pakistan come together in a fraternity of friendship, our economy shall be released from the stranglehold of cold-war politics. The people of India, Bangladesh and Pakistan shall be free to develop their economies. If China and America want to involve Pakistan in their cold-war politics by developing mutuality between India and Pakistan, we shall generate this liberating force in Pakistan which will create more amity between India and Pakistan.

This history, if it has to be understood, has to be understood in a proper light. Yesterday, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee tried to pour water over the Simla Agreement and tried to ridicule it. There is a wave of development. The news of today about the possibility of an agreement between India and Pakistan is something which will enthuse peace loving people all over the sub-continent. If Pakistan is taken out from the influence of China and America or it is taken out from the influence of imperialism and cold-war politics, to that extent, it serves the interests of India.

These gentlemen will not see the glory of Indian foreign policy. They will not appreciate that we are developing relations with Tanzania and that there are Muslim countries and Arab countries, like, Iraq and Afghanistan which are developing a fraternity of friendship with us. They will not appreciate the fact that India today has given the biggest success to its own foreign policy.

Look at the liberation of Bangladesh. When Bangladesh was liberated, there were very few members in the General Assembly of the United

Nations who stood by us. At that time, it looked that the horizons were dark. Except for Soviet Union friendship and the friendship of Socialist countries and that of some of the West European countries, nobody in the world appeared to be with us. But because of the policy of principle, because of the policy of strength and because of the fact that our non-alignment policy has teeth in it, today Bangladesh has been recognised by 85 countries in the world and the United Nations has proved in their Resolution that they are in favour of the Bangladesh recognition.

The foreign policy of India has been a great success when we look at the history of the battle for the recognition of China and for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. We find that they had to trudge for decades for recognition. Here, there might be about hundred countries recognising Bangladesh by the time Bangladesh celebrates its first anniversary of the Liberation Day on 16th December.

In the Security Council, four super powers recognise Bangladesh. America was isolated in the NATO camp and on the Western front on the issue of recognition. China was isolated from the Socialist camp. Can there be a greater tribute to the success of the foreign policy of India to the effect that the foreign policy of India is based on strength and is based on principles.

Before I conclude, I would like to say that by the recognition of the German Democratic Republic, by sending our Ambassador to North Vietnam, the Government of India has pursued the policy of peace and strength which the Opposition will not see with their jaundiced eyes. It is the policy of strength and peace; it is the policy of principles. We shall continue to follow that. When our Prime Minister said that we do not covet West Pakistan's territory, that we are prepared to vacate it, we

[Shri R. K. Sinha]

vacated it Which are the super powers whose army went into a neighbouring country and withdrew its army from there? We withdrew our army from Bangladesh. We stood by what we said.

With these words, I pay my tribute to the success of our foreign policy.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour). Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have said about Bangladesh in my substitute motion. It says

“(a) the Government of India have not made any significant and vigorous efforts to build up Indo-Bangladesh friendship on a firm basis and notes with grave concern the growth of anti-Indian feelings in Bangladesh;

(b) the Government should take note of the adverse criticism of its policy by some senior Bangladesh politicians and make all possible efforts to remove misgivings, if any, of the Bangladesh people about India.”

Sir, you read newspapers regularly and, as you know, alarming news are coming everyday that a section of the progressive Bangladesh leaders say, “Save the country from exploiters from India.” This is a very serious matter. We cannot afford to have that sort of feeling being created in Bangladesh. So, I say, our Foreign Ministry has totally failed and the Government has also failed in their foreign policy.

In spite of the many assurances and promises given by the Government, trade between India and Bangladesh has not grown appreciably. I want to put a clear and specific question to Sardar Swaran Singh. Please give us the figures of letters of credit that have been opened for trade with Bangladesh. Forget about barter trade which is neither fish nor flesh. We want to know, since the liberation of Bangladesh, how much trade has been covered by letters of credit bet-

ween the two countries. That will be the proper test.

Then, the Government have not taken steps to liberalise the passport and visa system. In the beginning, there was no passport and visa system. In the beginning, there was no passport and visa system. Sardar Swaran Singh had said on the floor of the House that this will be a mere formality to check smugglers and anti-social elements and to check the inflow of weapons that are coming there. But today if a person is politically opposed to this Government he is not allowed to go there. I am giving here a specific case. I know, in the case of the daughter of Shri Syed Baddraduja, a young 22 year old student, it took about three months and I had to seek Sardar Swaran Singh's intervention to get a passport for her. This passport and visa system should be changed. You cannot keep away some people from going there. They are the same flesh and blood as we are. Therefore, you must change your policy in regard to that.

The Government has yet to define its attitude to P.R.G. of South Vietnam. Why is this delay? It is a genuine representative Government of the people of Vietnam. Why is the Government adopting an ostrich policy, hiding its head in sand so that others cannot see.

The Government have totally failed to take this House into confidence in telling what positive steps have been taken to open bilateral talks with the Peoples Republic of China in order to normalise the Sino-Indian relations.

With Pakistan we must have cordial relations. But I regret to say that sometimes some public speeches are made by some responsible people here, in this country, which are not complimentary to Mr. Bhutto or Pakistan. That is not desirable. You cannot be both hot and cold at the same time.

About the "India's love call" from America, the editorial that came out in the *New York Times*, Mr. B. K. Nehru rushed from Shillong to Washington, because you need food. Now, you pay more to buy food. You are paying 35 dollars more per tonne. That is how you are buying wheat. We want to see that the Vietnam issue is settled soon; there is no use delaying it. India, as usual, as we have soon in the past, will adopt an ostrich policy, hiding her head under the sand and thinking that the others cannot see.

I want clear and categorical replies to all the points that I have raised from Shri Swaran Singh.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Syed Ahmed Aga. Only two minutes.

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA: (Bara-mulla): I cannot make my speech in two minutes. I will speak on some other day; I will take some other chance.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am almost sure now that the Minister cannot finish before 3.00 p.m. Therefore, we will allow the Minister to finish his speech even if it crosses 3.00 p.m. and we shall push forward the discussion on private Members' business by that much time. I think, the House has no objection to that.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I will try to be as brief as possible and I will confine myself mainly to replying to some of the points that have emerged in the course of the debate.

Before I do that, I would like to say that this debate has been, as usual of a very high order, Leaders of political parties, important members of the

Opposition and very senior members on our side have participated in the debate. This process helps us in the Ministry to formulate our policies taking into consideration the various suggestions that are thrown up in the course of such a debate. It is particularly useful because at the present moment very significant changes are taking place in the attitudes of many countries in different parts of the world, and it is in the fitness of things that our Parliament should have an opportunity of discussing this matter and should utilise this opportunity for making their comments about these happenings and also make suggestions, valuable suggestions, so that we may keep note of these when we formulate our attitudes and decide about our position with regard to these important matters.

Some points have been raised by my friends who sit in the Opposition benches and by the members from our side. Several senior members on our side have participated in the debate; Shri B. R. Bhagat and Shri Dinesh Singh, with their background and knowledge of External Affairs; having themselves been at one stage or the other in charge of External Affairs, had some valuable suggestions to make. I have also no hesitation in saying that the projection from my friends from the Opposition benches has also been, on the whole, constructive. Even the traditional critics adopted an attitude of trying to understand the basic problems, and I could see some slight shift in the attitude of such a strong critic as Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee because I heard from him, for the first time, that he is not opposed to the basic objectives and basic elements in the Simla Agreement, his main fear was whether it is being implemented by Pakistan in a proper manner.

My distinguished friend, Shri Hiren Mukherjee, whom it is always a pleasure to hear not only for the substance which, of course, is always the

[Shri Swaran Singh]

result of deep study but also for the fine inimitable language that he uses attracts our immediate attention. All of us hear him with the greatest respect.

Of all the people my hon friend Shri Samar Guha who at the present moment is not here for a change was not his usual sarcastic self notwithstanding his gesticulations and circular movements of his hand which he indulges in plenty he was not entirely negative.

PROF MADHU DANDAVAT (Rajapur) Please do not provoke him.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH He is not here, unless he has left you as his attorney. I am sure he would have liked this if he were here. His main point was what he described trilateralism between India, Bangla Desh and Pakistan. Of course in the interest of peace in the Indian subcontinent all the three countries have to work in close cooperation in order to reverse the trends of conflict and to establish a durable peace but it will perhaps be not quite practical, not even quite proper, to talk always of tri-lateralism. For instance I pose a problem if everything is to be discussed on the tri-lateral plane how will we react in India if Pakistan were to say that, in India's relations with Bangla Desh, Pakistan should also have a voice. If we examine this in depth you will agree that there are several matters in which all the three countries will have to sit and arrive at appropriate agreements—on the question of prisoners-of-war, on the question of trade and transit, on economic relations, communications, overflights, there are several matters in which a tri-lateral agreement will be necessary. But our relations with Bangla Desh are of such a nature that we can never think of any element of tri-lateralism, this will be entirely opposed to any proper way of handling this situation which is of a special character. There are several other

matters which I do not want to spell out in detail but we have to approach this problem in the background of what I have said.

On our side senior members of our party like Dr Henry Austin, Mr Goswami, Mr Stephen, have participated in this debate and have made important contribution. And I would commend some of the points mentioned by Shri Shamim to my friends from the Jan Sangh Party to appreciate the circumstances in which President Bhutto is functioning today. It is not for us to offer any defence for what President Bhutto says or does. I agree with Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu that while dealing with the Head of Government of a State friendly or unfriendly whatever may be our state of relationship we have to observe certain decencies, certain decorum, however much we might differ from the policies pursued we have to show the necessary courtesy and due consideration to the position that is occupied by any Head of Government or Head of State, more so if we keep this in the background of our thinking that President Bhutto was thrown up by a democratic process and he is the elected leader of the party with overwhelming majority in the National Assembly of Pakistan, which controls roughly about 70 per cent of the seats. He is the head of that Party. It is for any country and any Party to choose anyone as the leader of their party. Therefore while we have differences by all means we should mention those differences, we should put them forward with all the vehemence with all the logic with all the cogency, but, at the same time we must not say things which will unnecessarily rub the people of any country the wrong way. I would, for instance, like to say, like to recall how sensitive was Shri Asaf Bihari Vajpayee when *Tass News Agency*—which according to the Soviet sources, is a non-official body—said that they were happy that Shrimati Nandini Satpathy had succeeded in the election and that it was a victory for progressive forces.

he took umbrage to this, saying, 'Why should this news agency of USSR express satisfaction on the result of an election?' which all of us know was victory for the progressive forces. There was no doubt about it, but Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said that the true facts should not be mentioned by any outside newspaper agency, whether it is Tass or some other agency. Well, if that is the concept, that means that you expect others to observe such a high degree of discipline and this meticulous adherence to what, according to him, was a matter of high principle. But, while reciprocity demands that similar considerations should be extended in other spheres, you talked, and there are several others also who talked and mentioned, about President Bhutto in terms which are not at all consistent with the normal standards that are expected to be observed in such cases. It is necessary for us to show the proper courtesy as we expect others to show reciprocal courtesies, and we should not be too sensitive about our susceptibility. We should also show some consideration for the susceptibilities of other countries. I would, therefore, like to say that these are the aspects which should always be kept in view.

There is one aspect which was put across in a very forceful manner by my very dear friend, Shri B. R. Bhagat, about our relationship with USSR and other socialist countries. This was also mentioned by Prof. Hiren Mukherjee and even by Shri Bhat-tacharyya and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, and there appeared to be a consensus in favour of recording our view that we greatly appreciate the consistent friendship shown by USSR to India in all vital matters. The Soviet Union had co-operated with us in extending help in vital sectors of our economy when we were not getting adequate technical know-how and collaboration in very sensitive areas like machine-building, designing, oil exploration and oil refineries and we got co-operation from the Soviet Union in

vital matters. This is a record of relationship between India and USSR which has already become the envy of many countries and at the same time, it is based on principles and it is based on certain attitudes, and the two countries have co-operated in their international activities in the United Nations and elsewhere, to strengthen the forces against colonialism, to render stout support to the freedom fighters engaged in the laudable task of attaining freedom. It is in this background that we have to assess our relationship with the USSR, and Mr Bhagat was only voicing the sentiments of the entire country when he said that this is not only a friendship between the governments of the two countries but this is a relationship in which the people generally in India and in USSR are involved, and this was reciprocated by several members from the Opposition Benches as Well.

I would like to say that our friendship and our co-operation and our understanding with the USSR is one of the basic pillars of our external relations and it has now been placed on a juridical basis when the treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation was signed last year. The treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation was the natural culmination of the process of co-operation in various fields—economic, cultural and technological and other spheres and this was embodied in a juridical document, the development of relations of close co-operation and friendship between India and USSR.

We made it clear when we signed the treaty that there were no secret clauses outside the treaty. We also made it clear that this is a treaty for peace and not of war. We further made clear that it is not directed against any third country. And, in spite of all these clarifications, if certain quarters continue to raise objections which have no validity, I cannot help them. But our relationship is on a sound basis and we intend to strengthen this relationship in every way.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

In the economic field, it is known that there has been a progressive rise in the volume of trade between India and the USSR. I do not have the figures with me but it is something of the order of Rs. 300 crores now, and it is hoped on both sides that this can increase even further.

I feel somewhat dismayed when a note of, what I should say, some sort of equi-distance is imported into these discussions—these catch phrases like placing all the eggs in the same basket. These trite expressions, to say the least, are very irritating at times, but we must not confuse and compound our basic friendship, with a tried friend merely in order to get some sort of superficial satisfaction of the so-called equi-distance. This is a wrong approach, not in our national interest. We should never think on those lines. We owe no apology to any third country, friendly or unfriendly, and we do not stand in need of offering any defence while we value this relationship. It is based on principles. It has worked to the mutual benefit and satisfaction of both the countries and, therefore, we intend to strengthen it and we attach a great deal of importance to it. Let this be understood by everyone inside our country and outside our country. It is not at the behest of any third party. We will not permit any third party to have any say in our relationship with any country, much less about our relations with the USSR. This is our basic approach in this regard and I have no hesitation in stating it in no unmistakable terms. Then, on our relations with Pakistan, I have nothing very fresh to say. But I would like to touch upon one aspect which was raised by the Jan Sangh leader Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. He made a mention of the two Resolutions which have been recently adopted by the UN on the question of admission of Bangladesh and the Resolution in which it was suggested that the question of the prisoners of war should also be settled. I would like to clarify the position and I would take this

opportunity to put the matter straight.

As the hon. Members are aware, the General Assembly of the United Nations has adopted two resolutions on the 29th of November. Both the resolutions were adopted without a vote and the President of the Assembly read a statement proposing such adoption by consensus.

The first resolution was a 23-power resolution initiated by Yugoslavia which, considering that Bangladesh was eligible for membership of the United Nations, expressed the desire that Bangladesh will be admitted to the UN at an early date.

The second resolution, co-sponsored by sixteen delegations and submitted on the initiative of Argentina, was, in fact, a compromise proposal designed to avoid acrimonious debate on the Yugoslav resolution. Hon. Members may be aware that Pakistan was intending to move amendments to the Yugoslav resolution which would make the admission of Bangladesh to the United Nations dependent on the release of the prisoners of war. The adoption of the Argentinian resolution had the effect of preventing such amendments.

The Argentinian resolution does not make the question of the admission of Bangladesh to the UN conditional upon the release of the prisoners of war. Therefore, the statement made by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is not justified.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: But the President of the General Assembly spoke about the interdependence of the two resolutions.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Let me proceed. In fact, that resolution does not refer to the question of the admission at all. At the same time, the Argentinian resolution makes specific mention of the Assembly's satisfaction at the steps taken so far to facilitate the restoration of conditions of normalcy in the Asian sub-continent, notably the Simla Agreement.

While calling upon the return of prisoners of war, this resolution also expresses the hope that all parties will refrain from any act which could jeopardise the prospects of settlement and render more difficult eventual reconciliation.

Long negotiations in the United Nations resulted in an understanding that both resolutions, namely, the Yugoslav resolution expressing the desire for the admission of Bangladesh to the UN at an early date and the Argentinian resolution, were adopted without a vote and without opposition by any Member.

As far as the question of prisoners of war is concerned, I have already referred to it in my opening statement and we have made this position clear in the United Nations as well. In particular, we have drawn the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 6 of the Simla Agreement which refers to further discussions between the representatives of the two sides for establishment of durable peace and normalisation of relations including repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees.

Our position that in discussions concerning the repatriation of the prisoners of war, Bangladesh was a necessary party, was also made clear in the United Nations.

The President of the General Assembly referred to the interdependence between the viewpoints as expressed in the resolutions. We believe this to indicate that as long as Pakistan refuses to recognise Bangladesh and Bangladesh is kept out of the United Nations, the solution of the pending problems including the repatriation of prisoners of war would be difficult if not impossible.

I should like to take this opportunity to place on record our satisfaction at the manner in which Shri

Samar Sen, our permanent representative to the U.N. handled the situation and conducted talks with various groups of delegations resulting in the satisfactory outcome of the debate. We have also been gratified to receive reports from other delegations of the excellent work of our Permanent Representative and of the Indian Delegation; and I should like to share with the House the information that the distinguished Foreign Minister of Bangladesh has also expressed to us his great appreciation of the work of our Permanent Representative in the matter. We should not be unnecessarily pessimistic in these matters and we should view the thing in proper perspective.

There are one or two other matters about which I would like to take a little more time.

I told the House yesterday that serious efforts were being made to settle the outstanding differences in regard to the delineation of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir. I can now inform the House that these efforts have been successful.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI (Shajapur): How far it is successful, please let us know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there further complication?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: No complication, further simplification. I thought you would like to know the latest position with regard to this matter.

The Army Chiefs of India and Pakistan met at Lahore yesterday. At the end of the meeting, they issued the following joint statement and I quote from it:

"General Sam Manekshaw met with General Tikka Khan once again at Lahore on December 7, 1972. The meeting lasted three hours and was held in an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual understanding

[Shri Swaran Singh]

The two Chiefs were able to compose the differences that existed and are directing their senior military commanders, Lt. Gen. P. S. Bhagat and Lt. Gen. Abdul Hameed Khan, to meet at Suchetgarh on December 11, 1972 and finalise the delineation of the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir at adjusted by them (that is, the two Chiefs): This line of control will commence from Chhamb Sector and end in the Turtok Sector (Purtapur Sector)."

Hon. Members will appreciate what was involved in the negotiations which concluded in Lahore yesterday was not a territorial question. It involved acceptance by Pakistan of a position which India had held all along, namely, that there was a basic difference between the border dividing the State of Jammu and Kashmir and Pakistan and the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir.

15 hrs.

We are naturally glad that in the interest of not merely the Simla Agreement, but of future relations between the two countries, Pakistan has recognised the validity of our stand. The importance of Pakistan's agreement to withdraw from Thako Chak is likely to be lost if we think merely in terms of territory. In Lahore, our Chief of the Army Staff insisted that the question of Thako Chak had to be settled in terms of its own merits.

Hon. Members will appreciate that the delineation of the line of control consisted in the acceptance or rejection by either side of claims made on the basis of military positions on the day of the cease-fire, namely 17th December, 1971. Indeed, it has been our view that such a delineation is quite different from the controversy over Thako Chak. Since Pakistan agreed to settle the question of Thako Chak, our Chief of the Army Staff re-

viewed some of the claims which Pakistan had earlier made. As a gesture, in the interests of peace and in order to rationalise the line of control, minor adjustments have been made. Finally, hon. Members will appreciate that the essence of all negotiations is not to depict the solution of problems under negotiation as a total victory or a total defeat for one side or the other. In fact, in the interests of peace and in the interest of further implementation of the Simla Agreement, the agreement reached in Lahore yesterday is a victory for both, and if I may add, defeat for none.

Unfortunately, some of my friends opposite are more impressed if there is some note of satisfaction expressed in Pakistan over the outcome of any agreement. We should on merits consider if what has been agreed to is satisfactory or not, whether it meets our viewpoint or not; if it does, and if it is also satisfactory to Pakistan and they express satisfaction, that should not be the basis for raising this controversy, as unfortunately, by Jan Sangh friends, who are always great experts in pinpointing some statement made by Pakistan, whether it be radio or any other statement, do and then try to belittle what we have achieved. It will be a bad day for the country if in order to judge as to whether a particular decision which we have arrived at is good or bad, the touchstone is the satisfaction or non-satisfaction in Pakistan; I would say that would be a very immature way of approaching this problem. We should be happy that Pakistan is also satisfied. Why should this be a matter of grievance?

I would, therefore, like to say that this is an agreement which has been arrived at after a great deal of bargaining, great deal of negotiations, and if it has emerged in a form in which it is broadly acceptable to both sides, no side can say that everything that they wanted to achieve has been achieved, for in that case, there is no need

of negotiation, and I can send some telegrams to the other side or make some statements and leave it to the other side to accept or reject the same

Let us remember the essentials of the basic new relationship that we are trying to develop. The basic new relationship is that there will be differences. The essence of differences is that on several issues, we shall say one thing and Pakistan will say another thing and ultimately the basic approach is that we shall sit together and try to iron out these differences and will arrive at an agreement which is mutually acceptable to both sides.

I would like to warn that if either India or Pakistan proceeds with these bilateral discussions in the spirit that whatever Pakistan says on any matter will be accepted by India or whatever India says will be accepted by Pakistan, that is certainly not the spirit not even the letter of the Simla Agreement. The Simla Agreement has been entered into on the explicit understanding that there will be differences, and these differences will be solved, firstly, peacefully and I would add, secondly by mutual agreement and consent. There will always be some element of give-and-take in the agreements that are forged as a result of these discussions. So, whether it is this point or any other point in future, our approach should be to keep the outside forces away from the Indian sub-continent. The best way to keep outside forces away from the Indian sub-continent particularly in our relations with Pakistan, is to approach these problems in new spirit, the new spirit of willingness on either side to see the viewpoint of the other side also and then try to accommodate that viewpoint, without sacrificing any basic interest of either country, which is in the long run to the good and in the mutual interest of both countries. This is the essence of the Simla Agreement.

If in any negotiation we are going to be held responsible that India took

such and such attitude on a particular issue in the beginning and at the end of the negotiation, it was not fully vindicated, I would like to say that many other occasions will arise when I will go to the negotiating table with a particular stand and as a result of these discussions and negotiations, there will be some change in that stand, because without give-and-take, there is no point in saying that we shall settle all these differences bilaterally and by peaceful means. What will be the result if this attitude is not adopted? Then, the end result will be that we take one line, the other side takes another line, then there will be a deadlock, and again, both sides will run to various other capitals in the world or to the United Nations, and all of us know what the outcome of those approaches will be.

Therefore, I would like to appeal to this House which has always lent such massive support in our efforts to change the unfortunate trends that have gripped the relations between our two countries, to view this Simla Agreement not in terms of this particular clause or that particular clause, but as a basic philosophy which according to us is a good basis for ironing out our differences with Pakistan.

I would also like to say that this type of answerability has also to be viewed in its proper perspective. For instance, it is easy for any negotiator then not to raise any claim which is of doubtful validity, because if we expect miracles, then such a negotiator will always be under this fear that 'I should not raise anything doubtful because if I raise anything doubtful, then people will say that I have given up that claim', and, therefore, he would be answerable as to why he had raised that doubtful claim and afterwards why that position was given up. That is not the way in which these delicate and difficult negotiations can be conducted. The negotiators must have a certain responsibility and also discretion, to get the best possible terms. That is the parameter within which

[Shri Swaran Singh]

any sensible negotiations can be held. For, we shall be hitting our vital interests in a very mortal manner if we were to insist that India should never in any negotiations raise any claim unless it is dead certain that it is going to be accepted by the other side. Is that commonsense? Is that in our interest? Is that a *modus operandi* by which we can safeguard our interest?

Therefore, I would appeal to the House and to the whole country that we should view this problem in the proper perspective and not pick these little points in order to raise merely argumentative points or points for trying to bring in the earlier attitude merely to criticise the ultimate agreement. There will be many occasions when if we want to settle difficult problems with a country like Pakistan, we shall have to adopt an attitude of give-and-take, and it is better that we elaborate this position clearly. For otherwise, what is the alternative?

I was listening very carefully to see if I would get some light in the form of alternatives from any other quarter in the course of the debate. Only one hon. member speaking from the Opposition Benches had an alternative and it, again, was from Shri Vajpayee. What was his alternative? He said: scrap the Simla Agreement and again try to have an agreement between the three countries. Now, if you start any new negotiations by scrapping an earlier agreement, all that I can say is that perhaps, all reasons which I can understand, this is based on a complete lack of experience in international affairs. Any country which starts any fresh negotiation by scrapping an earlier agreement will certainly be not in an advantageous position. If anything, the basic tenets of international law and relations is that even if governments change, the first statement that they usually make is that 'we abide by international agreements'. That is the usual statement that is made by any country. But he wants me to

start by scrapping the Simla Agreement and then sit with the same people to work out another Agreement. How can I inspire any confidence in the other party when I start my negotiations by scrapping the agreement which was signed at as high a level as that of the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan? This is certainly not an alternative.

So there is no use raising the dust and cloud without clearly visualising, the direction in which we are moving, without having any alternative line of approach, without offering anything constructive as to how this is to be handled. Hence the advice that is given is, on the face of it, hollow, unpractical and against our national interest. I would, therefore, say that the best method of handling our relations with Pakistan is to adhere to the Simla Agreement and also to pin the other side down to the implementation of the same and also to carry out their responsibility under the Simla Agreement.

There were some other matters raised but since time is running out, I have no intention to take much time. I would like to say only this much that a word of caution has been uttered by my hon. friend, for whose judgment I have great respect in fashioning our relations with the United States. The previous case history has been cited. It is known to us; all of us know it. It is known to the other side also. I had made a statement, more or less a public statement, which has been widely reported in the press after taking into consideration all these aspects. I would like to say that whatever newspapermen in their enthusiasm may like to describe as a 'love call' or any such thing, there is nothing in that, it is just a down-to-earth assessment of the situation, in making moves which might open the way to improvement of relations. I did not hear any voice which was against improvement of relations if it is possible. Even the critics did not say that it is not desirable to improve relations, if it is

possible. Only words of caution were uttered. I would like to say that we have taken a good look at these aspects of caution and still we feel that we should indicate our desire to improve relations. If the government statement in this respect is carefully studied, the answer to some of the doubts will be there. The essential thing is the acceptance of mutuality of interest between the two countries. If that mutuality of interest is basically accepted, that will be the basis for a move towards normalisation of relations.

I would also like to say that such statements are studied very carefully in foreign offices, particularly in the foreign offices of the countries concerned. We should be glad to note that our desire to normalise relations with the United States of America has not with a positive response. I am not taking of the newspapers. I would like to say that, by and large, the newspapers and other information media in the US had definitely a note correct appreciation of the situation ever since the problem of Bangla Desh took the shape it did last year. But we have noted with satisfaction that Secretary of State William Regors made a statement on the 1st December in which he welcomed our statement concerning friendly and co-operative relations between our two countries. Public and press reaction in the two countries has also been favourable.

So if there is a chance of improvement of relations within the broad framework of what I had said, we will welcome that, and I have no apology to offer in that respect. It is our desire...

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Only a few days ago you said that their attitude was not so friendly or co-operative as seen in the CIA activities.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: What is your objective—that such attitude

should continue? Or we should make some effort...

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: No, no. That was meant purely for domestic purposes.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: This is a serious effort to alter the original un-co-operative attitude, an attitude which lacked understanding, and see that they move from that.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You go on changing. That change would be noted by the country. That was raised only for domestic purposes.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The domestic subject is a separate subject and when matters pertaining to the Home or other Ministries are discussed you will have an opportunity to discuss that. But I would like to take this opportunity to say categorically that this suggestion that it was for domestic consumption is totally wrong.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You are wrong to say that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: If I may say so, this is voicing the sentiments which have been expressed by our critics abroad. I do not want to elaborate further on it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Why?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Do not fall into their trap.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Do not make that kind of statements. You cannot daunt us by such statement. We have got intelligence.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I understand you enough. You need not shout in that manner.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Why are you taking a stand which is so cheap?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I say in all seriousness that this stand which Shri Mishra propounded with great flourish this forenoon is totally incorrect, totally wrong to say that we have made a statement with an eye on the domestic situation is totally unjustified. We know the domestic situation more than the leaders of tiny parties sitting opposite.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
We know what has happened to your massive majority. You are not able to master any crisis.
(Interruptions)

SHRI SWARAN SINGH We know the pulse of the people. We know the interests of the country.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
We know where you stand in the public eye. We know that. (Interruptions)

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I am glad some ripples are being caused both in the Jan Sangh and Cong(O). If this is the first sign of the grand alliance, I take note of it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
What is the grand alliance in this?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH If it is again taking shape, we will take note of it and take our actions accordingly.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI
Which is the grand alliance except that between the Congress, the Communists and the Muslim League in Kerala?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH We would like to carry most of the progressive forces with us. If I can carry my friends of the Communist Party, I will be very glad to do so.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI
Some friends are here also.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
This is your strength, this is how you matter in the international world, that you have become a zero.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI
Why do you unnecessarily talk like this?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I do not want to belittle anyone.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
No Foreign Minister has ever made such a statement with such pedestrian intelligence. You always tire our patience by the most unintelligent statements.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I tired your patience only when you unnecessarily dragged in domestic considerations.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
You brought in the CIA only for domestic purposes. You have the courage to say

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I am not deterred by shouting. I do not mind it at all.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
Many have greater stature than you not only sitting on the top of as Ministry but

SHRI SWARAN SINGH Why should you bring in my stature? My stature may be nothing, but if I happen to be the Minister incharge.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
You deal with the logic of the thing.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I could deal with logic if there was any logic in the criticism. If there is lack of logic, I have to deal with it in the manner it should be dealt with.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA
You are impervious to logic.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I was trying to say that it lacked logic. It I may ask my friends to consider in all seriousness what were the domestic compulsions which might be the basis for making a statement of that kind. We know the situation in the country and the general support that we are

receiving in the country thanks to this Parliament for consistently supporting our socio-economic policies and our efforts to forge unity in the country. We are not faced with any domestic problem so that we should raise a matter of this nature. This is the aspect which I want these excited gentlemen to keep in view. There were no compulsions of any domestic character which necessitated our making a statement of that kind. We have information about the functioning of intelligence agencies of other countries and this in a sense can be called domestic in this respect, it was in the sense of making our people aware of the functioning of these intelligence agencies so that they should take care of it and act in such a manner that they do not fall within the snare of these activities. If you call it domestic, it is domestic there is no other domestic compulsion which the hon Member is trying to inject into this debate.

A view was expressed about the situation in Viet Nam. We share the concern which was expressed by Prof Hiren Mukherjee about the continued military action and bombardment, continued massive military action against the people of Viet-Nam. We earnestly desire restoration of peace and from all reports it appears that the negotiations are at a very delicate stage. All that we should like to say is that we would strongly urge early conclusion and signing of the agreement.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE In the debate yesterday, Mr Goswami suggested that in the Asian context we should try to develop more friendly relations with countries like Japan.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I am glad he reminded me of it and I shall take a few minutes in order to elaborate this point. Mr Goswami and also Mr Dinesh Singh and Mr Bhagat said that we should pay greater attention to economic, technological and cultural co-operation with countries in Asia. I fully accept that approach. As a

matter of fact we have been pursuing this policy quite purposefully. We have very excellent co-operation in the economic field with Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Bangladesh, within our resources we are trying to expand this. I reported yesterday that in Africa we had entered into an agreement with Tanzania to participate in the task of economic development there. Similarly we are desirous of entering into similar agreements with other countries in South Asia and Southeast Asia. Our relations with these countries are growing in every respect—economic, cultural and in technological field and we shall pursue this policy.

Japan has been specifically mentioned. Japan as you know, in the economic sense is a super-power. Their economic strength is immense. They have accumulated foreign exchange reserves—I do not remember those figures now—perhaps more quickly than almost any other affluent country today. In fact it is one of the matters of concern for them how they should shed some of their vast accumulated foreign exchange holdings that Japan has got. We should like therefore to co-operate with them. I should like to add that this co-operation with Japan or with any other affluent country has to be in the context of our own development plans. It has to fit in with our own philosophy about industrial development, it has to fit in with our views about the public sector and public control over the critical and essential sectors of our economy. We shall certainly to everything possible to involve Japan and other countries who might be willing to participate in our economic development to do so. It is in our interest to extend this area and get more and more countries to do so, it is our basic objective that critical areas in which we want control should be in the public sector should be maintained in the public sector. Within this perimeter we welcome co-operation and collaboration from all countries including Japan. It is quite likely that Japan

[Shri. Swaran Singh]

after achieving its high affluence may start having a second look at their general economic involvement in the region I have no hesitation in saying that So far their attitude has been mostly commercial out for high profits Now that they have achieved such a great success if they alter a little of this attitude of trade to look at the problems of the developing countries in a more sympathetic and respective manner it will be a good change and we shall certainly try if we can succeed in achieving that

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER There are a number of substitute motions moved by Shri Bosu, Dr Laxmmaram Pandeya and Shri Ramavatar Shastri I shall put all of them together to the vote of the House

Substitute motions Nos 1, 2 and 3 were put and negatived.

15 27 hrs

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

TWENTIETH REPORT

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI I beg to move

"That this House do agree with the Twentieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 6th December, 1972"

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER The question is

"That this House do agree with the Twentieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolution presented to the House on the 6th December, 1972."

The motion was adopted

15.27 hrs.

Committee on Private Members' Bills and UNEMPLOYMENT—Contd

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER. We shall take up further discussion of the Resolution on the problem of unemployment moved by Shrimati Maya Ray.

Shri Bhandare may continue his speech

SHRI R D BHANDARE (Bombay Central) While speaking on the question of unemployment I was trying to mention the magnitude of the problem. When the First Five Year Plan was drafted the country accepted planning as a means of the development and changing the face of the country and it had three objectives to remove poverty, reduce unemployment and reduce inequality that existed among different classes of people. So far as poverty is concerned, that is not the topic of today's discussion and so I shall not deal with that question, one line is enough forty per cent of the people of India live under poverty line. As regards inequalities, as different reports of Government show, they are increasing inequality between the rich and the poor.

What is the position of unemployment? It has to my mind increased to a disproportionate dimension. Ever since we accepted planned society and planning as a means right from 1951 to 1972, unemployment had steadily increased. While dealing with the figures I must make these points clear. Correct figures are not available both of rural and urban unemployed. We have only the live registers of job-seekers maintained by the Employment Exchanges, from which we get some idea of the staggering proportion of the unemployment problem. I shall divide the period from 1951 to 1972 into three slabs. From 1951 to 1956, 3,28,718 unemployed persons were registered in our employment exchanges. From 1956 to 1966, it went up to 26,22,460. By 1971 it had gone up to 50,99,390. As on 30th June 1972, it is 56,87,972. These figures clearly show that employment opportunities are steadily decreasing and the number of unemployed persons is steadily increasing.

In the interim report on short-term measures submitted by the Government of India Committee on Unemployment, in page 4 it is said, the total