

## (iii) PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS COMMITTEE

13.50 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1970\*—  
*contd.*

SHRI M. B. RANA (Broach): I beg to move:

"That the members of this House do proceed to elect in the manner required by sub-rule (1) of Rule 312B of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, ten members from among themselves to serve as members of the Committee on Public Undertakings for the term beginning on the 1st May, 1970 and ending on the 30th April, 1971."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the members of this House do proceed to elect in the manner required by sub-rule (1) of Rule 312B of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, ten members from among themselves to serve as members of the Committee on Public Undertakings for the term beginning on the 1st May, 1970 and ending on the 30th April, 1971."

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI M. B. RANA: I beg to move:

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate five members from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Undertakings of the House for the term beginning on the 1st May, 1970 and ending on the 30th April, 1971, and do communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate five members from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Undertakings of the House for the term beginning on the 1st May, 1970 and ending on the 30th April, 1971, and do communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

*The motion was adopted.*

## MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 12 and 13 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.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Balampur): They must be after 5 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: Let it be after 5 P.M. Let them indicate the cut motions they would like to move.

## DEMAND NO. 12—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,10,97,000 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, 1971, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

## DEMAND NO. 13—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,01,35,000 be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

13.48 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till forty-five minutes past fourteen of the Clock.*

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at forty-nine minutes past fourteen of the Clock*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—*Contd.*

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*contd.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Hon. Members may now move their Cut Motions.

SHRI BENI SHANKER SHARMA (Banka) : I beg to move:

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

[Failure to reduce the expenditure on missions abroad (34)]

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

[Failure to get the aggression by China vacated (35)]

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

[Desirability of Indianising our missions abroad (48)]

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

[Need of attaching one scholar of Sanskrit to every mission in foreign countries well-versed in our ancient Shastras and Sanskrit literature and other Indian literature to explain and interpret the old tradition of India, about which there is so much demand in foreign countries (49)]

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

[Need of attaching one "Karma Kandi" Pandit to every foreign mission to help the Indians in performing their Sanskaras, including marriages according to Hindu rules (50)]

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

[Need of producing and publishing a small booklet containing answers to questions which are generally asked by foreigners about India and its culture which could be supplied to every Indian citizen going abroad (51)]

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

[Need of making every member of our embassy and high commission staff wear only Indian dresses when on duty in foreign countries (52)]

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

[Need of publishing monthly or fortnightly journals in local languages by our embassies to acquaint the people with India, its hoary past, its culture and its religion (53)]

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

[Need to enforce strict prohibition amongst the staff in the foreign embassies (54)]

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

[Failure to establish good and brotherly relations with Nepal (55)]

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

[Failure to project our secular character in the muslim countries (56)]

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

[Failure to counter-act the mischievous and venomous propaganda lashed out by Pakistan (57)]

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

[Need of non-extension of the terms of Indus Water Treaty with Pakistan by which water shall continue to be supplied to Pakistan in spite of its declared enmity with India (58)].

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

[Fresh exodus of Hindus from Pakistan (59)]

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

[Desirability of improving relations with Pakistan (60)]

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

[Desirability of improving relations with China (61)]

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

[Failure to get the aggression by Pakistan vacated in Jammu and Kashmir (62)]

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

[Pro-Russia policy followed by India and the Russian interference in trade matters with that country (63)]

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

[Failure to check the flow of arms to Pakistan by purchases as well as aid from U. S. A. and U.S.S.R. (64)]

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

[Failure to get the Kashmir question solved under the aegis of United Nations (65)]

SHRI OM PRAKASH TYAGI (Moradabad): I beg to move:

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

[Failure of Indian embassies to project the cultural aspect of India (66)]

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

[Failure to present in foreign countries the true picture of India's economic development (67)]

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

[Neglect in the use of Hindi language in Indian embassies (68)]

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

[Failure to write agreements with foreign countries in Hindi thus giving importance to English only (69)]

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

[Failure to maintain our neutrality in the conflicts going on in Middle East and South Vietnam (70)]

8-4 L. S./70

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

[Failure to increase the number of friendly countries (71)]

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

[Failure to ensure stoppage of the supply of armaments to Pakistan by USA and USSR (72)]

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

[Need to give training to diplomats before their appointment (73)]

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

[Failure to reduce the work load and expenditure of our High Commission in U. K. (74)]

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

[Failure to liberate the Indian land under Pakistani and Chinese occupation through peaceful means. (75)]

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

[Set back to Indian prestige by participating in religious conference at Rabat. (76)]

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

[Failure to get citizenship to stateless Indians living in Malaysia, Ceylon and East Africa. (77)]

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

[Failure to withdraw Kashmir case from U.N.O. (78)]

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

[Failure to establish diplomatic relations with Israel and Taiwan. (79)]

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

[Failure to safeguard the rights and future of Indians residing in East Africa (80)]

[Shri Om Prakash Tyagi]

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

[Failure to get the right of entry into U. K. of those Indians residing in East Africa who possess British passports. (81)]

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

[Failure to establish cultural relations with Mauritius, Guyana and Nepal. (82)]

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

[Failure to raise in U. N. O. the question of annihilation of culture of Tibet by Chinese. (83)]

**SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra):** I beg to move:

That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1.

[Failure to appreciate the significance of the hostile attitude adopted by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam against our country from the beginning and accordingly reformulate our policy. (84)]

That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1.

[Failure to take initiative in constituting a concord of South-East Asian countries for mutual defence and economic development. (85)]

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

[Failure to appreciate the Communist Chinese expansionist policy resulting in the Government of India indulging in the vain hope of China respecting our territorial integrity. (86)]

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

[Failure to take any positive measures to retrieve our territory illegally and forcefully occupied by Communist China for the last 10 years. (87)]

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

[Failure to take steps to stop hostile propaganda against our country

and political leaders now being consistently and regularly carried on by Moscow Radio Peace and Progress. (88)]

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

[Failure on the part of the Government of India to reformulate its policy *vis-a-vis* the West Asian countries in the light of happenings at Rabat. (89)]

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

[Failure to raise the Tibetan issue at the United Nations. (90)]

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

[Failure of our foreign policy *vis-a-vis* Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan where the Communist Chinese influence has been on the increase against the interest of our country. (91)]

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

[Failure to take up with the Co-Chairman of Geneva Agreement the question of re-establishing the International Control Commission in Cambodia where a grave situation exists now consequent on Vietcong entry 7 miles inside Cambodia. (92)]

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

[Failure to take any positive steps for decreasing tension in the former Indo-China arising out of the activities of the Vietcong and other hostile elements where India has special responsibility as the Chairman of ICC. (93)]

**SHRI YASHWANT SINGH KUSHWAH (Bhind):** I beg to move:

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

[Disregard shown to Indian culture, Indian National language and Indian interest in Indian Missions abroad. (101)]

That the demand under the head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100.

[Failure of India's foreign policy. (102)]

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA (Madhubani): I beg to move:

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

[Failure to quit the Commonwealth of Nations in view of Britain's inability to use force against the racialist regime of Rhodesia and Britain's planned blocking the Afro-Asian resolution in the UNO for the same. (103)]

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

[Failure to plead for abolition of the Veto Power used by the big powers in the UNO. (104)]

SHRI R. K. AMIN (Dhanduka): I beg to move:

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

[Failure in not strengthening our High Commissions in East Africa by suitably qualified men. (105)]

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

[Failure in not safeguarding the interests of people of Indian origin in East Africa in the Commonwealth countries Association. (106)]

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

[Failure in developing our close ties with neighbouring countries like Nepal, Sikkim, Burma and Ceylon. (107)]

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

[Failure in not raising the question of freedom of Tibet in U.N.O. (108)]

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

[Failure in maintaining our neutrality in Arab-Israeli conflict (109)]

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

[Failure in not liberating Indian land from Pakistan and China. (110)]

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

[Failure in not developing close economic ties with Israel when there exists a good deal of scope for this. (111)]

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

[Failure in not solving the question of people of Indian origin who are stateless in East Africa. (112)]

SHRI S. SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur): I beg to move:

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

[Need to review our Tibet policy (121)]

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

[Need to check increasing attempts by some foreign countries to interfere with the internal political situation in India (122)]

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

[Failure to improve the plight of the people of Indian origin in East African countries. (123)]

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

[Need to review our relations with the People's Republic of China (124)]

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

[Diplomatic failure in Rabat Conference. (125)]

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

[Ineffectiveness of the International Control Commission in Vietnam (126)]

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): I beg to move:

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

[Policy in regard to India's neighbour States. (143)]

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

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

[Need to accord full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic (144)]

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

[Need of sustained Indian initiative in improving relations with China and with Pakistan (145)]

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

[Need for exchange of embassy level representation with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and recognition of the Peoples' Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam (146)]

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

[Government's attitude towards recent developments in Laos and Cambodia (147)]

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

[Wasteful expenditure in our embassies abroad (148)]

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

[Failure to sustain fight against colonialism, racism and other evils in South Africa, Rhodesia and elsewhere (149)]

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

[Failure to foil imperialist crusade against Arab freedom in the Middle East (150)]

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

[Opening of a separate Mission in Ulan Bator, Mongolia (151)]

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

[Need for improvement of relations with Cuba and with the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea (152)]

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

[India's role in relation to the Himalayan and Trans-Himalayan region (153)]

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

[Attitude towards U. S. atrocities perpetrated in My Lai and other places in Vietnam (154)]

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHARY (Cooch-Bihar): I beg to move:

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

[Need to make arrangement to release all erstwhile properties of Indian citizens seized under the garb of 'Enemy Property' in East Pakistan (155)]

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

[Need to pay compensation for all properties left by Indian citizens in East Pakistan (156)]

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

[Need to collect all available works and information on Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose from various parts of the world (157)]

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

[Need to enquire into the grievances of the minorities in East Pakistan (158)]

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

[Need to construct I.N.A. memorials in Singapore, Burma and Japan (159)]

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

[Need to establish Netaji Museum in Berlin and Tokyo (160)]

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

[Need to open a training centre to impart training to all intending foreign diplomats and their officers (161)]

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

[Need to send those persons in foreign countries as office-employees who know the local language and acquainted with local customs and traditions (162)]

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

[Need to re-fashion the existing office procedure in foreign offices and curtail extravagant expenditure. (163)]

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

[Need to improve the functioning of foreign offices by appointing and assigning duties only to experts (164)]

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

[Need to improve relations with neighbouring countries and supply them books and literature of Indian authors which are readily acceptable to them at a cheap rate (165)]

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

[Failure to get the aggression by Pakistan and China vacated by encouraging dialogue. (166)]

SHRI K. M. MADHUKAR (Kesaria): I beg to move:

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

[Failure to scrutinise and recall those officials in our embassies abroad who have no faith in socialism. (187)]

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

[Failure of officials posted in our embassies abroad to keep themselves posted with the changing situation there. (188)]

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

[Failure to make forceful protest by permanent Indian mission in U. N. O. against imperialist interference

in West Asia, Vietnam and African countries. (189)]

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

[Failure to recognise and establish diplomatic relations with German Democratic Republic. (190)]

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

[Failure to increase commercial relations with Cuba. (191)]

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

[Failure to improve contact with other countries of Commonwealth by excluding Britain from it. (192)]

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

[Failure to stop huge expenditure being incurred by Indian embassies in the name of entertainment. (193)]

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

[Failure to economise in the gift given by a socialist country like India in the marriage of crown Prince of Nepal. (194)]

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

[Failure to stop extravagance in travelling expenditure by the officers going abroad. (195)]

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

[Failure to curb American interference in the International Control Commission despite the fact that India is still its Chairman. (196)]

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

[Failure to review the work of Indian publicity organisation in London. (197)]

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

[Futility of Indian publicity in London. (198)]

[Shri K. M. Madhukar]

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

[Failure to provide suitable assistance to helpless Indians in foreign countries. (199)]

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

[Failure to provide suitable facilities to class IV employees of Indian Missions abroad in keeping with the standard of living there. (200)]

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

[Failure to remove disparities in respect of salary, working conditions and other facilities of clerks and other officers working in Indian Missions abroad. (201)]

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

[Failure to remove wide disparity between class IV employees and high officials of Foreign Missions. (202)]

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

[Failure to stop American influence in the Ministry of External Affairs. (203)]

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

[Failure to curb excessive expenditure by Government Missions and officials going abroad. (204)]

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

[Poor quality of Indian propaganda material being published in foreign countries. (205)]

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

[Failure to repudiate the hostile Pakistani and Chinese propaganda (206)]

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

[Failure to give ideological shape to anti-Indian propaganda by China

when India has declared socialist pattern of society as its objective. (207)]

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

[Failure to bring efficiency into the activities of Indian Ambassadors posted abroad. (208)]

That the demand under the head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100.

[Need to increase the facilities being given to sikh and muslim pilgrims going outside India. (209)]

That the demand under the head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100.

[Need for proper rehabilitation arrangements for Indians who have returned from Burma. (210)]

That the demand under the head 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100.

[Failure to enter into technical and economic collaboration with North Vietnam. (211)]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The Cut Motions are also before the House.

SHRI ASOKA MEHTA (Bhandara) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is not easy to speak about this Ministry because in the corridor of power one hears the whisper that the Minister has lost his mandate, that the heaven's mandate has been taken away from him. Then again one is told that there is a running feud in his Ministry, a feud that is undermining the authority of the Minister. As a Member of Parliament I would like to assure the Minister that in case there is any such feud, we are on his side, as we would not like the authority of the Minister to be undermined whatever his competence or otherwise.

Now I would like to turn to the Report. The very opening sentence is :

"A decade of significant changes came to an end during the year under review. . . . And it marked the beginning of a whole new set of ideas and concepts."



One looks in vain in the Report and, I am sorry to say, at the working of the Ministry to see any new ideas and concepts, leave aside a whole new set of ideas. I would very much like to know from the Minister as to what are the new ideas and new concepts that have been injected into our understanding of the world or our relations with other countries of the world.

In the Report it is recognised that the cold war has come to an end. For instance, at page 18 it is said :

"Today, in spite of the visible end of the cold war and the general acceptance of co-existence, the two super powers maintain their basic rivalries in the realm of ideology and power politics. Non-alignment, therefore, continues to remain valid ..."

I presume that what the Minister is suggesting is that non-alignment has to be understood or re-interpreted in a manner whereby it becomes relevant to a world in which the cold war has come to an end and where the rivalries, the stubborn rivalries, are in the realm of ideology and in the realm of power politics. I presume that as far as power politics is concerned, we would like to remain non-aligned, but I do not know from the sentence it is not clear to me whether the Government is also non-aligned as far as ideology is concerned, because the entire stance of the Government shows that there is no such understanding about the ideological confusion and confrontation in the world.

Then again, there has been a remarkable change in the world. The frozen world is in motion again. We find that there is a dialogue going on between the United States and the USSR. There is a similar dialogue, though not so open, between the United States and China. At least for the time being sabre-rattling has been suspended and certain discussions are going on between USSR and China. Even the relations between China and Yugoslavia have improved very much. But one finds that the only meaningful dialogue in which our colleagues opposite have been engaged are the ones between Shri Jagjivan Ram and Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, or between Raja Dinesh Singh and Shri C. B. Gupta. I am not aware of any meaningful dialogue between our Government and our neighbours with whom our relations have been strained for a long time.

A state of deep-freeze prevails over Sino-Indian and Indo-Pak relations. Not only have no new ideas and no new concepts emerged as far as our foreign policy is concerned, but we remain frozen in our postures. I feel depressed and distressed that even our relations with Nepal have, instead of improving, somewhat deteriorated. Our Minister visited Nepal more than once I believe during the year and emphasized that there is a special relationship that exists between Nepal and ourselves. There is no doubt that if we look at the terms of the Agreement that binds the relations of the two countries, one is entitled to say that there is a certain kind of special relationship. Geographically, culturally, economically, historically and in every other way Nepal-India relations should be as close as one can conceive, but one is surprised and one is shocked to find that Nepal advocated Pakistan's entry into the non-aligned group, which means that we were not able to carry even Nepal with us in a matter of vital importance to us and of critical significance to the whole concept of non-alignment. And Nepal has become somewhat non-committal in its stand on Kashmir.

These are the vital issues on which we should like to find out the stand of friendly countries when we talk of special relationship. These are matters of such vital importance; not only are they vital for our national interests, but they are vital and important from the point of view of basic principles that we cherish. That we should not be able to carry Nepal with us is a measure of the success or the failure of our foreign policy.

A great deal of space has been devoted in this report to Mr. Brezhnev's proposal for collective security in Asia. After going through what has been written in the report and whatever the Minister has said in the House and outside, one is unable to understand what precisely Mr. Brezhnev's proposals are and how we are reacting to them. Our reaction has been brought out on page 5 where the Prime Minister is quoted as saying:

"We believe that security can be best ensured by economic co-operation and ensuring respect for the territorial integrity and independence of various countries, by renouncing the use of force in the settlement of

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

disputes and by refraining from interference in the internal affairs of other countries."

This is a beautiful doctrine, Shrimati Indira Gandhi's doctrine that has been propounded. But how precisely do you make it effective? It is a doctrine without any teeth in it; it is a paper doctrine. How is this paper doctrine to be made effective? Because if there is any country in the world today that is caught in the flames of war, it is our continent, Asia; both in West Asia and Southeast Asia a number of countries are caught not only in turmoil but in open warfare now going on there. How precisely is this doctrine to be made effective? Over and over again one tries to look into whatever documentation is available and one finds that except for a pious wish, the Government of India have nothing very much to offer.

The Government of India has been extending its appreciation and some kind of academic support to the proposal to hold a European Security Conference, a conference which is sought to be organised and which is being supported by non-aligned countries of Europe. Finland itself has been taking a leading part in getting this kind of a conference organised. I do not know why the Government of India is completely unconcerned about any kind of Asian Security Conference. After all it is in Asia that all kinds of wars and conflicts are going on and they are going to affect us profoundly. One is unaware of even any thinking about these matters. While other countries are going about and getting together in different regions and they seem to be formulating certain plans and policies—very often these plans and policies are likely to be somewhat injurious to our interests we seem to have no attitude. While we applaud efforts for European security we have no initiative to offer for Asian security! We seem to be somewhat unconcerned about the developments that are taking place. You are aware, Sir, that we have in our country the Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis. In its most recent publication I find that it has quoted an article in the course of which it is stated:

"While no nation ever truly owns an ocean, it is likely that the Soviet Union will be close to owning the Indian Ocean; the Soviet seems bent

on becoming the dominant naval power in the Indian Ocean.... Approximately 15 Soviet and East European ships pass the Cape of Good Hope every day".

I do not know what again is the attitude of the Government of India. They seem to believe that the Russians, the Americans, the Chinese will all somehow balance themselves and it is not necessary for us to play any role. Indian Ocean is an ocean with which we are intimately connected. If it is going to be converted into a lake of one power or another we should be concerned about it. One looks in vain again in the report as to what we are doing about it and what is our view about it. What is mentioned, what is underscored in the report is that the Soviet Union is an Asian Power. It is of course an Asian power. It is a European Power as well as an Asian power. But do we want it to be the dominant Asian Power? India is a big country. We do not want any country from outside this continent to become dominant; we do not want any country inside this continent also to be a dominant country. The Conservative Party in British is suggesting that it will maintain, it will perpetuate the British military presence in South East Asia. They are already talking about having a conference of Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Malaysia and if possible Indonesia. Various things are happening in Cambodia.... We have found that the Indonesians are also taking interest in it. All these countries are concerned, worried. But we seem to be satisfied with playing somewhat an isolated and marginal role.

15 hrs.

Either in the report or earlier, the Minister has said that the Americans would withdraw from South East Asia. We would like the Americans to withdraw from there, but any withdrawal of the Americans from that area is likely to create a number of problems. Take, for instance, Thailand. In Thailand, the Thai economists have said that American withdrawal would mean that there would be a loss of 100 million to 150 million dollars per year to the Thai economy, and it will bring unemployment to about 100,000 to 200,000 people. I believe both Japan and India have a responsibility to help Thailand to see that such an economic breakdown there is averted.

The Minister talks about all kinds of economic co-operation. But what is happening in Thailand? What is the result there? In Thailand, on the one side there is a consciousness, again an effort, to lean upon the United States which we would not like or, on the other side, sentiments are expressed which are very dangerous. The Leader of the Opposition in the Thai Parliament has said that Thailand will have to be like a bamboo that has to bend before any storm. I would not like my neighbouring country, Thailand, with whom we are culturally and in many other ways associated, to become a bamboo that has to bend before a storm. If Mrs. Indira Gandhi's doctrine has any meaning, then no country should be reduced to the position of a bamboo that has to bend before a storm.

The reason why I believe even Yugoslavia and China have been able to improve their relations is this: there is a certain amount of dialogue, discussion; a certain amount of mutual confidence has been generated between the two countries. No such development has taken place as far as China and India are concerned. According to me, there are many reasons, but one reason is that we somehow or other have specialised in being very clever.

When the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia, this is what China had to say:

"What exactly does the 'theory of limited sovereignty' mean? It means that the sovereignty of the Soviet revisionist social empire is 'unlimited.' It can extend at will its own 'sovereignty' to other countries and to the whole world because the sovereignty of other countries is 'limited' . . . . The Soviet revisionists have been riding rough shod over countries in their 'community,' violating their sovereignty at will, intervening in their internal affairs and destroying recognized elementary principles of state sovereignty lock, stock and barrel."

Why should China say this, apart from any tirade. any campaign that China may want to carry on against the Soviet Union? I believe China had valid reasons to come out and make this denunciation.

I find that the Bulgarian Foreign Minister—and the Foreign Minister of

this country will concede that Bulgaria, of all the East European countries, is the closest to the Soviet Union—had to say this in 1969. Mr. Ivan Bashev, the Bulgarian Foreign Minister, said:

" . . . the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies would intervene in other Communist countries 'should developments like those in Czechoslovakia take place'. 'Such a joint action,' he said, 'is also possible (against China) should the border incidents between the Soviet Union and China endanger the socialist camp.'"

When this is the kind of a threat held out against China also, Yugoslavia at least has the courage to get up and say "we will not permit this." Not only Yugoslavia, but in no other country you are going to permit any other country, no matter howsoever powerful, to interfere, intervene and to propound as absurd, atrocious doctrine of unlimited sovereignty like the Brezhnev doctrine. Even on this doctrine, my friend the Foreign Minister does not want to say anything, lest somebody gets displeased. Nonalignment has been reduced to non-speech, lest you say something which might hurt someone somewhere. Sir, foreign policy is not carried on by maintaining a vow of silence. Some countries follow "low visibility" policy in foreign affairs. We seem to favour "no visibility." A vow of silence where something significant and meaningful has to be said on behalf of a country of 500 million and odd people! Our vasculations are responsible, according to me, among other reasons, why what Yugoslavia has succeeded in doing, we have not succeeded in achieving so far.

We have opposed, abhorred, outside interference in Vietnam. I believe on this side of the House as well as on that side, we have equally been concerned about interference in the three countries of Indo-China from outside. But while we have objected to this interference, we seem to think that North Vietnam has a fundamental right to interfere in the affairs of Laos and Cambodia. What is sauce for some other goose is not sauce for the North Vietnamese gander, North Vietnam's interference in Laos and Cambodia is important, because these are the two countries which are culturally close to us. The very name Indo-China suggests that one part of that peninsula is historically and culturally close to China and another part historically and

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

culturally close to India. If nowhere else at least in Laos and Cambodia we have a responsibility. The Ho Chi Minh Trail has been converted into a Ho Chi Minh doctrine, like the Brezhnev doctrine, entirely their right to interfere in Laos and Cambodia. I have great respect for the North Vietnamese for fighting for the unity of their country. We mourn their 600,000 soldiers killed. But I cannot understand, I am not willing to concede to any of them, in the name of some abstruse revolution the right to interfere in the internal affairs of Laos and Cambodia.

**SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA** (Begurairai) : What about the Americans ?

**SHRI ASOKA MEHTA** : You must remember that around the Mekong River, the Laotian population is spread. A great majority of the Laotian population live in Thailand. Thailand is directly and inevitably concerned. If twice or three times or four times the number of Laotians are to be found in Thailand than in Laos, surely you cannot expect Thailand to be unconcerned about it. If Thailand is concerned about it, we should be equally concerned about it. I do not want any outside element to interfere there, but then one must ensure that. Even when the Prime Minister of Laos comes here, neither our Prime Minister nor our Foreign Minister has anything significant to say publicly. And, that they have not said anything significant privately is proved by the fact that nothing happened afterwards.

About Cambodia, one does not know what the policies are. Some people say that we have to wait for the policies to be enunciated in some other capital of the world ! Have we been reduced to the position where we have got to wait for the light to shine on some other hilltops before we are able to formulate our own policy ?

In the Middle-East, we have been deeply concerned by the aggravation and escalation of the conflict there. We, at least the bulk of us in this House, are also concerned over Israeli intransigence there. We cannot condone the occupation of Arab territories by Israel. But increasingly religion is getting mixed up with Middle-Eastern politics. I do not

know whether the Foreign Minister is having any second thoughts about our misadventure at Rabat. Whether he has any second thoughts or not, they have been having very interesting thoughts. What has happened in Jeddah should make us realise to what extent Islamic politics is being injected into the Middle-Eastern conflict and other conflicts also. Pakistan has, to a certain extent, succeeded in outsmarting, outmanoeuvring and encircling us. It is a matter of real concern to me that in the Secretariat that is being set up there, the Secretary-General will be a Malaysian. Malaysia and India have been great friends. On the whole in Malaysia and India, we have tried to follow similar policies. Now, Malaysia has been involved in this Islamic secretariat. Indonesia was also there. And among the Arab countries, whatever be the reluctance on the part of certain countries, the fact remains that increasingly the politics of the Israeli-Arab dispute is getting religious overtones.

Then, Pakistan is getting directly involved in the dispute. There are between 2,000 to 3,000 Pakistani troops in Jordan, 200 to 300 infantry men as part of the training mission in Jordan and it is now suggested,—I do not know how far it is true but in responsible foreign journals I have read it—that Pakistani pilots are likely to fly the French Mirage planes when they are delivered to Libya. This involvement of Pakistan in that area can have far-reaching repercussions, the Islamisation of the dispute and direct involvement of Pakistan. What is our approach ? If we want to take sides there, let us take sides and at least get the benefit of it. We seem to be losing both ways. We are willing to wound but we are afraid to strike as a result of which all round we seem to be losing.

Then I come to the next important problem in which we are all interested. This country pioneered de-colonisation. We were the pioneers of the freedom movement, the liberation movement of the world and we continue to be deeply concerned about the liberation movements elsewhere, particularly in Africa. On page 15 of the Report it is stated:

"We continue to extend our sympathy and support to the liberation movement in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea."

Of what value is this sympathy and support, as far as the Portuguese colonies are concerned? All our sympathy and support for our people in Goa had no meaning and ultimately we had to resort to arms to liberate them. What are we doing to help them concretely? Take China. In 1968 the Chinese gave the liberation movement nearly Rs.1½ crores. One would like to know what the government is doing, what is the concrete way in which we are going to help them. If it is just sympathy and support, how are we going to retain our foothold in Africa? Surely the Foreign Minister knows what Russia is doing, what China is doing, what America is doing, what France is doing and what Japan is doing. There are certain key countries in Africa with which we have to be concerned about our future relations and among them, I believe, the most important countries are those who are fighting for freedom. Because, if we do nothing else, we can at least share the flame of liberty, not the mere words "we give you sympathy". What did we think when we were given words of sympathy when we were fighting for our independence? We wanted some concrete action, concrete co-operation. In the world of today I believe it is necessary that we move beyond mere verbal sympathy.

I do not know; the Foreign Minister may feel happy or he may feel unhappy. When I compare his record with his British counterpart. The other day I was reading *New Statesman*. And the *New Statesman* of Britain, after carefully considering the foreign policy that country has been following,—as you know, under the Labour Government British stature has continuously gone down—this very radical paper sums up its judgment of the foreign policy of Britain in the following words, and I am reading these words because they sum up my judgment on the foreign policy of our government,

"It is possible to be in foreign policy both immoral and inefficient. Foreign policy is not necessarily more effective merely for being craven. You claim to have chosen difficult but adult international course. What in fact the Foreign Minister has achieved is a charade of maturity. It is dubious policy, and on present showing, an unsuccessful one."

This judgment passed by *New Statesman* on the British foreign policy is the kind of judgement which history will pass on the work of Shri Dinesh Singh.

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA** (Bangalore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the foreign policy is not a subject which is to be discussed like other subjects in a partisan spirit. The democratic tradition and the parliamentary approach is to see as much common ground between party and party as it is possible to find. If we go on making comments, adverse and hostile, on every subject, every topic, every pronouncement that the government makes, obviously that is a highly partisan approach wholly unsuitable to a debate on foreign affairs.

My hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, from beginning to end, found nothing good or concrete in our foreign policy. In fact, the foreign policy that we had been pursuing all along these two decades had his personal approval. I suppose, he has been differing from this foreign policy only for the last two months. The policy which Nehru pursued and which has been described on the very first page of this report seems to have stood the test of time.

Foreign policy is not a proposition which can be shaped by one party. The international situation is so complicated that not even America and Soviet Russia are able to fashion their foreign policy to the satisfaction of their own selves, leave alone the satisfaction of all the parties in democratic countries.

He was speaking of Asia. He expects India to dominate the situation in Asia. It so happens that three powers are firmly fixed on this continent. China is there; India is there as also Soviet Russia by reason of its vast landmass in this continent.

AN HON. MEMBER : Also Ceylon.

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA** : This kind of levity does not add to the dignity of the debate.

Leave alone India, even the mighty Soviet Russia and China are not able to make the foreign policy of this continent one harmonious whole. To pretend that anyone in this world would be able to fashion foreign policy to one's own liking is mere imagination.

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

The debate is at best an occasion to pour hostile intensions on one's opponent.

AN HON. MEMBER : Pakistan seems to be succeeding.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA : In our anxiety we ourselves exaggerate the danger of Pakistan in one breath and in another we are overestimating the strength of Pakistan and undermining the reputation of India. We must bear in mind that with all these alliances and arms supply, Pakistan was able to do pretty little to us in the two confrontations it had with us. All the time to exaggerate one's enemy's importance, power and wisdom is certainly not the way of enhancing the reputation of one's country which we all have in mind.

You say that India is a land of 550 millions and it must play its due part. But, at the same time, you cannot go on saying that everything Pakistan does is right and everything India is doing is wrong. This is an approach which is neither sound nor logical nor appropriate to the occasion. We have developed recently such attitudes in the political world that we see nothing right in our country. All the time we work up our anxiety to decry India and find fault with every aspect of the situation. As I appealed to the House, this is not the approach we have to make in the matter of foreign policy. There must be a consensus evolved between the leaders of the Opposition and the leaders of Government so that all of us can feel a sense of participation not only in the making of our foreign policy but also in supporting it. If for that purpose the leaders of the Opposition want from time to time meetings with the External Affairs Minister and have discussions, that will be a welcome move and can legitimately be made.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : We have to go to Lucknow to meet him because most of the time he is in Lucknow.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA: He is very much here. You are so over-conscious about his movements that you forget the time he spends in Delhi. All the time you are conscious of his presence elsewhere. This is hardly an excuse or argument that could be advanced

by a responsible Member of the House.

The meetings can be arranged. It is only the proper attitude that is required.

Coming to the Indo-China question, Shri Asoka Mehta, described, by reason of the proximity of India and China, that area is known as Indo-China. But things have so worked out that it is neither India nor China that is playing a dominant role in the area but Soviet Russia and U.S.A. I agree that this area must be freed from foreign domination and foreign intervention. Let the people be allowed to choose their own form of Government. I will go to the extent of saying, if people want communism, let it be even communism—it is their own affair—if people want their country to be socialistic, let them have it. If they want democratic form of Government, let them have it. That is the right approach from the point of view of the people.

What has actually happened is this. In the good old days, it was the civilisation and culture of India or China that shaped the events. Now it is Soviet influence and American influence. They have spoiled the place and put the whole population into untold miseries.

Shri Asoka Mehta was speaking of the economic help that is being given by America to Thailand. The same is the case with South Vietnam. In South Vietnam, I understand, because of this war, even an ordinary man has got a transistor. Many people have cars. American money which comes into the country in the form of pay to the soldiers, the equipment and other aids and amenities have boosted the economy. In the matter of consumer goods, Vietnam is far ahead and far more prosperous than any other South Asian country. But that is a very unnatural prosperity. If you tell a sick man, "Yes, you have got bed here with clean bed-sheets, a white-washed room and people to attend on you. All these facilities you cannot have at home. It is better to continue to be in the hospital than in your house", that will be an absurd argument. If in Indo-China, by reason of the help that is being given either by America or by other countries, the people are enjoying some amenities and facilities, these are wholly unhealthy and artificial.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: Do you know what foreign armies are in this region?

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA :** It is exactly the Indian point of view that all foreign armies in this region must be withdrawn, that is, American, Soviet Union or any other. Unless all these foreign armies, including the communist army, are withdrawn and, in the true spirit of the Geneva Conference Agreement, and the people are allowed to elect their own form of Government.

**SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) :** Czechoslovakia.

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA :** My hon. friend, Shri Sondhi, is all the time thinking of Czechoslovakia. I wish he took much more interest in Indian affairs than in Czechoslovakian affairs.

**SHRI RANJEET SINGH (Khalilabad) :** Why are you taking so much interest in foreign affairs?

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA :** I make bold to say that we take interest in foreign affairs in the interest of our country and world peace. We are not taking interest being pressurised by this country or that country. Those of you who laugh at the Government of India for its foreign policy, please search your own conscience whether you are not being influenced by some foreign country or the other.

In Indo-China, we must see that, ultimately, the troops of every foreign country, including those of the neighbouring countries, are withdrawn and the people allowed to chose their own form of Government.

When such a straight path is embarrassing to America it brings in its army in the name of containing Communism. If it does not suit China and other Communist powers, they bring in their infiltrators in the name of Communism. All these missionary like activities should be given up. Freedom, human freedom, must be the prior consideration in the matter of shaping policies and ideas of these countries.

Many people are blaming India that we have not started a dialogue with China as if it is our fault. Any self-respecting Indian would hesitate to accuse India in this matter. When China has committed aggression, struck our hand of friendship and perpetrated crime, for any Indian to say that we are at fault

and, therefore, we should take the initiative, shows either want of patriotism or mere hostility to Government. Therefore, silence, of which my hon friend, Mr. Mehta, accused us with, is many a time more appropriate than speech. In the case of Pakistan and in the case of China sheer self-respect dictates that we must exercise patience in the matter of exercising our vocal power. There are some people in the House who are in the habit of exaggerating the importance of Pakistan, its equipment, its arms and its foreign policy. Never before I have heard people unintentionally give all credit possible to that hostile country. It is better that we exercise a little moderation in exaggerating the importance of Pakistan. That is to our own good.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Where is Pakistan?

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA :** I never thought that a Member of the Jana Sangh would be so ignorant of geography.

**15.30 hrs.**

[**SHRI K. N. TIWARY** in the Chair.]

India is following a policy of friendship. All that we should do in the context of the international situation dominated by two or three powers is to bring some approach which they can appreciate. That can be done only by friendly talk and by reasonable approach. It is not our policy to threaten any country or become hostile to any country. That will not serve any useful purpose. That is why our policy of being friendly to all nations as far as possible is the only correct policy. If you threaten or make hostile statement, that will not help the situation. That is why our Prime Minister pays friendly visits to many countries. Appropriate authorities of many countries pay friendly visits to this country. We have been able to have dialogues, bilateral dialogues. Whether it is America or Soviet Russia or whether it is Yugoslavia or Nepal we have these useful bilateral talks and we are trying to smoothen matters. We must ultimately see that human freedom is allowed to exist unrestricted without any ideological hostilities. It is these ideological hostilities that have been the ruin of the Indo-China area. The proposals that France has made is welcome to India. And I hope, these 5 or 6 Governments will be able to meet again in a conference and

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

this time evolve agreement and take concrete steps, so that the people of this vast area of Indo-China are freed from their difficulties and the ravages of war. This is the policy that the Government of India is following. And, therefore, it ought to receive the approval and the approbation of all the parties in this House.

**SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA:** Did you ask the American armies to quit? What is the use of giving this sermon to us?

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA:** Even if my friend asks American armies to quit Indo-China that will also be a sermon, Sir. You cannot suddenly change the foreign policy of either the Soviet Union or of America; it takes time; it takes persuasion. If you become too much attached to one party or the other, your voice will count for nothing. Our policy of all-round friendship is the one which will ultimately make India great, which will make the voice of India prevail, which will help the establishment of peace in the world.

Sir, the other day, I was very happy to see that the Government of India took a decision to curtail the cultural activities of various embassies in this country. Sir, India does not need coaching on culture and civilization. What these embassies are doing in fact is only propaganda. Propaganda in their own ways for their own ideologies Sir, the Press Registrar in his Report says:

"24 out of 76 Missions or Embassies in India have publishing Houses. The newspapers and periodicals that are being published in India by these Foreign Embassies are of the order of 103 and their circulation is of the order of 12,80,000."

The Government of India has been demanding that these embassies should conform to the Vienna Convention and that this kind of propaganda is not consistent with the ambassadorial relation between country and country. They have also been reminding these embassies that this expansion is undesirable, and should be curtailed. India cannot be made a field for propaganda and conversion. Well-established conventions in the field of foreign affairs should be strictly adhered to. Propaganda may have its own value in the modern world but if

ultimately worsens the situation. Some people have become fanatical either this way or that. It is this fanaticism that has placed Indo-China in its present pitiable situation. We must, well in time, guard against the development of this kind of danger in India.

The number of personnel in foreign embassies must be proportionate to the work involved in the embassy. This is a principle that has to be strictly enforced.

Now, there are some embassies in India whose number is as big as that of some of our State Secretariats. This is a very delicate matter. Government of India has to take serious note of it. The periodicals, their circulation as also the number of personnel in an Embassy have all to be within a reasonable limit. India cannot be made the field of experimentation of foreign ideologies. I hope the move of the Government of India already taken in this regard deserves our support. We must give further support to government to contain these embassies and their activities.

Sir, an hon. Member posed the danger of Islamic Secretariat being established by the Middle-East countries. We cannot prevent these Middle-eastern countries from taking any steps they like. Nor need we be perturbed much about it. All the Middle-eastern countries put together are not anywhere near the population of India. Besides our strength depends upon our own industrialisation; our strength depends upon our own army. Therefore if some countries have archaic ideas of their religious, in this modern age, we must point out to them that it is they who will ultimately suffer for their policies. I am surprised to find that Shri Mehta went on paying indirect compliment to the formation of this Secretariat and decrying the Indian attitude. Did we support the idea of this Islamic Secretariat coming into existence? On the other hand our line of thinking has been to dissuade the formation of such a Secretariat. Some of these countries are in agreement with our line of thinking. The United Arab Republic and one or two countries differed radically from the others. But they were overpowered in their conference. If they take to this wrong line, it is they that will suffer and not India. Therefore, let us not get worried. If we see all this in the context of world picture it becomes clear that these religious



conferences will not matter much. Ultimately they will put themselves in the wrong. Our policy of friendship is universally applicable to one and all. If the Middle-eastern countries continue to follow fanatical approach to political problems, India may be forced one day to recognise Israel. It is not that Israel is a country hostile to India. It has never done anything wrong or hostile to this country. In spite of that, we support the Middle East countries because they are in an unfortunate situation. Our attitude is that any one who is oppressed, or attacked, deserves sympathy. We stand by the underdog and the oppressed. It is in this true human spirit that we are trying to give moral support to the Middle East countries. If they do not want such support from India, if they do not want our co-operation in their policy, and pursue this Islamic kind of foreign policy, and organise Pan-Islamic secretariats and establishments, it is their affair and responsibility. Let us not worry about the mistakes they make.

**SHRI RANJEET SINGH:** What about Bhutan? He has said nothing about it.

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA:** Having entered politics late, my hon. friend requires to be educated even in regard to Bhutan.

So far as the neighbouring countries are concerned, our relations with them are good. Whether it is Nepal, Ceylon or South Asian countries, we have been able to improve our relations with them. I am happy to note that Indonesia which became hostile to India under Soekarno's leadership has discarded that policy, even as it discarded Dr. Soekarno. Our relationship with Indonesia is growing well.

As for Nepal, there have been too many visits to that country by our President, Prime Minister and External Affairs Minister. A general impression is produced in the mind of the people in India which makes them ask: why so much attention to Nepal? If Nepal wants to play one against the other and always puts India on tenter-hooks, we might say to her 'Peace for yourself'. If she wants to overplay her part, I am afraid it will ultimately not work. I am myself a great friend of Nepal and I know the King of Nepal. But I want Nepal to realise its sense of proportion. She is exploiting India too much. It is time

the Government of India woke up a little and stood firm against all her manipulations. If they go to the Chinese side, it is very likely that what has happened to Tibet will happen to the King of Nepal too. If he wants it, let him have it. But he should not be allowed to browbeat India. He should not be allowed to make it appear that he is on par with India, that he can browbeat India and can do anything with India. This impression must be rectified. Though Government may have much more information than I have, I am merely reflecting the opinion of the common man, that Nepal is over-playing its part.

The aim of our foreign policy should be definite and precise. May be our policy of non-alignment is good, but it is only a means. What is the ultimate end? In the famous resolution framed by Mahatma Gandhi when he sponsored the Quit India Movement in Bombay, he envisaged a Federation of the World. Pandit Nehru also in several of his pronouncements acknowledged that to be the desirable goal, though it is distant.

**SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH:** You used to criticise him in those days.

**SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA:** Ultimately that seems to be the only solution to avoid the evil consequences of all power blocks, aggressions and ideological attitudes. Whether it is in the United Nations or in international conferences, India must always try to project the image of World Federation. It is desirable not at a distant future but within a reasonable period of time so that this world can get rid of wars and conflicts.

I agree with many of my friends on the opposite side, and the same point has been made by many of us on this side also, that the Indian image has to be improved in international conferences. I have attended several conferences. Commonwealth Parliamentary and Inter-Union Conferences and the like. In the matter of projecting our image, it is the person who is sent from India that counts, his stature, knowledge ability and his approach to problems. Secondly, there must be continuity. The other countries send the same people continuously to these conferences, whether it is the United Nations Assembly or other international conferences, so that they develop contacts and friendship, they get to know things. They will be able

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

to participate effectively in the proceedings and take the initiative in framing resolutions. Unfortunately, for the last 20 years in this country the delegations sent are *ad hoc* delegations. If a person is sent one year, he will not be sent the next year. Therefore, Indian leadership has not been allowed to develop in the area of foreign conferences and international meetings. If India is to make its impression, impact, there must be continuity in the selection of delegates, at least for a period and men of ability and understanding and stature must be selected instead of bestowing it as a matter of patronage.

**SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra):** When my party asked me to speak on External Affairs, I was very hesitant to do so because it repulses my sense of cricket. I felt that it was such an unequal match that we were going to play that it was not really worth the effect of trying to browbeat my poor friend who really at this point of time needs considerable support. But when I read this magnificent report that the Ministry has produced I was convinced more than ever that I should skip down instead of speaking against the report. As a matter of fact I have to leave this evening because I cannot bear the idea of having to face my friend Mr. Dinesh Singh replying to what I have to say. I really do not know why the External Affairs Ministry takes the trouble of producing this report. For sheer inept drafting and lack lustre presentation it would be difficult to beat. In many ways it represents the sort of times that we are passing through; it reflects to a very large extent the dead, wooden thinking of the External Affairs Ministry. In many ways it also exposes what is going on in the Ministry itself. Because if you were to read some of the choice passages that you can find here, you will conclude that for its sheer non-sensical collection of words and prize clichés, it would be difficult to beat. I have collected a few samples so that the House may be amused:

"India has consistently held the view that fundamentally the peace and security of the region depend on the economic development and political stability of the countries of the region."

Another one:

"We hold that independent development of the countries of the region and regional co-operation amongst them as well as international co-operation with outside powers interested in the welfare of the region would be the best method of ensuring peace and security in the area."

Here is another:

"India did not in the conduct of its foreign policy neglect the development of bilateral relations with countries in the region."

Another one:

"The international situation has witnessed many far-reaching changes during 1969-70. When the world has been changing, and India itself has been changing, the foreign policy of India could not stand still and remain rigid and inflexible."

Take another:

"India took the stand that these activities should be intensified and co-ordinated and that the non-aligned nations could make a significant contribution to international affairs in the seventies."

Yet another:

"Co-operation has been the main theme of India's foreign policy and we believe that it ought to be the keynote of the policies of nations in the seventies."

If this can pass muster, if this can pass off as foreign policy, we do not need it. We can spend the money for more usefully and fruitfully building houses or producing manure. If you wish to find out what our relations with various countries are this will give you some choice indications: here are some of them. With Afghanistan our relations are 'close and friendly'. With Burma our relations are 'close and friendly'. With Ceylon our relations are only 'close'. With Nepal we 'discussed various matters... in an atmosphere of understanding, mutual trust and traditional friendship', because of our 'close and friendly' relations. With Pakistan 'India continued to make efforts to improve relations'. Our relations with the people's Republic of China 'did not see any improvement', but with Bhutan we have 'close and friendly ties' and with Sikkim the

relations remain 'close and intimate'. I do not know why this departure. With South-east Asia, we have 'cultural co-operation' and with Australia 'relations were further deepened and strengthened'. With Fiji, there was 'considerable progress'. With Indonesia we have close and friendly relations. In Laos, the situation has caused some concern and with Malaysia our relations were cemented by effective co-operation. With New Zealand—

DR. MAITREYEE BASU (Darjeeling): Sir, my sense of humour is defective. I cannot appreciate these remarks. So, what is the use of my staying here? I walk out. (*Interruption*)

[*Dr. Maitreyee Basu then left the House*]

SHRI PILOO MODY: I have got a very long list. With New Zealand, it was decided to step up bilateral economic relations. With Singapore, our relations were only friendly. With Thailand, our relations have grown stronger and particularly in the economic field, and in Vietnam, the Government of India has been in touch with all the concerned governments,—I take it, with the legal as well as the illegal governments,—and continues to hope that a peaceful settlement could be found. With Japan, there is growing scope for economic co-operation. In Korea, the Government of India's policy is to look forward to a peaceful unification of Korea while maintaining friendly relations with both. I do not understand this anxiety of this Government in trying to bring separated countries together like Germany, Korea and Vietnam, because I hear from this very Government ideas about the partitioning of Chandigarh and Belgaum and also, I heard at one time, Delhi.

With Mangolia, Sir, the Government exchanged views—and this is very peculiar—on the current international situation. I take it that no other country in the world was prepared to discuss the current international situation with us. With West Asia and North Africa, we have made sympathetic efforts to further develop India's relations and with Iran there was a significant move forward in co-operation. We have been following with natural interest developments in Bahrein, Qatar and the Trucial States, while with Kuwait, our relations remain friendly. While with Iraq, they remain cordial, with Jordan

and Morocco, we received a setback because of Rabat. But with Lebanon, our relations still remain cordial.

I believe it was the Republic of South Yemen which nationalised the Bank of India over there. And there, our relations remain very friendly and cordial. We continued to render technical and economic assistance to the Republic. With Saudi Arabia, our relations continue to grow. With Sudan, our relations are friendly and with Tunisia, a cultural agreement was signed and with the UAR, our traditional friendly relations developed further. With the Yemeni Arab Republic, they were very friendly.

In Africa, for all the countries south of the Sahara, there was increased mutual co-operation in economic and technical fields, allowing them to recruit doctors, engineers, accountants, railway people and teachers—

AN HON. MEMBER: Not architects.

SHRI PILOO MODY:—not architects—and at the same time throwing-out Indians from that part of the country. I have here a copy of the *Standard* from Tanzania and it is very interesting. What the Alhura declaration says is;

"President Nyerere went on to say that the majority of the merchants were Asians—

meaning—Indians—

"and they not only face the problem of a small group of people monopolising the economy of the country but also the problem of this group being easily identifiable by their colour."

These are the people to whom we have been sending our engineers, accountants and doctors, but not architects.

Our relations with the countries of Europe were "further strengthened through increased contacts and cooperation". We have not been informed about how close our relations with the United Kingdom are, but with France there is "closed friendship and Indo-French cooperation". With West Germany, our 'bilateral relations' have 'developed further in the economic, technical, cultural and other fields' and with the German Democratic Republic, our

[Shri Piloo Mody]

'relations have continued to improve in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding'. With Yugoslavia, our relations 'were marked by traditional warmth, friendship and mutual cooperation' and relations with all European countries 'developed satisfactorily'. Relations with the USSR have 'registered a significant growth' and for the U. S. there is a great fund of friendship and goodwill in India. With Canada, our relations 'were marked by traditional cordiality and cooperation'.

16 hrs.

In Latin America, we have broken new ground and the possibilities for economic exchanges have received some attention.

I do not want to bore you any further, but if you know half a dozen words, it is possible to write a report like this. The rest of the report deals with international conferences, congresses and seminars in which India participated. It might interest the House to know that 186 of them were held last year, which on an average works out to more than one every two days. We are also members of 95 international organisations, not to mention their various committees and sub-committees.

A casual reader of the report would think mistakenly that it is a travelogue of ministers, officers and others, because 75 ministers, officials and delegations travelled abroad. India received in return 63 VIPs, including Heads of States. This must be the influence of Prince Charming, who has become the Minister of Tourism on the other side, because all the ministers seem to be infected with his enthusiasm and they have spared no time and effort in making a jaunt to all the capitals of the world. According to the report, the friendly and cordial relations between the various countries are as a result of these goodwill trips. According to stories circulating in the Lobbies, it is surprisingly that India has any goodwill left at all. Frolicking round the world has become an Indian pastime and has not left even Members of Parliament unaffected. However, there are three substantial points of departure that this report makes from past records.

For the first time, the PLO—the Palestine Liberation Organisation—which is a terrorist organisation of

which the Al Fatah is an affiliate, has come in for recognition along with other countries of the Arab world, even though it has been pointed out to the minister in Parliament that the constituents of the PLO are dangerous terrorists, receiving their Maoist training in China, with instructions in the techniques of sabotage, ambush, assassination and guerilla warfare—possibly in the same centres that are training our Naga rebels. Although it has been proved that the members of the PLO have been responsible for hijacking of planes and thing like that, it does not seem to bother our External Affairs Ministry. It has thought it fit to glorify this organisation and put it on a par with the countries of the Arab World. I am quite sure that there must be a large number of self-respecting Arabs who take a very dim view of the terrorist activities of the PLO and the methods it employs, but not our External Affairs Minister, who in his anxiety to de-Islamize Pakistan is ready to circumcise himself!

On China, while admitting in Parliament that "China violates the norms of international behaviour and threatens our security... and attempts subversion in our country, we must be ready to meet them". In the same paragraph the Report says "We have no enmity and we wish them well". Sir, this is very creditable and very charitable indeed, but at whose expense? In a pathetic attempt at surveillance, it is said that "when China responds to the winds of friendship and cooperation blowing all over the world... (I am sure he is partly responsible for this great whirlwind) we shall not be found wanting in responding to it adequately". Sir, this is the outlook of a weakling and a coward masquerading in the garb of a statesman.

But the most confusing and sinister of all departures made hitherto in our foreign policy is the recognition of the Soviet Union for the first time as an Asian power, accepting and even propagating the so-called Breznev doctrine of collective security and economic cooperation, and thereby paving the way for the Soviets to fill the vacuum created by the withdrawal of the British and American forces from the Indian Ocean. In this connection, I recall the Prime Minister having made a statement in this House that it was not necessary to fill this vacuum. If this

was her conscionable strategy for presenting the Indian Ocean on a Bokaro steel platter to the Soviets, let me make it categorically clear that she needs to be exposed.

It might be worth reading what appeared in the *London Times* of March 25. In an article by Peter Hazelhurst, entitled Indian Policy in favour of Russia, the *London Times* says :

"Significantly, while referring to the Soviet Union as an Asian power, the Report stipulates that the Indian Government would not like to see foreign naval forces move into the Indian Ocean to threaten the stability of the region. On the other hand, the Report makes it clear that it welcomes the Russian plan for collective security in Asia through economic alliances."

"Deriding the Western military pacts, the Report says that the South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO) alliances had receded into the background over the year and the concept of economic, scientific and technical cooperation within the region had gained ground." The same report also deplores a lack of warmth in Indo-British relations. It says again :

"Reflecting the diminishing interest in Indo-British relations, the report omits any reference to the Commonwealth and limits the review of India's contacts with the United Kingdom to a brief paragraph."

In case you think that I am biased in favour of British opinion, let me quote to you a more socialist journalist from India; writing in the *Times of India* on all-fools day, which may be significant, Shri Girilal Jain has this to say :

"India will have to adopt a wholly different posture if it really intends to legitimise Soviet military presence in Asia. It will have to argue that American withdrawal is now a foregone conclusion, that this will create a dangerous power vacuum, specially in South East Asia, in view of the instability and weakness of most governments there and China's hegemonistic ambitions; that halting attempts at regional economic cooperation will not provide an answer to the problem of security, and that Mr. Brezhnev's

emphasis on the need for collective measures in the region offers the hope that the Soviet Union may be willing to assume in some modified form the role which the United States is rapidly giving up."

With wise diplomacy, a little intelligence and some patience it might have been possible for India to fill that vacuum even though partially. But I do not think the thought ever occurred to them. I do not think the desire ever existed. But with their total disregard and callousness and their over-anxiety to stay in power at home, no one has any time for constructive thinking and purposeful action for the national cause. But how is it possible for a servile government, which has reduced this country to the status of a Soviet satellite, to maintain any sort of independence in the international field?

It all started very tragically and unhappily in 1964 with our approaching the Soviet Union for some arms which the Western democracies had denied us. Our relationship might have continued on that happy basis had we thrown those arms back into their faces at the very first hint of pressure or blackmail or interference in our internal affairs but, unfortunately, the puny man at the helm of affairs succumbed to every threat, every bribe and every pie in the sky. The stage was reached where every action of India requires Soviet approval. Our ambassadors have to be pro-Soviet; our Governors have to be pro-Soviet and even our Ministers have to be pro-Soviet. Now our legislation has to be pro-Soviet, our Plans have to be pro-Soviet and even our textbooks have to be pro-Soviet.

Many a patriot in this Government might have rebelled against this national humiliation but the Soviets had their means of counteracting any bourgeois nationalistic tendencies. I charge this Government and the ruling Congress Party of having maintained itself in power with the flagrant use of Soviet money and having worked itself into a position of impotency in its relationship with the Soviet Union.

Take a simple matter like Radio Moscow and Radio Peace and Progress which have been flagrantly violating all norms of international behaviour and abusing people in our country, citizens who sit on the same benches as these

[Shri Piloo Mody]

people, day in and day out and this impotent Government can do nothing about it. All they can say is that "we protest but they do not listen." If this Government cannot even protect its citizens from the verbal attacks of other countries, how is it going to protect our borders from armed attack?

Take the case of Ceylon. There is a vituperous propaganda going on in Ceylon against the DMK and the Government seems to be able to do nothing about it. This, I think, is a small example of its impotency.

But I do not wish to be misunderstood. I welcome friendly relations with the Soviet Government and the Soviet people as indeed I do with the American Government and the American people, irrespective of the political policies that they follow, because I think it is their business. But I want such relationships to be among equals and on honourable terms. I do not wish that our trade should be used as a political weapon. They have a rich cultural heritage as indeed we do. If they can afford us facilities for education, we at least can provide them facilities for meditation. But I will not let them interfere with either our thinking or our progress or even our inefficiency. I would extend the same facilities and conditions to all countries of the world.

The projection of diplomatic relations is a public relations job and the public relations of this Ministry are deplorable. It might be true that we have dropped at least one brick a day. Routine negotiations are classified as top secret and secret information is blurted out to the press. There is no flare, no vision. There is only mingy negotiations with puny objectives.

Our embassies abroad are undernourished with funds and information and our disposition of personnel inconsistent with our interest. What outside talent they have is of the most mediocre quality. I strongly recommend that you put your External Affairs Ministry in order and start conceiving of your global image in terms of a broad vision in a more relaxed dialogue, in our pattern of behaviour and give up your pathological fears about offending the Soviets or the Arabs or allowing the Pakistanis to

win a point in the game of one-upmanship that we have been playing. Forget trying to recruit support for your Kashmir policy. Kashmir is a part of our country and no resolution is going to change that. However, there are a great many directions in which we can establish free and cordial relations, indeed, firm friendship with Pakistan and, in this connection, I commend to you the superlative article written by my friend, Mr. B. G. Verghese in the *Hindustan Times* weekly of March 29, called "Waters of Hope".

In conclusion, I would ask the External Affairs Minister to cheer up. After all, he has to overcome the blunders of only 22 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Sant Bux Singh.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Sir, I have just received a message from Shri Rabi Ray that the body of a dead person is not being delivered. . . . (*Interruptions*). This is a very serious matter.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor): In the morning, they promised that after the *post mortem*, the body will be delivered. Why is it not being delivered? (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, is not available on the phone, either in his office or in his residence. I do not know where he is. The body is not being given. . . . (*Interruptions*).

सभापति महोदय : आप एक ही बात कह रहे हैं। पार्लियामेंट्री एफेयर्स के डिप्टी चीफ व्हिप बैठे हुए हैं। वह होम मिनिस्टर को इसको कनवे कर देंगे।

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU: They should see that the body is given. . . . (*Interruptions*)

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : वह मिलते नहीं हैं कहीं। न घर पर है और न दफ्तर में है। पता नहीं कहां चले गए हैं ?

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): You send for the Home Minister, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Sant Bux Singh.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, after having been lulled and cheered, we might get to do some serious thinking about the foreign policy of our country. I hope the House will be indulgent enough to me. I am so slight compared to my hon. friend, Shri Piloo Mody. He has quoted the entire book and there is little to answer. We are grateful for the impressive reading that he did.

Sir, the situation in which this country finds itself today is a situation that some of us have been speaking about for the last three years. Ever since the two super powers came to an understanding on the basis of the nuclear treaty that was being forced on the other nations, the situation has developed where all of us, the less developed powers, have to look together to see whether we are to be taken in by the Monroe doctrine or the Brezhnev doctrine. In the words of the American author—since I speak after Shri Piloo Mody, it will be proper not to quote any Soviet author—Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, I quote:

“United States policy favours super nationalism among its friends and nationalism among its enemies and, in this respect, its diplomacy bears broad resemblance to that of the Soviet Union.”

What are the two great powers doing? The two great powers today are selling arms worth 5 million dollars per annum to the smaller countries of the world. The super powers can, at the most, have a cold war between them. But what does a cold war mean to the other countries? Since 1945, as has been pointed out, there have been 56 wars of some significance out of which 54 wars were fought in the under-developed countries through the arms manufactured in the developed countries. When we think of the world, of the cold war period, it was cold and cosy as far as the super powers were concerned. It was not cold in Korea. It was not cold in Vietnam. It was not cold in the Middle East, and it certainly was not cold either for India or Pakistan. The big powers to-day would like to have technological supremacy, would like to sell ‘intermediate technology’ and would like the less developed countries go in for ‘substitute

production’. Is there any power which advocates that independence can come or that prosperity can come or sovereignty can be achieved through the help of large powers? We have to see the case of many a country bleeding and its people suffering untold miseries. If prosperity has to come, if sovereignty has to come, it has to come in terms of the doctrine that has been advocated by the Prime Minister of India, that is, through economic co-operation between lesser powers, through respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of these nations.

The conflict in the international sphere is something which we cannot look upon with a sense of quietness and detachment. From Korea to Vietnam, from Vietnam to Cambodia and on the borders of Thailand, whether it is American arms or it is the troops of one country crossing into another, the grim situation and conflict moves nearer us. Three years ago I pointed out in this House that the Soviet Union and the United States are two great powers which are interacting here. China wants to spread out. Japan, with its tremendous economic growth, is also acting and interacting. To-day several powers want a presence in the Indian Ocean, be they the Russians or be they the Americans. The fact is that these major powers do not want their lands to be nuclear targets for each other or for China and we, particularly, cannot be silent spectators or quiet observers to missiles flying all over the Indian Ocean and perhaps on the body of this country.

The reason why arms are supplied is because the armament industry has become so great, and a large part of the budget of these countries is spent on arms. They help them and their economies. The result is that we have Malaysia confront Indonesia, North Vietnam confront Thailand and Laos, and Israelis and Arabs looking at each other with suspicion. You supply arms to India. You supply arms to Pakistan. Are Soviet tanks more socialistic when they go to Pakistan? Are American arms better when they are used to further the dictatorial regimes of countries? Armaments are supplied merely for one purpose and that is to strengthen the economic and military hold of the super powers at the cost of the smaller powers which will continue to be enfeebled. I think Pakistan is permitting itself to be

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

exploited, even to-day if it feels that arms supply from the Soviet Union or China or USA is going to solve its social and economic problems. I do not look upon Pakistan as a country of which we need be frightend at all. I look upon Pakistan as our brothers who are permitting themselves to be exploited.

To-day many people will forbid us this and that merely because the *Time* magazine or the *Newsweek* or *London Times* or the *New Statesman* has put forward a theory or an interpretation. See how confusing the old classifications and categories are. Look at the advocacy of China being seated in the Security Council by Senator Edawrd Kennedy. You look at the poll survey that was carried out in Nebraska about whether the American farmers would like to supply wheat to China. 95% of the farmers in a distant place like Nebraska said that they are only too willing to sell wheat to China. On the other hand, Mr. Chou En-lai told Mr. Hamlin, the Agriculture Minister for Canada, that USA cannot ignore a billion people market. To-day 86% of the Chinese trade is with the West. What values are there that are left? The only values that are left are values that India has stood for. These values are that the fate of a nation will be decided by itself, will be decided by the will of its people, will be decided by the cooperation of the people. We have opposed every form of racialism in Africa. We oppose any kind of colonialism, new or old, eastern or western, and more and more, hon. Members should appreciate that we have been paying, for the last several years, greater attention to our neighbours. Of course, our neighbours, like us, are in an exploited situation today and as Mr. Pashupati Shamsheer pointed out in articles published in the *Indian Express*, only a few days ago, at times any country however much it likes to be independent has to choose between the pressures that are applied. We became independent and our neighbours became independent after us and it will take some time before many of these countries can withstand the weight and the might of the superpowers singly. India has always shown the way in this direction and there is growing appreciation of the role that India has been playing. I would request hon. Members of this House not to use foreign policy for purposes of domestic politicking.

When it comes to West Asia there are communal overtones both in support and in criticism of our stand. There has been a feeling that the relation of this country with the outside world has been over-idealistic. We have to have a policy which is a policy in the interest of this country, a policy that will share the idealism and the outlook of our people and the great heritage of this country. Our policy has been peaceful, because ours is a country that has never invaded any land outside, a country that has always stood for independence and valued the independence of other countries as much as it has valued its own independence.

I would like to refer to some remarks where hon. Members quoted from the weekly, *Current*. Many people would like to state glibly that the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister and the Indian Parliament are not seeing eye to eye with each other. You can be amused by it. You can be amused by any distortion that you like, but that amusement should be confined to the Central Hall and not be brought to this solemn forum, and I wish to say that I have not been able to see any difference about the stand and the policies which we pursue.

Also, Sir, we talk glibly over the fact that we are not represented properly by our diplomats abroad. When we say that, we are being unfair to people who cannot answer. I have seen our diplomats and I can say that our diplomats are some of the smartest diplomats and they compare well with those of the advanced countries of the world. Of course, there are drawbacks.

There are drawbacks within us. The performance that we exhibit in this House creates a million times more bad publicity than any reaction on the part of our Foreign Service personnel. In terms of the influence that India has generated and in terms of the respect with which India has been listened to, all through the years, we must bear in mind that compared to many other countries the expenditure on our Foreign Service is very small, percentage-wise.

So, while we do have the right of saying anything to anybody, there are 520 of us here and we can confine ourselves to amusing, overcriticising each other and not people who cannot answer.



I shall make just two small points. The first point is this. I am grateful to the Foreign Minister for having taken my suggestions made last year, or, wherever the suggestions came from about the creation of a foreign policy cell. A policy planning cell is going to be created in the External Affairs Ministry. And hope a fair start will be given to it. However clever an Officer may be, there is a certain attitude that develops and ideas must be cross-fertilised. I regret to note that in a city like Delhi there are no institutes that are busy with current affairs. There is no cross-exchange of ideas. I also see that there have been outstanding men in our Foreign Service. But we politicians have never found it worth-while to get some of them into political life after their retirement. We should have them as is done in several other countries, as advisory politicians. I think there should be cross-exchange of ideas between the intellectuals, the journalists, the bureaucrats and the politicians.

In the end, in view of the importance that our neighbours are assuming, and in view of the fact that most of us have had an education which was inspired by the West, and, a very few of us know much about our neighbours. I would request the Government, the journalists and the public to pay the utmost importance to our neighbours, and the more people we can send to these countries the better it will be.

Lastly, we should be very careful about the choice of our diplomats. Our best diplomats perhaps do not need to be put in the western countries; we should send some of our smartest and ablest people in and around the Indian Ocean, because the history of this country and the history of the world in the years to come is going to be shaped in this area.

I support the Demands of the External Affairs Ministry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Sondhi.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this House which represents this sovereign will of the Indian people is concerned with India's role in the world affairs, it is concerned with the vision which we have in the affairs of mankind and it is also concerned with knowing what should be the light for us. Are we to see the world in the light of some other powers or

are we going to see the developing problems in the shadow of our own national interests?

16.34 hrs.

[SHRI P. K. VASUDEVAN NAIR—in the Chair]

I suppose, Sir, that it would have been a matter of honesty on the part of those who come here to support the Government's policy, not to pass head least by the substantive questions of India's Foreign Policy in the context of our relations with the super powers. Three decisive points are at issue and suggest imperative tasks. First to my mind concerns the need to spell out the elements of conflict and consensus in our respective national interests. The second point would require the explication of the technological compulsions of the super powers which may make the other functions as economic satellites and the third thing would be to study the implications of the super powers, their co-operative arrangements among themselves which have negative consequences for our defence and strategic capability.

I am sure we all are concerned though a section of this House is not concerned with this problem. Of late we have seen how on the question of Bokaro plant there has been an intrusion of politics in the economic spheres which no enlightened outlook on modern policy can sanction.

I believe that there is a habit—habit of mendicancy and a habit of always leaning on the support of others. I am very much concerned and I would like to ask the hon. Minister to clarify whether for some years India has not been providing the US with information concerning our arms purchases. We need friendship with America. But do we need to supply them information on our arms purchases? I would like to know whether India had refused to comply with the Senator-Long-amendment to the Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill of 1967, and afterwards this practice has been continued in which we inform the government of another country as to what is the disposition regarding functions inherent in our own outlook on strategic matters.

Therefore, this question of big power involvement requires from us a serious study based upon our own national interests and not based upon abstract ideological reactions.

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

If we look today to one part of the world, it would cause very grave concern to us, and that is the Middle East, or what we call West Asia. We have seen a super-power involvement there. That super-power involvement has not helped in creating a situation there where we can say that the explosive situation has been defused. Instead, we see mounting antagonism on all sides and we see that these big Powers are unable to bring about an arrangement by which the different nations can have recourse to their own ideals and co-exist side by side and permit each political community to enjoy the freedom of survival.

I do not wish to rub salt on wounds. But we know how this very Minister, the whole Government and the Prime Minister behaved. I also see Shri F. A. Ahmed. We know how they behaved at the time of Rabat. From Rabat to Jeddah is a journey for which these people are responsible. It is the burden they have to carry. I remember how in John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, the pilgrim had to carry a burden of sin, a burden of all sorts of their human failure—that burden is on their back. I do not know whether they should strengthen their backs to carry them.

**SHRI RANGA:** The backs are breaking.

**SHRI M. L. SONDH:** We on this side, and my Party in particular, are concerned with certain problems on which we want the Government to think realistically and we should not be misunderstood. Pakistan has an pan-Islamic outlook which has been to isolate India, to place hurdles in the way of our diplomatic efforts. The establishment of the Islamic Secretariat must cause concern because it is the consummation of a development, the development of Islamic interventionism. The Yugoslavs have expressed themselves against it; we should also have no hesitation in doing likewise ourselves, because we believe there is an inherent contradiction between modernisation and Islamic totalitarianism. Religious movements cannot cope with the inherent propensity of modern politics to seek channels of expression along national interests.

We have heard reports that in certain countries which are friendly with us, textbooks have been published in which our own territory the territory of our

sovereign Republic, has been shown shaded with a particular colour which is supposed to belong to a certain pan-religious movement. I hope the Minister will take note of it and impress upon friends of ours like the UAR, for example, and express to them our concern at these things. We are surprised that the UAR of all countries was canvassing for having the Islamic Secretariat in Cairo. That is a travesty of the claim that such countries are aiming at modernisation.

The question of Pakistan, and how they found their way to Jordan—all these questions should concern us because they are questions where we have to shape our own policies in accordance with our national interests. But when I come to national interests, I am also concerned with the relationship of national interests and national power. We live in a nuclear age today, and as far as this age is concerned, every nation has a certain feeling of insecurity and all statesmen also must reflect that concern for security. I realise our Defence Minister is not here. But I know Sardar Swaran Singh never feels insecure. We come from the same town. I do not wish to say anything against him. But the point is that the *bona fides* of those of us who are concerned with the problem of National Security should not be doubted because it is only those who are prepared for certain contingencies who are able to organise peace. It is no use adopting an ostrichlike attitude, as has been suggested by certain members on the other side.

I would, therefore, like to know from the Minister what are his concrete proposals for an agenda for negotiations to strengthen our Security and peace, and what are his proposals about our own strategic capabilities. We know that in the last few months in both the United States and the Soviet Union there have been developments and that they are thinking of anti-ballistic missile defence. India also would have to understand and clarify its own attitude. The answer we get from time to time from the Government is that Tibet is too close to us, that the Chinese can deploy missiles there and poise them mainly against India. But that is a challenge to us, to our ingenuity, to our political sagacity and to our military technology. I would like to know what the facts are. Will the Minister tell us how many I.R.B.M.s are poised in Tibet.

Then, on the question of our own policy towards Tibet, we on this side of the House, and my party in particular, have been asking the Government time and again to give a certain importance to it. I would like to know whether the Minister has carefully followed the recent decision of the United States to instal the ABM system as was announced as a defence against China. This is a very important point. We on this side of the House have to be concerned with the American objective in the light of inter prelabours of what may constitute nuclear blackmail to us. At the same time, as I mentioned, there is a ring of anti-ballistic missiles around Moscow and other areas of the Soviet Union. What have we been doing?

At the Eighteen Nations Nuclear Disarmament Conference we have been asking for tangible progress towards disarmament. We have been asking for the creation of conditions in which nuclear weapons would not be needed. We have been doing this for a long time, but today things have changed. We have found that we have not been listened to, our attitude has been rejected and we have, therefore, to rethink everything because now we see growing a certain body of opinion in the United States and in the Soviet Union that India has to be compelled, has to be forced, has to be persuaded to give up its rightful share of the opportunities through progress in nuclear technology and science. The tendentious and misleading reaching of the Super Powers in respect of India's nuclear development have not facilitated the psychological climate for evolving a framework for developing India's contribution to a peaceful world order. I would, therefore, make concrete proposals here because it is but fair to the Minister, he probably would not like negative criticism.

I would ask first of all for the setting up of a Parliamentary Commission for Nuclear Affairs because this House has the right to participate in the many dimensions of this problem and should not be told from time to time that it is the External Affairs Ministry or the Defence Ministry or the Atomic Energy Department which is concerned with this problem.

The second concrete proposition I have, and I demand of the Minister, is that they make a specific declaration on the retention of a nuclear choice. We have heard time and again that India has an option. That reminds me of the

sort of option many bachelors have. That option does not last every long. After some time others are not interested in that option.

The third point which I would like to suggest specifically is that India should make a declaration that the non-proliferation treaty is considered by India as a denial of the theory and practice of general disarmament. They quote Mr. Nehru time and again and I would invite him to read up certain earlier debates on this. I am also somewhat amused that our Prime Minister—she is not present here—came out some time back with a statement that India would brave all the possible hardships that not signing the non-proliferation treaty would entail, but where is the determination which a sovereign nation should have? What we find is always yielding to one pressure or the other from outside. The point I would like, therefore, to make is that we must not overlook the danger from Communist China which is developing its nuclear capacity, but at the same time we must have our own information and our own understanding on this subject. We must also be clear about our nuclear stance, the way we look at it. The United States, for example, has a ploughshare plan in which natural resources, mining, the opening of the second Panama Canal, all these things have been taken into account. But we find here that the Minister of External Affairs is mum, the Prime Minister is always mum except on certain matters of vague generalisation of policy. And we find that the Defence Minister indulges in constant haranguing when he comes to Parliament, that he hires us by his endless repetitions. Let it not be said that these were the three guilty people, the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister and the Defence Minister, who prevented India from exercising wisdom and statesmanship in its policies in the nuclear field. I am asking, therefore, for a reiteration of certain principles that we have followed. We wanted a comprehensive test ban. The security needs of non-nuclear countries have not been accepted. We have been opposed to vertical proliferation and we find we are not succeeding. Instead, we find that pressure is mounting up against us, pressure of which we find a certain example when we are recently asked that certain bilateral arrangements for the inspection of our nuclear plants should be made multilateral. This is the beginning; this so called internationalisation of our nuclear plants of super power domina-

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

tion on us. It has been said that there is division of roles. The United States will pressurise West Germany and the Soviet Union will pressurise us. Therefore, I have asked for specific action on these three counts. But the Government are talking of certain broad generalisations and say: we welcome SALT talks in Helsinki and so on; they have not given us any information as to the political context of these talks. Why is Soviet Russia trying to be so pleasant and smiling to the United States? What is it getting in return? Where is the actual limitation of armaments? After the Test Ban Treaty every week there has been one explosion or the other by one or the other of the two super Powers and one of the ill-effects of those explosions has been that gaseous ingredients had escaped the subterranean channels. The Japanese have said that their ratification will be dependent upon substantial progress in disarmament talks; they do not want to be classed as pariah power in the world. I am again, not to be misunderstood. I am asking for a responsible nuclear policy where we can have a dialogue on various questions such as safeguards, knowing how far different missiles systems can be brought into some kind of mutual equilibrium if necessary. May I remind the House that at one time this used to dominate our demand. We made great speeches in the United Nations and elsewhere; we talked of resolution 2028; we regarded that as the sheet anchor of our policy and that stated that NPT should be without loopholes, that it should balance mutual responsibilities and that steps should be taken towards general and comprehensive disarmament and that it would be effective and so on. Today we have failed to persuade any of the super Powers on any of these items. Is it not necessary that you take action to understand what the consequences are and come out with a statement which can satisfy the House. I have demanded the setting up of this Commission. I am also concerned with certain basic problems and these are of Southeast Asia.

Time and again I have reiterated here that we should revive International Control Commission. I find that the hon. Minister is waiting for something to come from France and Canada before he reacts. That is the mendicancy which is inherent in them. I ask specifically: will he take steps to call a conference of Southeast Asian States to

work as a catalyst for working the Geneva machinery in order first to define the operative principles and secondly to establish joint commissions for direct bilateral talks to resolve differences without bringing in China, Soviet Union or any other party and try for an agreement on demilitarised zone. The supervision machinery should be strengthened. We have a duty and obligation to Laos. We have held Souvannaphouma as a neutral; simply because today China denounces him we are not going to say that he is no longer neutral. We have to see that the regime here translate into action the national ideals of that country. Whether it is Cambodia or Laos our presence there should be to provide guidelines so that the belligerents should come together. Therefore the question is whether India could organise machinery and generate respect for the frontiers of existing States and prevent the spread of conflagration. Cambodia has asked for a peace force and it did so much earlier. It asked for the grant of wider powers to the ICC. I charge the Minister of being like Nero who fiddled when Rome was burning. He has done nothing in the last one month. In any other country where there was consciousness about this problem and where the Government had not suppressed information there would have been a public outcry against this sort of procrastination which has been going on. We have talked so much about our relations with Southeast Asia and it is not for me to reiterate them. There are statements by Mr. Nehru and others. It is a matter which history and civilization sanction; cultural links are there. In the report which has been mentioned earlier, I crave the indulgence of the House to refer to certain specific points because I find that it is old wine in a new bottle—nothing more. We find here a most remarkable quality of this report. Soviet Union with whom we are going to build up relations, and we want to—I would like Prof. Mukerjee to make a note of this—is mentioned at pages 64(a) and 64(b). They evidently forgot to write about it, and they have put it like this afterwards. It is tucked away under "Other European countries." The only other European countries the Minister or the Ministry have noticed here are Rumania and Belgium. All the other countries have been given the go-by. Of course, this is the practice they have been adopting. And this is no time for me to analyse it in

terms in which Shri Piloo Mody has done before.

I now come to the question of administration and organisation. There is a model approach which is now pervading the rest of the civilised world. There has been the Plowden Report; and also the Duncan Report there has been the report from Canada and from the United States there is the Herer Commission's Report. Certain new conceptions on foreign policy have come into being: on foreign policy and administration. Here, in India we find an administration which refuses to do anything about raising the level of specialisation of foreign policy making and implementation which does not permit any examination of this foreign policy. Also, I ask you one thing: have you ever seen a Foreign Minister in any other country in the world who take over Foreign Minister has no legislative programme? Have you ever seen Mr. Dinesh Singh coming up with a proposal of a Bill? After all, powers proceed from legislation; they are not doing it. The law of preservation is something which they do not bother about, Sir.

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

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI: Sir, I crave your indulgence. I now quote from what an internationally renowned scholar-diplomatist said in this connection. He said:

"It seems to me that I have seen over the decades, an unduly high percentage of older men in this service who prematurely lost physical and intellectual tone, who became at best empty bundles of good manners and at worst rousing stuffed shirts."

Here, I would refer to the Pillay Committee report which was presented here. What about the implementation of it? The most remarkable thing about this Committee is that it was an ICS-sponsored one. It was very conservative, if I may say so. No Member of Parliament was on this Committee, although the Plowden Commission had one representative from the Conservative Party and one from the Labour Party and could have served as a precedent.

Government were asked about the cultural affairs abroad. The answer was that the matter is being processed further. Another recommendation of this Committee was that a trained officer

should be appointed to modernise filing procedure and to this, the answer is it is under consideration. Then, the need for expansion of network of publicity units abroad. This is again under consideration. Then the need for exploring film strips medium for external publicity: the answer was that the possibility of adopting this medium of publicity was explored but it was found that film strips of the kind required were not readily available. Then, another recommendation was that a separate Joint Secretary should be appointed to look after training and a Directorate of Training under him should be set up. The response to this is that this recommendation is being considered. So, everything is being considered. Then, promotion of Grade I of IFS (B) Officers: it is being considered. Then, review of the pay scales of certain officers: the answer is, owing to the ban on revision of pay scales, it has not been possible to implement these recommendations as yet. What is this ban? Is it a test ban, Sir? What ban? The Committee went into all these things, but no progress has been made. When the Foreign Minister was a junior Member here, he waxed eloquent on the reform of foreign service and foreign policy. Obviously, he does not read anything; let him read what has been asked before in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI: The question of China exercises all of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are all interested in your speech, but when I look at the clock, I feel helpless.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI: Sir, it is elementary for us to be concerned with China, to have more information on China, to enrich ourselves with more knowledge on China, and to know what is the assessment of the 9th Party Congress. Clearly, judging from the Government of India's reaction, they are pleased if somebody turns up at the cocktail party, and if somebody does not turn up, they draw some other conclusion. Concrete steps are needed if India is to have a China-diplomacy. I would suggest some concrete steps. Any step in the direction of normalisation of our relations with Peking can only be considered on the following conditions, which are to be fulfilled. Firstly, renunciation by China of claims to Indian territory, for which this House

[Shri M. L. Sondhi]

has taken a pledge. Second, renunciation by China of propoganda against Indian territorial integrity. Third, renunciation by China of interference in Indian relations with Bhutan and Sikkim. Fourth, recognition of the rights of the Tibetan people and fulfilment of the requirements of decolonisation. Fifthly—this is basic—recognition of the nuclear-free status of Tibet, with adequate measures of control and inspection. Finally, if it comes through, balanced reduction of force levels between India and China in the Himalayan area.

Sir, when this House is concerned with questions of our country's foreign policy, it is concerned with problems of disarmament, with the posture of our country, with our image abroad and with our financial capacity to back action in foreign policy. It is concerned with all these problems. What we cannot permit is an ostrich-like attitude whenever a crisis comes up. This Government has no theory of crisis management. The rights of this House are trampled upon. Some event takes place, but the event is not brought before the House. The sovereign Parliament of Indian people is denied the opportunity of shaping the world public opinion.

Let India speak with resolution. Let India speak not with mendicancy, but with the proud conviction that we are a people who have a voice in the affairs of the world. Let us have not a foreign policy or a Foreign Minister who walks on crutches, but a Foreign Minister who walks with his back straight, head high and mind attuned to the circumstances, not one who is oppressed by bureaucratic fears or who is oppressed by petty political concerns. He should have that wider vision and wider outlook which will enable India to meet the challenge of the seventies.

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor): Sir, when we are having this debate because of the absence of any particular issue to take our attention, it is good that we discuss the basic policy issues which are involved in our foreign policy and some of the departures that have been made this time in regard to the very dynamic report that has been produced by the ministry, in spite of the selection that was made by Mr. Piloo Mody about our relations with other countries. I hope Mr. Mody under-

stands that when we discuss a number of matters and when the ministry places a number of matters about neighbouring countries and a general review of the world situation, the ministry is expected to reiterate our friendship with those countries. It is a step we have to adopt whether we are friendly or very friendly; even when we are inimical, we are expected to say it in a polite language, if we are to conduct our foreign policy with any sense. We cannot omit to mention our relations with other countries, unless we want to go on taking postures, which would be most un-foreign-policy-like.

Coming to the basic issues, our main problem today naturally arises out of the internal danger of subversion, internal troubles, the type of strategic attempts being made in our neighbouring countries against us, our relations with Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan, our relations with Pakistan and China—these have much more relevance to us than distant issues like West Asia. I call it distant issue, because our involvement does not immediately affect our security, except in a diplomatic sense. That is why when the ministry report speaks about normalisation of our relations with China, I whole-heartedly agree with the attitude that has been adopted by the Government and the posture that has been taken, in spite of the pressure that has been mounting from members opposite that we should create a certain situation where, as Mr. Sondhi said, we should take up a number of reconnaissance measures which would practically forestall any dialogue. For example, if we go into the internal affairs of China it would be impossible for any type of dialogue. I do not think that is the pattern in the world, even between the worst enemies. The pattern today, as the Report has again stated in very clear language, even between USA and the Soviet Union or the Soviet Union and Russia is carrying on some kind of dialogue. There is no longer that policy of taking up an inflexible position. In the matter of foreign policy every country has to take a stand which is flexible. Unless we are flexible and not bogged down to certain problems of security we would certainly not make that impact on world affairs that a big country like India is usually expected to make.

17 hrs.

It is not necessary for us to take a big posture on the issue of the power

vaccum in the Indian Ocean. Even Britain is forced to withdraw from the Indian Ocean because the economy of Great Britain is not capable of sustaining the policing of the Indian Ocean. In view of four basic objectives, we cannot think in terms of taking up responsibilities which are not within our capacity and not informed by the political decision of the type of world which we would like to create.

In spite of the Peking Plan to improve their strategic position *vis-a-vis* New Delhi by creating subversion in various parts of our country, like Nagaland and NEFA and neighbouring countries—they have excluded only Pakistan and Nepal—it is their general policy—we should not think in terms of alignment, the type of alignment which the super-powers would like us to take, encircling China or some such thing. Security should be our first consideration. Whatever posture we take in relation to China should not be guided by SEATO or CENTO or the new formulations but by our security. Because, subversion can undo what our military may achieve unless our economy is developed on progressive line. So, the danger of subversion can be met only by economic co-operation, by the development of the economy. Why is it that subversion is not possible in the west whereas it is possible in the east? It is mainly because in most of the countries in the east there is poverty and unemployment. So, this type of subversion has to be met firmly, steadily by a convinced band of workers who believe in a socialist progressive government.

We are not in favour of military alliances and all that. So, we must try to find out to what extent we should go in trying to have a dialogue with China. I have no doubt that in this matter our security demands that we pursue two objectives simultaneously. We would like to have a dialogue with China. At the same time, regional alliances for defence are completely out of date. It is not possible for any country, not even for USA, to be safe by simply having regional alliances. That is why they are backing out of them. It is in that context that we have to consider the question of the nuclear bomb, because India's security ultimately will depend upon its capability to make massive retaliation. As a French defence expert once said,

if North Vietnam had a very small atom bomb and a very small delivery system, America would not have dared to bomb North Vietnam.

Coming nearer home Shri Sondhi has said that Pakistan is having Islamic type of interventionism. Islam is a religion and just as we have got the problem of Jana Sangh in the country, Islamic states also have the problem of Islamic conservatism. It is not that in all countries Islamic conservatism is in power. When we think in terms of Pakistan, we do extreme wrong to ourselves and to the Islamic world if we think that Pakistan's obsession with India is a part of the Islamic obsession with India. Islam is not involved in this matter. We have got our best friends in the Islamic world.

When it comes to the question of being friendly with Pakistan, in spite of what the West has said, namely, that Indo-Pakistan understanding can take place, we very well understand that it is a very difficult thing. Understanding with Pakistan will come only if the West stops its military assistance to Pakistan. The argument which the Russian Government has been giving that they want to have a level against the Chinese in Pakistan has never convinced us. We have no doubt that any attempt to arm Pakistan in a competitive attempt by the USA and the USSR will only increase Pakistan's appetite for aggression because Pakistan has no other enemy. It is unfortunate that in view of their global political reasons the Western powers have done this. While protesting against the type of assistance that the USA and the USSR are giving to Pakistan, we should always try to have bilateral understanding and agreement with Pakistan on smaller issues.

So far as the eastern region is concerned, the East Bengal leader, Mujibur Rehman, has said that the trade ban with India should go. It will strike a very sympathetic chord in the heart of any man who belongs to that region because we understand that a real trade relationship between East Pakistan and West Bengal and Assam, which have suffered so grievously because of partition, is in the common interest of the entire area and this trade ban should go.

[Shri Bedabrata Barua]

17.08 hrs.

[SHRI SHRI CHAND GOYAL *in the Chair.*]

Coming to East Africa, this House had several occasions to discuss about the position of the Indians in East Africa. Today also mention was made about the liberation movement in East Africa, our own liberation movement and so many things. We know the attitude that the Governments and people of East Africa have got. It is not that it is a fascist or hostile attitude towards India. The people of East Africa have consistently been friendly to India. But, at the same time, for historical reasons this area had a very large population of Indians and not all these Indians in East Africa are citizens of East Africa—some of them are British citizens—and they became very prosperous. As the House knows and understands, in the East African countries there is a policy of Africanisation. They are saying that the East African people, who form 90 to 95 per cent of the population of East Africa, have no standing in the industry and business of East Africa.

When we went in a delegation—I do not pretend to speak on behalf of the members of the delegation—we found that in the cities of Dar-es-salaam, Nairobi and Kampala, the people of Africa, the Africans themselves, have no standing whatsoever in business. Our Government has taken the stand that it is not possible to quarrel with the objectives of Africanisation. But certain hardships that have been created should be dealt with properly.

In respect of those Indians who want to go back to Britain, the efforts should be made to help them to transfer their assets. If they want to come back to India, they should be allowed to come back to India. . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Allow them to come.

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA: There has been no objection. The Government has not said that they will not be allowed to come. If they want to come back permanently to India, there is no objection. They can surrender their passports and come. But the point is this. We must realise that most of them are British citizens and they do not wish

to come to India. They expect the Government of India to help them in the matter. I have no doubt that consistent with our relations with these countries, the Government of India has done whatever is possible. In the circumstances, I would request this honourable House that so far as the relations with these countries are concerned, we should try to understand their problems and try to help these countries to develop their own economies as they are doing. We should not say what economy they should have. In Tanzania, 99 per cent of the import-export trade, the wholesale trade, is owned by Indians or Asians and they have nationalised or taken it over. But we found the Indians there saying, "Even after the nationalisation, we feel that we do have a part to play." This is the feeling of the people there. But whatever the hardships are there, the Government should help them in the best way possible.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the three Congress Members who preceded me. I was expecting from Mr. Hanumanthaiya or from Mr. Sant Bux Singh or Mr. Bedabrata Barua to give some of their achievements, in the External Affairs Ministry, during the year under review. Like the Report of the Ministry, they also did not mention any of the achievements of the Ministry because there is none.

Sir, if at all there are any achievements, I take, that they are, namely, the rebuff of our Foreign Secretary, Shri T. N. Kaul at Hanoi, the defeat of our nominee, Dr. Nagendra Singh, for the International Court of Justice, the fiasco and insult suffered by India at Rabat, the discourtesy shown to our representatives in Canada and to the railway delegation at Moscow, the walk-out by India at the non-aligned meet at New York—these are some of the achievements of this Ministry.

Sir, I have no quarrel with the basic policy of non-alignment. But does it or does it not require a re-assessment or a review in the changed context? I am not going to call non-alignment immoral as Mr. John Foster Dulles called it or a leaning Tower of Pisa as Mr. S. K. Patil calls it. Whenever a Minister receives a kick or a bank or a rebuff, he comes out with a statement that there is the necessity for a review of our foreign policy. Mr. Dinesh Singh,



addressing the Governors, said that the old concept of non-alignment is no longer valid and, after the famous trip to Rabat, when he returned, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, said that there is a need for re-assessment of our foreign policy. Even the Report says that India could not standstill and be rigid. Does it not mean that the situation requires a reassessment of our foreign policy? I could like to devote some time on the Government's policy of disarmament or nuclear non-proliferation treaty. No doubt, India stands for a general and complete disarmament. I agree with the Government. But what did we do in this regard? We are supposed to celebrate the Gandhi Centenary year in this year. The message of Mahatma Gandhi should have echoed beyond the seven seas. What should we have done? We should have sponsored a resolution in the United Nations that the year should be called the disarmament year. The Government have failed in that. What is our policy on nuclear weapons? They say that this is our policy for the last 22 years. The nuclear energy will be used for peaceful purposes. It is all right. But what about China and France? For example, China is already becoming a mighty nuclear power. Chinese explosion of nuclear bombs has created an imbalance of power in Asia. The big powers are not very much worried about China going nuclear because the USA think that the target may be USSR and the USSR think that this might be a check against the USA. Though China may not get any decisive advantage by having nuclear weapons, she has become immune from aggression and she has put her neighbours on defence. I am not for going for a nuclear umbrella. But, at the same time, are we not here to think about the foreign policy or our nuclear policy at this time?

It has been argued that if India goes nuclear, it would not only heighten the morale of the nation but also change the attitude to our hostile neighbours. Again it has been argued by experts, the supporters of this view, that when the French started manufacturing nuclear weapons, on the whole it has contributed to the economic prosperity of France and hence we need not worry about the economic breakdown. So, I will request the Government that they must now have a review of our nuclear policy and I suggest that an expert

committee should be set up to advise the country on this nuclear policy.

I support the Government's stand in not signing the non-proliferation treaty. But did we take advantage of the situation when some powers signed the treaty and some did not sign it? When we did not sign the treaty, we should have developed the Kalpakkam atomic plant which is quite apart of these agreements. After all, the non-proliferation treaty is only an effort to prevent potential nuclear powers from developing nuclear weapons and does not put any check on the existing nuclear stockpile of the super powers. Even those countries who have signed the treaty, are not happy. When we did not sign the treaty, we must have impressed upon the super powers that without India's effort this will not come into existence. For example, even our own friends have signed the treaty. Yugoslavia, our close friend, have not only signed the treaty but have ratified it also. We should have rallied the support of all the countries to our view point. Then we should have been taken seriously. This the Government have failed to do.

I would like to devote some time on the neglected part of the world, viz., Africa. Often the importance of Africa is ignored and its numerical strength, viz. one-third of the world's voting power in the United Nations is often forgotten. In the forties and fifties India had the image of a rising power in Asia and the African countries looked to us as champion of their freedom. What happened in the sixties and the beginning of seventies is that in spite of our support to the African cause in the United Nations and outside against Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal, in spite of our support to the African National Congress and other liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Portugese Guinea, what is the result? There is very little appreciation of our stand and at crucial time we find no friend, in Africa. Why? What is the reason? Sir, the young African nations free from colonial bondage looked up for material assistance for economic progress. What did we do? They asked for Paise, we offered Panch-Sheela. Often our sermons to Indians in Africa to identify themselves with African aspirations are misunderstood and has created more suspicions and this has resulted in strained relations.

[Shri G. Viswanathan]

Sir, another reason is our inadequate diplomatic missions in Africa. There are more than 40 countries in Africa and we have got only 13 diplomatic missions with concurrent accreditation to 12 other countries.

Sir, Mr. Pilloo Mody spoke about the tours of Ministers and other high officials their expensive and extensive tours, African towns and African cities do not find a place in the expensive and extensive tours of the Ministers. They want to go to Sweden and Switzerland instead of to Somalia and Sudan and they prefer to go to London and Rome instead of to Liberia and Ruanda. Our leading diplomats prefer to go to the glamorous capitals of Europe rather than to Africa.

Sir, the last, but not the least, reason is the utter failure of the external publicity division. Sir, you know, the western Press is hostile to India and they paint very gloomy picture about our country in the African countries and we are not able to do anything; we are not able to contradict them. I would like to tell you, Sir, that the External Services of All India Radio allots only 30 minutes programme in Swahili for the whole African continent out of more than 25 hours of total daily transmission. This is completely negligible and this time should be increased. I would like to suggest that our diplomatic activity should be increased in Africa. Our top diplomats should be posted to Africa. Our diplomats should mingle with the common people. The days of cocktail diplomacy is over though I am not against inter-dining or inter-wining as they call it. The External Publicity Division should bestow more attention on the African continent.

Now I would like to say a few words on the Asian situation. Sir, the British decision to withdraw naval forces from Singapore, Malaysia and from the Persian Gulf has created a problem. Some believe that a power vacuum has been created and they say that it should be filled up. Sir, the report say:

"Indian ocean should be an area of peace and a nuclear free zone, free of military bases and big power tensions."

This is a pious wish. But, Sir, what is happening? There is no vacuum; it

has been already filled up and the super-powers are there already. Sir, I wish to state that India has a positive and significant role to play. I think the Government of India, particularly, the Foreign Minister should convene a conference of Asian nations to discuss the security problem that has been posed.

Sir, in this connection I wish to make a reference to Brezhnev's Plan of Collective Security in Asia, which has come in the wake of the British decision to withdraw their forces from the Indian ocean. According to Mr. Gromyko "collective security was not spearheaded against a certain country or a group of countries." It is only for "safeguarding security in that part of the world in their common interest." The Report of the Ministry says that the Soviet leaders gave further clarifications of their ideas on the Brezhnev Plan when Mr. Dinesh Singh visited Moscow. But the details have not been given. I expect Mr. Dinesh Singh to throw some light on this to the House. Sir, Mr. Dinesh Singh is reported to have said that the Brezhnev Plan is similar to the ideas on security advocated by Government of India. He must take the House into confidence and explain his own statement. In this context, I would like to state that there are more than one opinion about this Brezhnev Plan. We just now heard Shri Asoka Mehta opposing that Plan.

Again in the words of Frank Moraes, 'the Brezhnev Plan for Asia, if implemented, would leave Russia as the ring master of this Asian circus'. I do not know what role Shri Dinesh Singh is going to play in this circus. No doubt India's relations with Ceylon is cordial. They say it has been strengthened by the visit of our President very recently to Ceylon.

In this context I would like to point out that there are three lakhs people of Indian origin awaiting their citizenship in Ceylon. The process of getting citizenship is very cumbersome. I would like the Minister to take up with Ceylon Government to expedite their getting their citizenship.

We have been told that the question of Kucha Thivu was under discussion. For how long are we going to discuss it? It has been for years discussed and we are waiting for the results. I would

like the Minister to give a categorical answer about the outcome of this discussion. Malasia has also the same case. There are three lakhs of people of Indian origin awaiting the citizenship. Government has done nothing about them.

About Pakistan, a report says that "Pakistan has been constructing, with the assistance of Communist China, a second road in Pakistan occupied part of Kashmir. The road is built mainly for military purposes and it extends the Chinese road network in Tibet and Sinkiang into the sub-continent." Again, the same report says:

"Pakistan continued to get military equipment from the Soviet Union. They include tanks, guns, helicopters, ammunitions and spares."

Again we are told that Pakistan is likely to get 100 tanks from U. S. via Turkey since under the present policy which is under review, U. S. cannot sell arms to both India and Pakistan. Thanks to Chester Bowles, it has not materialised till today. We must try to have our relations on a strictly bilateral basis without worrying too much about other party's relations with neighbouring countries. This is the secret of success achieved by Pakistan. For example, take the case of recognition to G.D.R. Even the foreign Minister of West German Government says that 'Hol-stain doctrine is almost dead. Why don't you do it?' We very much like to have full diplomatic relations with the G. D. R. In this context I would like to point out that at the time when we asked the Americans to close down their cultural centres, we were told that the Voice of America had decided to discontinue its Tamil broadcasts. I would like the Minister to take up this case. Shri Sondhi who preceded me gave a very detailed analysis of the functions of our Foreign Ministry. Very often *ad hoc* and haphazard approach to the complex international problems has led to all these difficulties. Inadequate direction and guidance from the headquarters to our Mission is given. Because of this difficulty, the Foreign Service has become by and large a divided and faction-ridden oligarchy in the words of Shri G. K. Reddy of the Hindu. The standard of courtesy is unsatisfactory and the Indian visitors don't receive sufficient attention from our missions. In this context I would like to

quote from Plowden Committee Report which went into the affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Britain. It says :

"Members of the Government and Parliament of the country to which a Head of a Mission is accredited as well as leaders in all walks of life ought to come to the British Embassy or High Commission as the House of a Friend. There is no substitute for this kind of personal relationship."

I would like to recommend this. There has been a quick change in the Ministry's Secretaries in the last few years. We were told by Shri Sant Bux Singh that there is no difference of opinion between the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. Sir, I want to ask the Minister 'why did the Prime Minister reject the Foreign Minister's draft in the Bombay Congress?' Again, Sir, Expert Panels to assist policy planning division was proposed by Shri Dinesh Singh. We are told that the Prime Minister has rejected it. Man proposes and woman disposes!

Lastly I would like to say that the Ministry is functioning with inertia. They must come out of their inertia and take up the initiative and must play a positive role in the foreign policy. A thorough review in our foreign policy is called for in the changed world context.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :** सभापति जी, पिछले 22 वर्षों में हमारी विदेश नीति का यह दुर्भाग्य रहा है कि हमारी विदेश नीति कुतुब-मीनारी विदेश नीति रही है। कुतुब-मीनारी विदेश नीति से मेरा अभिप्राय यह है कि कुतुब मीनार पर चढ़े हुए आदमी को दूर के दृश्य आसानी से दिखाई देते हैं, लेकिन जड़ में क्या हो रहा है, उस को वह कठिनाई से देख पाता है। हमारी विदेश नीति का पिछले 22 वर्षों में दुर्भाग्य यह रहा है कि हम ने दुनिया के दूसरे बड़े देशों में क्या हो रहा है, उन की नीति और हमारी नीति में टकराव कहां होता है, इस पर ही अधिक ध्यान दिया। लेकिन पड़ोसी देश जिन के साथ हमारा दिन-रात का सम्बन्ध है, उन के साथ हमारी राजनीतिक घनिष्टता बढ़नी चाहिये, इस की पर्याप्त उपेक्षा की। यह उपेक्षा आज भी बराबर चल रही है। मेरा

### [श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

अपना सुझाव यह है कि हमारे पड़ोस के जितने देश हैं—बर्मा, नेपाल, लंका, अफगानिस्तान, कोई भी क्यों न हो, इन के अन्दर जो हमारे राजदूत भेजे जायं, वे प्रथम श्रेणी के भेजे जाने चाहिये। जिस तरह से हम रूस और अमरीका के सम्बन्ध में निर्णय लेते हैं वहां प्रथम श्रेणी के हमारे राजदूत भेजे जाते हैं, मेरा अपना सुझाव है कि इसी प्रकार का निर्णय हमें इन देशों के लिये भी लेना चाहिये। भले ही उन का क्षेत्रफल छोटा हो, उन का संख्या-बल छोटा हो, लेकिन इन देशों को प्रथम श्रेणी का देश मान कर इन के साथ राजनायिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने चाहिये।

पिछले कुछ समय से मैं देख रहा हूँ—हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय का यह स्वभाव हो गया है कि जो हमारी सेना के बड़े अधिकारी सेवा निवृत्त हों उन्हें राजदूत बना दिया जाय। मैं उन की सेवाओं के प्रति सम्मान प्रकट करता हूँ, लेकिन इस का यह अभिप्राय नहीं है कि जो सेना में कुशल साबित हुए हैं, वे व्यक्ति राजनायिक सेवाओं में भी कुशल साबित होंगे। जब भी कोई व्यक्ति भारत की थल सेना के अध्यक्ष पद से निवृत्त होता है, उस को राजदूत बना दिया जाता है, वायु सेना के अध्यक्ष पद से निवृत्त होता है, उस को राजदूत बना दिया जाता है। अगर इन को राजदूत बनाना ही है, तो ऐसे देशों में बनायें, जिन के साथ में हमारे दिन-रात के घनिष्ठ संबंध न हों। इन देशों में इस प्रकार के राजदूत भेजने चाहियें, जैसे नेपाल के अन्दर आपने राजबहादुर जी को भेजा है। मेरा अभिप्राय यह है कि सार्वजनिक जीवन में जो व्यक्ति रहे हैं, जिन को यह पता है कि जनता के साथ किस प्रकार से सम्बन्ध स्थापित किया जाता है, वहां की सरकार के मन को जीतने के साथ साथ वहां की जनता के मन को कैसे जीता जा सकता है—इस प्रकार के राजदूत हमारे पड़ोसी देशों में जाने चाहियें।

दूसरी बात—इन छोटें पड़ोसी देशों के सम्बन्ध में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पहले कुछ विदेश

मंत्री इस बात की उपेक्षा करते रहे हैं कि हमारे इन पड़ोसी देशों में कैबिनेट रैंक के मिनिस्टर तो दूर, डिप्टी मिनिस्टर रैंक के लोगों को भी नहीं भेजा गया है। परिणाम यह हुआ कि जो देश हम को नेता मान कर चलते थे, जिनके साथ हमारे घनिष्ठ मैत्री सम्बन्ध थे, वे हमारे कैम्प से बाहर जाने लगे। आज उन की मित्रता को खरीदने के लिये हमें कितनी महंगी कीमत देनी पड़ रही है, इस बात को कह कर मैं अपने को लज्जित नहीं करना चाहता और इस विदेश मंत्रालय को भी कठिनाई में नहीं डालना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन यह अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारे राष्ट्रपतिजी के पास समय नहीं है, तो उपराष्ट्रपति जी को इन देशों की यात्रा करनी चाहिये, प्रधान मंत्री जी को इन देशों की यात्रा करनी चाहिये, बहरहाल बड़े स्तर के व्यक्तियों को इन देशों की यात्रा करनी चाहिये। जिस से ये देश महमूस करेंगे कि भारत सरकार हम को भी उतना ही महत्व देती है, जितना बड़े देशों को महत्व देती है।

तीसरी बात — दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया के देशों के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूँ। अभी भारत सरकार के एक संसदीय शिष्ट मंडल के साथ मुझे इन देशों की यात्रा करने का अवसर मिला। वहां मैंने एक बात देखी—उन की ओर हमारी एक समस्या इस प्रकार की है कि जो समान है। वह है चीनियों का बढ़ता हुआ दबाव। यही थाईलैंड में भी देखा, मलेशिया में भी देखा, सिंगापुर में भी देखा, इण्डोनेशिया में भी देखा, उत्तर वियतनाम और कम्बोडिया में भी देखा। मेरा कहना यह है कि चूंकि यह समस्या हमारी और इन की समान है, इसलिये समान होने के नाते अगर और कुछ नहीं कर सकते तो एक बात अवश्य हम कर सकते हैं कि अपनी जैसी समान समस्याओं के समाधान के लिये हम इन देशों को नैतिक समर्थन दें। जैसे कम्बोडिया में आज वियतकांग लोगों का आक्रमण चल रहा है। उस समय तक तो हमारी चुप्पी सही थी, जिस समय तक हम ने यह कहा कि यह राज-कुमार मिहानुक और वहां के नये प्रधान मंत्री

का आपस का घरेलू मामला है। इस में भारत सरकार को आगे आ कर सब से पहले अपनी कोई राय नहीं देनी चाहिये, लेकिन कम्बोडिया में आज वियतकांग बराबर आगे बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं और चीन उन की कमर पर है और खल्लम-खुल्ला घोषणा भी वह कर रहा है— इस समय भारत सरकार अपने होंठ चुप रखे— यह भारत जैसे तटस्थ देश की नीति के सर्वथा विपरीत है। मेरा कहना यह है कि यदि इस से एक बार दक्षिण एशिया के अन्दर चीनी प्रभाव इतना बढ़ गया कि छोटे छोटे देशों को चीन अपने मुँह में रख ले, तो आप सच मानिये यह समस्या हम को भी आ कर किसी समय बड़े विषम रूप में टकरानेवाली है। इस लिये इस बढ़ते हुए खतरे को आंखों से ओझल नहीं करना चाहिये।

चौथी बात— हम को इन देशों के साथ अपने सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध बढ़ाने चाहियें। इन में कुछ देश इस प्रकार के हैं जो आज बौद्ध धर्म में विश्वास करते हैं और भारत को अपने धर्म का जन्म स्थान मानते हैं, क्योंकि भगवान बुद्ध का जन्म यहाँ पर हुआ था। वे चाहते हैं कि भारत से कुछ इस प्रकार के सांस्कृतिक व्यक्ति वहाँ आयें, जो हमारे और भारत के पुराने सम्बन्धों को और भी घनिष्ठ बनायें। लेकिन पता नहीं सेक्यु-लेरिज्म के भूत ने हमारे दिमाग से सही बातों को इतना दूर कर दिया है कि जिन चीजों का हमारी विदेश नीति पर प्रभाव पड़ सकता है, हमारी राजनीति पर प्रभाव पड़ सकता है, उन चीजों को भी हम अपने मस्तिष्क से हटाते हुए चले जा रहे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति व्यापारिक कार्यों के सम्बन्ध में भी है। दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया में हम अपने व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध बहुत अच्छे बढ़ा सकते हैं। लेकिन वहाँ पर जिस प्रकार की घटनायें मुझे सुनने को मिली हैं वह सुखद नहीं हैं दक्षिण पूर्वी एशिया के जितने देश हैं वे चाहते हैं कि भारत का कपड़ा वहाँ पर जाये, भारत का लोहा वहाँ पर जाये, भारत का सीमेंट वहाँ पर जाये। लेकिन भारत

सरकार का जितना भी सामान है वह समय पर नहीं पहुँचता, क्वालिटी कुछ और होती है और सामान कुछ और भेजा जाता है। समय की जो सीमा निर्धारित की जाती है उस समय में वह माल नहीं पहुँचता। परिणाम उसका यह है कि और धीरे धीरे जापान और दूसरे देश उन मंडियों को कैप्चर करते चले जा रहे हैं, उनको अपने अधिकार में करते चले जा रहे हैं। वहाँ से लौट कर आने के बाद मैं ने एक सुझाव विदेश मंत्री को दिया था। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस संसद के माध्यम से भी उनसे निवेदन करूँ। मेरा वह सुझाव यह था कि जापान के साथ जिन देशों का व्यापार होता है वहाँ पर तीन एजेंसियां काम करती हैं। जो आर्डर आज बुक होगा, एक तो वह संगठन उसपर हस्ताक्षर करेगा, जापान की सरकार को उसकी एक कापी जायेगी। इसके अतिरिक्त वहाँ पर तीसरा एक बीच का दलाल जैसा संगठन बना हुआ है, एक कापी उसको जायेगी। अगर समय पर माल नहीं पहुँचता तो वह संगठन उसका मुआविजा देगा। यदि संगठन मुआविजा नहीं देता तो बीच की जो एजेंसी है वह उसका मुआविजा देगी। यदि ये दोनों ही मुआविजा नहीं देते तो जापान की सरकार उसका मुआविजा देगी। बहरहाल उनके साथ व्यापार करने में व्यापारी को कोई कठिनाई महसूस नहीं होगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय इन देशों के साथ अपने राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध बढ़ाते समय, अपने व्यापारिक सम्बन्धों को बढ़ाने के लिये भी कुछ इस प्रकार की मजबूत प्रणालियों को अपनाये जिससे हमारी व्यापारिक मंडियां हमारे पड़ोसी देशों में बढ़ें। जिनको हमारे माल की भूख है और जो हमारे माल की खपत के साथ साथ हमारे देश के साथ में दूसरे सम्बन्ध भी बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, उनको किसी प्रकार की निराशा न हो।

एक बात मैं अपनी कूटनीति के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान को मैं इस विषय में श्रेय दिये बिना नहीं रह

[श्री प्रकाशवर्मा शास्त्री]

सकता, भले ही वह संख्या में छोटा हो, क्षेत्रफल में छोटा हो, लेकिन सभापति जी, यह सच्चाई है जिसको आंखों से ओझल नहीं किया जा सकता कि कूटनीति में आज पाकिस्तान ने भारत को पीछे छोड़ दिया है। पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध चीन से भी अच्छे हैं, रूस से भी अच्छे हैं और अमरीका से भी अच्छे हैं। जो देश आपस में शत्रु देश हैं वे पाकिस्तान के लिये सब मित्र देश बने हुए हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर कौन सी प्रतिभा पाकिस्तान के पास है जिसका अभाव भारत के पास है। मेरी राय में कूटनीतिक क्षेत्र में जो हम सफलता प्राप्त नहीं कर पाते उसके जहां और कई कारण हैं, उनमें एक सबसे बड़ा कारण है हमारी असफल विदेश प्रचार नीति। हमारी विदेश प्रचार नीति कितनी दुर्बल है? आपको मुनकर आश्चर्य होगा कि दुनिया में इस प्रकार के भी अनभिज्ञ देश हैं जिनको पता ही नहीं है कि भारत के अन्दर 6-7 करोड़ मुसलमान भी रहते हैं और वहां पर मुसलमानों को इतने अधिकार मिले हुए हैं। हमारी विदेश प्रचार नीति की दुर्बलता का सबसे बड़ा उदाहरण यह है कि कश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में पाकिस्तान ने दुनिया के अन्दर जो अपना पक्ष रखा हुआ है, भारत सरकार अपने प्रचार के माध्यम से पूरी तरह से अभी तक उसका निराकरण नहीं कर पाई। तो हमारी विदेश नीति में कहां पर दुर्बलता है जिसके कारण कदम कदम पर हमको असफलता देखने को मिलती है? मेरा कहना यह है कि इसके लिए एक उच्चस्तरीय जांच कमीशन की मांग तो मैं नहीं करता लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि उच्चस्तरीय विश्लेषण अवश्य होना चाहिये। उस उच्चस्तरीय विश्लेषण में इस बात को देखा जाये कि हमारी विदेश नीति में कौन सी दुर्बलता है जिसके कारण हमारी विदेश नीति हमारे लिये अभिशाप बनी हुई है। अभी थोड़े दिन पहले मैं ने देखा कि इण्डोनेशिया के हमारे राजदूतावास में एक पाक्षिक पत्र प्रकाशित होता था जो केवल मात्र भारत और इण्डोनेशिया के सम्बन्ध में होता था। हमने ज्यों ही

उस पत्र का प्रकाशन बन्द किया, पाकिस्तान की सरकार ने उस प्रकार का पत्र प्रकाशित करना आरम्भ कर दिया और इण्डोनेशिया के पुस्तकालयों में जहां पर हमारे पत्र जाते थे वहां पर पाकिस्तान के पत्र दिखाई देने लगे। एक तो पाकिस्तान को सबसे बड़ी सुलभता यह है कि छोटा देश होने के नाते वह दुनिया को आसानी से कह सकता है कि एक बड़ा देश छोटे देश को हड़प जाना चाहता है। दूसरे कहीं कहीं वह मजहब का भी सहारा लेता है। लेकिन इतना होने के बावजूद भी कई इस्लामिक देश इस प्रकार के हैं जैसे अफगानिस्तान, इण्डोनेशिया और मलेशिया जो राजनीतिक दृष्टि से पाकिस्तान के निकट नहीं हैं। परन्तु आज पाकिस्तान मजहब का लाभ उठाकर के इन देशों में अपनी राजनीति की जड़ें जमा रहा है और अपनी कूटनीतिक सफलता प्राप्त कर रहा है जोकि भारत सरकार की कूटनीतिक असफलता का प्रमाण है। इस विषय में भी हमारी विदेश नीति पर गम्भीरता से सोचा जाना चाहिये।

एक बात मैं प्रवासी भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। मुझे याद है कि जिस समय श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू विदेश मन्त्री थे, श्री दिनेश सिंह उनके सहायक थे। उस समय एक घटना घटी थी। फिजी के कुछ लोगों ने लिखा था कि भारत सरकार दुनिया की राजनीति पर ज्यादा ध्यान दे रही है लेकिन जो प्रवासी भारतीय फिजी में, मारिशस में, और अफ्रीका में रहते हैं, या दूसरे देशों में रहते हैं, उनपर क्या बीत रही है, वह भारत सरकार की निगाहों से ओझल होता चला जा रहा है। इसलिए उन्होंने कहा था कि हमारे और भारत सरकार के बीच में कोई ऐसा माध्यम जरूर होना चाहिए कि जो हमारी कठिनाइयों को बताता रहे और भारत सरकार का पक्ष हमको बताता रहे। उन्होंने इसके लिए दिल्ली में एक भवन निर्माण के लिए अपनी ओर से प्रस्ताव किया था कि भारत सरकार भूमि दे तो हम अपनी ओर से भवन बना लेंगे लेकिन अभी तक वह बात हल नहीं हो पाई। उसमें मैं भी कुछ अपनी दुर्बलता

अनुभव करता हूँ। लेकिन एक बात मैं श्री दिनेश सिंह से कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक इस प्रकार का कोई गैर सरकारी विभाग अवश्य होना चाहिए जो इन बातों के सम्बन्ध में वहाँ जाकर भी अध्ययन करे और यहाँ भी अध्ययन करे। यह आपके और उनके बीच में एक माध्यम का काम करे। उनका अध्ययन करके उस वास्तविकता से आपको परिचय कराये और इस देश की नीति से उनको परिचय कराये। प्रवासी भारतियों की समस्याओं को इस तरह से उपेक्षित नहीं छोड़ना चाहिए।

यहाँ एक बात मैं रूसी रेडियो के प्रसारण के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। रूसी रेडियो की स्थिति ऐसी है कि वह हमारे देश की नीतियों, हमारे देश की पार्टियों और हमारे देश की राजनीति के खिलाफ बेसुरे राग अलापता रहता है, प्रचार करता रहता है। उनके पास इतना शक्तिशाली ट्रांसमिटर है कि दिल्ली का रेडियो न सुना जाये लेकिन मास्को से प्रसारित होने वाले कार्यक्रम सभी जगह सुने जाते हैं। यदि रूस से कहा गया तो उन्होंने कहा कि यह तो कोई निजी संगठन है, उसमें हम कैसे बाधा डाल सकते हैं। क्या रूस जैसे देश में भी कोई निजी संगठन स्वतंत्रता से काम कर सकता है और वह भारत जैसे देश के खिलाफ प्रचार कर सकता है? लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह हमारी बहुत बड़ी दुर्बलता है। इस विषय में हमको रूस सरकार के पास एक कड़ा विरोध-यत्न भोजना चाहिए। नहीं तो इस प्रकार के जो प्रचार होते हैं उन प्रचारों का कुछ न कुछ उत्तर अवश्य देना चाहिए।

अन्त में एक बात तटस्थ नीति के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। हम अपनी तटस्थता बनाये रखें, भारत सरकार तटस्थ नीति पर कायम रहे, इसपर हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। क्योंकि भारत के लिए इससे अच्छी हितकारी कोई नीति नहीं हो सकती है। लेकिन यह भी सही है कि हमारी तटस्थता सच्चे अर्थों में तटस्थता होनी चाहिए। हमारी तटस्थता प्रवाह की शक्ति के अन्दर बहने वाली तटस्थता

नहीं होनी चाहिए। हम नारा तो तटस्थता का लगायें लेकिन हमारी विदेश नीति अन्तः-विशेष के अन्दर झुकती चली जाये, इससे बड़ा हमारी तटस्थता का दुर्बल प्रमाण और क्या हो सकता है। अभी हमारे डी०एम०के०के मित्र ने कहा कि जी०डी०आर०के साथ में हमको अपना राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध बनाने चाहिए। अच्छा होता इस बात को कहते समय वे यह भी कहते कि जो और देश हैं, जिनके अस्तित्व को भारत सरकार ने स्वीकार किया है और—जो दुनिया की राजनीति में हैं, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में जिनको प्रतिनिधित्व प्राप्त है जैसे कि इजरायल है उसको भी राजनीतिक मान्यता देनी चाहिए, तैवान को भी राजनीतिक मान्यता देनी चाहिए। जब हम तटस्थ हैं तो तटस्थता के नाम, जो देश हैं जिनकी सरकारें काम कर रही हैं, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ से जिनको मान्यता मिली हुई है उनको भारत सरकार मान्यता क्यों नहीं देती?

आखिरी बात जिसे कहकर मैं बैठता हूँ वह यह है जिसके बारे में मैं ने कई बार मंत्रालय को शिकायत भी की है कि दुनिया के देशों में जा करके जो एक बात सबसे ज्यादा लज्जित करने वाली देखने को मिलती है वह यह है कि जितने भी हमारे राजदूतवास दूसरे देशों में हैं उनमें मुझे खुशी हो वहाँ पर काम करने वाले जो कर्मचारी हैं उनकी उन देशों की भाषाओं की अच्छी जानकारी हो और उन देशों की भाषाओं के माध्यम से अच्छा कार्य करें। लेकिन मैं ने देखा है, कहीं भी आप जाइये, सभी देशों में भारतीय राजदूतावासों के नाम-पट्टों पर भी हिन्दी नहीं है। जब इस देश के संविधान ने हिन्दी को राज भाषा स्वीकार कर लिया है और संविधान में हिन्दी को स्थान दे दिया है लेकिन दूसरे देशों में भारत के राजदूतावासों के साइन बोर्डों पर भी हिन्दी न लिखी हो तो इससे बड़ी लज्जा की बात और क्या हो सकती है। वैसे तो यह बात छोटी है लेकिन हमारे स्वाभिमान की दृष्टि से बहुत बड़ी है। विदेश मन्त्री इसके लिए एक कड़ा नोट लें और इसके लिए उन लोगों को लिखें। जो सिध्दांत हमने

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शस्त्री]

स्वीकार किया है और दूसरे देशों में जो हमें अपने स्वाभिमानी स्वरूप का परिचय देना है जिसमें हमारी भाषा भी एक माध्यम है, उसको आंखों से ओझल नहीं करना है।

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : मैं ने आपको एक चिट्ठी, सभापति महोदय दी थी, वह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मसला है . . .

सभापति महोदय : उसके सम्बन्ध में यह जानकारी मिली है कि मृतक शरीर को देने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है लेकिन अभी पुलिस इन्वेस्टिगेशन कर रही है और जैसे ही वह समाप्त हो जायेगा, उनके रिश्तेदारों और सम्बन्धियों को वह मृतक शरीर हवाले कर दिया जायेगा। सरकार इसके लिए तैयार है।

श्री रवि राय : सभापति जी, आप स्वयं कानून के विशेषज्ञ हैं। बिहारी जी की मृत्यु रात में दो बजे हुई थी। आज सुबह श्री राम सेवक यादव जी से पुलिस वालों ने कहा था कि आप कहिए कि वह आपके दोस्त थे तो आपको उनकी लाश दे दी जायेगी लेकिन वह जानबूझ कर नहीं दे रहे हैं। हम लोग जुलूस लेकर वहां जाना चाहते हैं। वह जान बूझ कर नहीं दे रहे हैं। आप खुद कानून विशेषज्ञ हैं। क्या आप नहीं जानते हैं कि क्या होना चाहिए? बिहारी साहब 2 बजे मर चुके हैं। अभी तक लाश नहीं मिल रही है। सुबह इस बात पर यहां डेढ़ घंटा खर्च किया गया और सारे सदन का रोष आप को मालूम हुआ। यहां पर श्री दिनेश सिंह बैठे हैं, एक और मंत्री बैठे हैं। आप उन से कहें कि आधे घंटे के अन्दर लाश मिल जानी चाहिए। लाश देने में भी वह पक्षपात कर रहे हैं और हम लोगों को उकसा रहे हैं। यह बड़ा अहम मसला है। रात 2 बजे मृत्यु हुई और लाश अभी तक नहीं मिल रही है।

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : सभापति महोदय, लाश फौरन दी जानी चाहिए। आखिर यह देरी क्यों की जा रही है?

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य का पत्र आने के बाद मैं ने जानकारी ली है उन लोगोंको देने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। जैसे पुलिस का पोस्ट मार्टेम हो जायेगा . . .

श्री बलराज मधोक (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : इस में आपत्ति की बात नहीं है। उनका कहना यह है कि पूरे चौबिस घंटे का समय हो गया है। यह देर क्यों की जा रही है। आप इन्स्ट्रक्शन दें गवर्नमेंट को कि वह जल्दी से लाश को हवाले करें।

सभापति महोदय : उन का कहना यह है कि पुलिस की इन्क्वेस्ट रिपोर्ट तैयार हो रही है। उस के तैयार होने के फौरन बाद दे दी जायेगी।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : आखिर कितना समय लगगा? बीस घंटे तो हो चुके हैं।

सभापति महोदय : सुबह डेढ़ घंटे इन पर चर्चा हो चुकी है . . . . .

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : यह सरकार जो बेवकूफियां कर रही है उस का कोई हिसाब नहीं है। पोस्ट मार्टेम के बाद लाश दे देनी चाहिए। पोस्ट मार्टेम में एक या डेढ़ घंटा लगता है। कल रात दो बजे मृत्यु हुई। अधिक से अधिक 10 या 11 बजे लाश दे देनी चाहिये थी। अब तो 6 बजे रहे हैं। आखिर वह क्यों नहीं देते? सरकार इस का कारण बतलाये कि वह कौन सी विशेष दिक्कतें हैं जिन की वजह से लाश नहीं दे रहे हैं। एजिटेशन करवा कर और शोम मचवा कर देना यह अच्छी परम्परा नहीं है। मंत्री महोदय बतलायें तो सही कि वह कारण कौन से हैं जिन की वजह से वह नहीं देना चाहते। पोस्ट मार्टेम तो एक घंटे में हो जाता है।

श्री रवि राय : यहां पर कैबिनेट स्तर के दो मंत्री हैं, उन की सामूहिक जिम्मेदारी है।



**THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED)** : As has already been pointed out by you, the delay is on account of the fact that the inquest was being made. Now, I shall convey the wishes of the House to the Minister of...

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS**: How long?

**SHRI F. A. AHMED** : ... Home Affairs, that it should be expedited.

**श्री रवि राय** : हमारे लोग वहां से चले गये हैं। यह हम को उकसा रहे हैं।

**MR. CHAIRMAN**: Immediately after the preparation of the inquest report, it must be handed over, because it is getting late and they are worried and agitated.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK**: Our feeling is this is being delayed deliberately.

**SHRI J. H. PATEL**: I am coming from that place. They have determined to give the body only after it gets dark; they do not want the body to be taken in daylight. That is what they are trying to do.

**MR. CHAIRMAN**: The Minister has assured this House that they will try to expedite the matter.

**श्री रवि राय** : 6 बजे चुके ह, 2 बजे से हम इन्तजार कर रहे हैं।

**श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त** : सभापति महोदय, इन के ऐश्वर्य का कोई मतलब नहीं है। यह हमें देना नहीं चाहते। नहीं तो यह देर क्यों हो रही है।

**श्री शिव नारायण** : उन को फौरन देना चाहिये। यह क्यों देर कर रहे हैं ?

**MR. CHAIRMAN**: Shri Surendra Pal Singh.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH)**: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is the time for annual stock-taking, and

it is in the fitness of things that this hon. House should assess and scrutinise the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs during the past one year, and should find our shortcomings and faults and mistakes that may have been committed in the past. And also, during the course of the debate, this is the time when hon. Members can give suggestions for our better functioning in the future. From this point of view, this debate is most welcome and this Ministry, I am sure, will benefit a great deal from this discussion.

Now, Sir the foreign policy of any country is essentially the reflection of that country's own internal policy and domestic policy and the two of them are very closely related to one another. In the field of international affairs, we have to deal with sovereign and independent countries, who have their own national interests and have their own principles to guide their policies and it is not always possible for two or three countries to agree wholeheartedly over any one particular issue or see eye to eye with all of them on many basic issues. By and large, effort is made to reconcile all these divergent views and different viewpoints and to bring about the largest measure of common agreement between all like-minded States and on that basis build up a closer, friendly and co-operative relationship between countries of the world. This precisely is the basic principle of our foreign policy. Our policy of active, peaceful co-existence and nonalignment has been very beneficial to us and through that policy we have been able to earn the friendship of a large number of countries in the world. The policy of nonalignment, as the House is aware, has played the role of a catalytic agent in reducing tension in the world and bringing about a better understanding between a large number of small and medium-sized countries.

The success of the policy of nonalignment can very well be judged by the fact that even a country like Pakistan, which is fully aligned and is a member of the SEATO and CENTO Pacts, has shown a very keen desire to join the nonaligned group. Of course, she is trying to do this without giving up her membership of SEATO and SEN-TO. This is a very difficult feat to perform, but she is in a way trying to ride two horses, running in different directions, at the same time. In other

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh]

words, she wants to eat the cake and have it too. But all the same, it does show that even countries like Pakistan are evincing a great deal of interest in this policy of nonalignment.

The days of domination by big powers over small powers are now over and we are entering an era in which the relationship would depend on mutual cooperation and mutual understanding on an equal basis and to mutual benefit. India's foreign policy and also our attitude and approach to all the world problems should be judged against this background.

Hon. members have given notice of a large number of cut motions. Through the cut motions and also through their speeches today, they have raised many points. It will not be possible for me to reply to all of them. I have selected two or three subjects which are of topical interest, in which members have also shown interest from time to time and even during the course of their speeches today. I will deal with those subjects.

I would first like to say something about administration. Mr. Sondhi, during the course of his speech today, said that a number of recommendations of the Pillai Committee have not been implemented till now. I would like to make a reference to it to correct the record. The recommendations made by the Pillai Committee fall under two categories. One group of recommendations fell within the competence of this ministry which we could implement straightway without any difficulty. Another group of recommendations had some financial implications which could not be implemented without the concurrence of the Finance Ministry and without getting extra funds, especially foreign exchange allocation. All these matters which are still pending are being discussed with the concerned ministries, especially with the Finance Ministry and as soon as we are able to get the funds sanctioned, we would implement them also. Our inability is due to shortage of funds.

Generally speaking, administration of any service or corps of men is a very complex and difficult task, specially in respect of a service like the Foreign Service, whose officials have to serve in

far flung corners of the world. Sometimes they have to serve under difficult climatic and other conditions. Administration is also an art of exploring and finding out ways and means of improving the efficiency of the service, of meeting the needs of individuals on a human basis and also keeping our expenditure on our foreign missions as low as possible, without affecting the efficiency or performance of our missions. We also have to devise ways and means of proper training of our diplomats, both old and new, so that they can perform their task properly and project our country's image.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** But the main complaint about our foreign service is that they are unsympathetic to the Indians when they go to their embassies.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** I will come to that point also. Our main problem in the Ministry is how to reconcile, on the one hand, the pressing need for cutting down expenditure—we all agree that a country like ours cannot afford to spend too much of money—and, at the same time, maintain some optimum standard of performance and efficiency abroad. This is a very difficult task to perform and this requires a great deal of ability for tight rope walking. I assure the hon. House that every effort is being made by the Ministry to achieve these objectives and our missions abroad have been instructed to carry out the strictest possible economy and to prevent all wasteful expenditure, as far as possible. In fact, this is a continuous effort on the part of the Ministry. Economic measures are being taken by the Ministry and efforts are being made to see that the expenditure is not increased. By rationalisation of the staffing pattern and by cutting down wasteful expenditure and certain items of miscellaneous expenditure which we do not think is necessary, we have been able to keep down the expenditure. And I would quote some figures to show that the expenditure during the last three years on our foreign missions has not shown any rising tendency at all.

In 1967-68 we spent Rs. 1,052.22 lakhs on our foreign missions and we had 99 foreign missions at that time. So, the average per mission came to Rs. 10.63 lakhs. In 1968-69 the expenditure was Rs. 1,097.87 lakhs, a

slight rise, but the number of missions increased from 99 to 101. In 1969-70 the expenditure went up slightly to Rs. 1,151.89 lakhs but the number of missions also went up from 101 to 102. So, these figures clearly indicate that there has been no abnormal rise in our expenditure during the past three years. On the contrary, as a result of various measures of economy taken up by the Ministry, in fact we have been able to make some notional savings in our expenditure over the last two or three years. I may mention those figures also for the benefit of the hon. Members. According to our calculations, in 1968-69 Rs. 33.70 lakhs has been our notional saving. In 1969-70 the same is about Rs. 35.35 lakhs and in 1970-71 it is going to be a little less about Rs. 27 lakhs, because of some expected additional expenditure this year.

I will give a few more figures here to show and to prove to the House that the cost of running of our foreign missions is not abnormally high and it compares very well with the cost which other countries are incurring.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** There is no doubt about that. In fact, let it be a little more expensive. But let it really serve its functions. When we are spending so much, a few lakhs more will not matter. But the question is whether it is really doing the job for which it is meant.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** I want to prove the point that our foreign service is the least expensive. I will compare our expenditure with that of a country like New Zealand. As I said, in 1968-69, our expenditure has been Rs. 1,097.85 lakhs. But New Zealand, which is a smaller country and which maintains only 32 missions as against 101 by us, spent Rs. 968 lakhs. The difference is not very much, considering that we have three times their missions. So, the expenditure is not very much. I have raised this point because sometimes hon. Members make the point that we are spending a lot of money on our missions, that a lot of money is wasted and that this expenditure should be curtailed.

Then I will come to another point to show that our expenditure is not much. We spend 1.3 per cent of our total civil expenditure on maintaining our missions abroad whereas countries like UK spent 4.9 per cent, USA 4.4 per cent and New

Zealand 3.4 per cent. From that angle also it can be proved that our service is not very expensive. On the basis of its performance and the reputation that it enjoys abroad, I can say with great pride that this service has done extremely good work and has a very good reputation indeed.

**18 hrs.**

Now I would like to say something about our High Commission in London because that is a very favourite subject with hon. Members. Sometimes allegations are made that a very large staff is being kept there unnecessarily; they have no use for them there at all, and so forth and so on.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** A large number of foreigners too.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** Yes.

I agree with hon. Members when they say that our High Commission in London has been overstaffed and is probably still overstaffed. But it is a legacy from our colonial days. Even before we got our independence, we were greatly depending on London for many things. Even after independence we were depending for our development work on London and most of our Ministries had to deal with London for which purpose they had to have their representatives there. London became a kind of an outpost for a number of our ministries. As a result of that our staff multiplied out of all proportion, so much so that in 1958-59 the total strength there was about 1,300 people. But the number now is only 758. During these ten years or so we have been able to bring this number down by nearly half.

I would like to make it quite clear to hon. Members that all these people there are not actually under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs. On the diplomatic side we have only 400 people and the rest belong to other ministries. Perhaps it would be useful if I give the names of the ministries concerned so that hon. Members know what exactly is the position.

The India-based staff of the Ministry of External Affairs is 60 and the local people are 340. A large majority of these are English people but quite a number of them are Indians who are settled in UK.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** What is the explanation for so many Englishmen there? There are 50,000 Indians in London itself. Why can you not recruit from amongst Indians there?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** It is an old problem. These people have been there for long, and we cannot re-trench them easily. It is a human problem. We cannot throw them out of their jobs. It will take some time.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** Can you assure us that new recruitment will be made out of Indian settlers there and not out of Englishmen?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** As far as I know, an attempt is made to recruit as many Indians as possible.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** My information is different.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** It depends on the availability and suitability of candidates. If Indians are available locally, they will be given preference.

The Ministry of Works and Housing has 27 India-based officers and 149 local people, the Ministry of Defence has 60 India-based and 34 local people; the Ministry of Commerce has 6 India-based and 25 local people; the Ministry of Education has 3 India-based and like that it goes on. Altogether they have about 167 India-based officers and 581 local people including those of the Ministry of External Affairs. The total strength is 748.

But I may add that this number is likely to be reduced further because very recently our Foreign Service Inspectorate carried out an inspection and made certain recommendations for reduction of staff. They have recommended that 258 officers can be reduced very soon. But since the matter relates to other ministries also, the recommendations are being considered by all the employing ministries and we are hopeful that they will be accepted by them and implemented very soon. Once they are implemented the number will come down to 500.

The difficulty is only about the local staff. It is very difficult to dispense with their services because they have been there for a very long time and

they have got certain terms and conditions guaranteed to them. It will take quite some time before we eliminate this element or reduce their number. It will be done over the years.

In regard to other missions also, they have recommended reduction of 54 posts in Washington and about 59 posts in other missions.

In regard to efficiency in our missions, this matter has been exercising our mind. We are seized of the situation that our efficiency should improve and the heads of Missions and other officers of our missions should be able to give a good account of themselves. A number of new steps have been taken by the Ministry at the initiative of our Foreign Minister. Firstly, all our missions abroad have now been given certain objectives which they have got to achieve during their tenure of office. Each head of mission is now being told what he is supposed to do and achieve while he is there. A target is being set for them; a time-limit is being fixed for them by which time they have to achieve it. Instead of being vague about it, they now know, precisely what they are supposed to do. They have a time-limit by which they have got to finish. A proper check is kept to see that they keep to schedule and they work according to instructions from here. The Ministry also takes steps to encourage close and continuous dialogue between the heads of missions and officials at headquarters.

In the past, it did happen that some communications, certain suggestions, came from the heads of missions and they were not attended to promptly and there was a delay in dealing with them. That is why the schemes could not be taken up and implemented. Now, we have taken steps to see that the correspondence is dealt with promptly so that decisions can be taken as quickly as possible and schemes implemented. The senior officers, particularly, have been instructed to attend to their letters and mails very promptly.

The efforts are also being made to administer our missions abroad on officer-oriented basis. Our officers have been told that they should be able to take decisions on their own and that they should not wait for long notes from their subordinates. That causes a great deal of delay and, consequently, there

is delay in taking decisions. They have been asked to take initiative and take decisions on their own.

About the quality of personnel, Mr. Bal Raj Madhok just now said that complaints have come that our heads of missions and other officials are not upto the mark, that they do not show courtesy, that they are not able to project the image of India properly, that they have no background knowledge, that they have no knowledge of India's culture, historical heritage and the rest of it. This is a very sweeping sort of a statement. There may be some people in our service, call them black sheep or anything, who probably are not upto the mark and their behaviour may not be as good as it should be. But, by and large, the officers in our service are very highly educated people and they have a very good idea of India's culture, historical heritage and the rest of it and they have very good knowledge of contemporary India, what are our problems, how to solve them and all that. By and large, they have been functioning very effectively abroad and our impression is that they have been doing well.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** It is not a question of education. The question is how they project India. I know how they are apologetic about our stand on Kashmir question. They do not know what our stand is on Kashmir question, on Pakistan question, etc. They are apologetic about our stand on Kashmir. Then, they are not sympathetic to Indians who go there to these missions; they do not help them. They do not get sympathetic treatment from our Embassy people there. They do not show courtesy. That is the main grouse.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** May I submit once in an Indian Embassy, the contemporary poet Vatsayan was introduced as the author of *Kamasutra*? That shows the extent of their knowledge.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** I am sorry to hear from Mr. Bal Raj Madhok that our diplomatic personnel do not show courtesy to the visitors. I can assure him and the House . . .

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** This is my own experience.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** . . . that instructions have been sent that they should show courtesy to all visitors irrespective of the fact whether they

come from India or they are local people. If there is any case that has come to his notice, I would request the hon. Member to kindly pass it on to us and we will take necessary action. Whenever such cases are reported to us, the remedial measures are taken immediately.

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK:** They should not be apologetic about our stand on Kashmir; they should not be apologetic about our stand on Pakistan. If they are apologetic, how can they put through our case?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** The Government of India's policy has been explained to them. They know the position. There is no need for them to be apologetic. They should explain the position and our policy very clearly. If there are any cases of that type in your mind, the hon. Member may kindly pass them on to us and we will see what can be done about it.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** I think, the local language is a barrier for them and they become apologetic. They do not know the local language.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** Most of our diplomats know the local language of the country in which they are serving.

**SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai):** I know of an Ambassador in a foreign country whose wife knew French but he did not know French.

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** His wife can help him. Anyway, it does not take them very long to pick up the local language. It takes six or seven months to follow the ordinary conversation in a local language. I agree all of them do not know the local language. But every effort is being made to persuade them to learn the foreign languages, at least one or two foreign languages, so that they can carry on conversation with the local people. Now, Sir, the other subject on which I wish to speak is the question of Indians abroad. This is a subject which has been exercising the mind of Members of Parliament and people outside for a very long time and it is something about which we also feel greatly concerned. This is a problem which has been left over by history. The contribution which the people of Indian origin have

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh]

made in developing and opening up these countries where they are residing now is well-known to everybody. There is no doubt about that. These people went there as pioneers; they went there as labourers, as farmers and as workers and they have made a great deal of sacrifice and undergone privations in opening up and in the development of those countries. Now after nearly half a century of settled life in these countries, they are again facing difficulties and privations and they are actually on the verge of being pushed out of these countries. This is something which makes us feel very sad and we are trying to do our best to help them.

While on this subject, I will dwell upon the conditions prevailing in East Africa alone and will not deal with the people of Indian origin in Burma, Malaysia and other South East Asian countries where the situation has not taken a very serious turn and things are quite normal and there is no cause for alarm, but conditions are not the same in East Africa. The hon. House is fully aware of the background and the genesis of the whole trouble. We all know that some African countries—Kenya and a number of other countries in Africa—have adopted a certain policy of nationalisation as a result of which many of these people who are not local nationals are finding it difficult to stay there and carry on their normal trade. They are now being more or less squeezed out of these countries and a large number of such people are British passport holders. Their difficulties have been made worse and more difficult by the Commonwealth Immigration Act of 1968 which placed a great deal of restrictions on their entry into UK. As more and more people are joining the queue to go to UK and are not able to enter UK, the situation is becoming rather difficult. This problem has two aspects as I said sometime ago. It has a legal aspect and it has a moral aspect. Legally India can very well say that it is no concern of ours and it is British responsibility and we have nothing whatsoever to do with this. This kind of an attitude will not go down well with our people and with the policies we have ourselves adopted. The moral aspect is that they are our own kith and kin and the feeling in our country is very strong on this that we must do something about their difficulties. What should we do?

If we take a legalistic attitude, we will become unpopular with our own people and if we interfere too much also, then those Governments will say that we are interfering in their internal affairs. That will jeopardise our relations with those States. So, we are doing our very best to maintain our relations with those countries as well as to intercede with them on behalf of these people to see that the least amount of hardship is caused. We have no quarrel with the African Governments and their policies. They have a right to pursue this policy. We only ask that those policies should be implemented in a humane manner and in such a way that the least amount of hardship is caused to them and these people are able to leave Africa with dignity and in a proper manner. This is being done. In addition to that a number of steps have been taken by the Government of India to give them facilities of importing their stock-in-trade—I have not got the time to enumerate all this. But, everything possible is being done from our side to give them all facilities and help to settle down in India and even with regard to British subjects who are not able to enter UK we allow them to come to India on a six months visa and at the end of the six month period, they can decide whether to stay in this country or to go to UK.

**SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA (Anand):** What about stateless people? There are people of Indian origin in East Africa who do not hold Kenyan citizenship or hold British passport or Indian citizenship and technically they are stateless. What is going to happen to them?

**SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH:** It is true that there are a large number of stateless people whose applications are pending with the local Governments. There are stateless persons whose applications are pending and there are others who have not even applied. I am afraid, Sir, that persons who are Stateless are the responsibility of the States in which they are living and as regards the cases of those who have applied and are kept pending, we are trying our best to persuade local Governments to grant them citizenship as quickly as possible.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Some hon. Members—Mr. Rabi Ray, Mr. Patel, Mr. Balraj Madhok—raised the question of handing over the dead body and now

the Government has informed me that the dead body has been handed over. Now, Mr. Hiran Mukerjee,

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE** (Calcutta—North-East): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the fog end of the day and with the Foreign Minister busy elsewhere I offer my observations to the House for whatever they are worth. Foreign policy has often necessarily to be pragmatic. But, a country like ours whose material strength is limited, needs above everything a principled approach which alone can command not fear but the respect of the nations. Our misfortune in India is that our foreign policy suffers from the fact that the political scene of India is a shambles today. The forces of the left that alone have a future are in some sort of disarray and Government on its side in spite of some early posturings seems unable or unwilling to go ahead with a genuine programme of national reconstruction. The result is the kind of foreign policy we have. And, the Ministry's essay at a general survey with which we have been presented attempts a certain flashiness, but it is stale and insipid.

Sir, non-alignment has been stressed in the Survey but I do not see any evidence of a realisation that non-alignment is not a concept in isolation, that it is linked with peace and with freedom. Non-alignment is not merely a moral protest against power-politics nor a shrewd strategem of less powerful countries to gain maximum advantage out of big power conflicts. Non-alignment should call for purposive cooperation, sub-regional, regional and where possible, even global, and it connotes a deeper association especially of the freedom-loving countries of Asia, Africa and Latin-America in augmenting the totality of their impact on the international scene.

#### 18.19 hours

[**SHRI P. K. VASUDEVAN NAIR** in the Chair]

I know, the world today is a great deal more complicated than it was a decade ago, but India, I fear, has not even attempted consistent and principled application of the policy of peace and non-alignment. It was a good deal more than symbolic, when the Prime Minister some 18 months ago went on a round of South American countries,

carefully choosing a bunch that was in the good books of the United States but she never perhaps thought of a visit to Cuba and a hand-shake with Castro which might have been good for her soul. With Cuba we have diplomatic relations but virtually no trade, doubtless because the United States frowns upon it. Will this be ended?

Our foreign policy performs wonderful balancing tricks and yet the slip shows. We have consular relations with two Koreas but mentionable trade only with the U.S. puppet in the South. The Democratic People's Republic of North Korea is fighting the United States in a manner which shines through to the world outside in the Pueblo incident and in so many other ways; but we keep them out. So far as trade is concerned, we keep them at arms length. We have Consulate Generals in the two Viet-Nams. But we have trade only with the U.S.—propped South Viet-Nam. When will this kind of disparity go? I have been told that Government is examining of upgrading the representation with the Democratic Republic of North Viet-Nam. But how long is this examination to go on?

Meanwhile must we evoke imaginary juridical difficulty in giving a recognition to the provisional Revolutionary Government in South Viet-Nam? It was good that the Minister, on the 18th March, paid a tribute to the Vietnamese struggle as a symbol of the fight for freedom of the peoples of the world. But there is neither sense nor sensibility but only a confession of cold-feet in government virtually equating the United States and its satellite troops on the one hand and the freedom fighters in Viet-Nam or for that matter in Laos and Cambodia on the other. We have asked for mechanical withdrawal of all the troops. Can't India, as Chairman of the I.C.C., conscious of the Geneva agreements, state clearly that the Americans, Australians, New Zealanders and others have just no business at all in that part of the world? Do we not know that President Nixon's so-called Vietnamisation of the war is a resurrection of the idea of "Asians to fight Asians" as a cheaper proceeding doubtless for the American imperialist purposes? Why Shrimati Indira Gandhi has shied away from reacting to the My-Lai and other atrocities? At least her Government could have taken note of the authenticated reports of preparations and actual

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

application of chemical and bacteriological methods of war-fare and other unspeakable atrocities practised by the U.S. in Viet-Nam? And yet we could go to the U.N. Human Rights Commission to raise the Tibet issue along with the U.S., the Philippines and Gwatamala a very good company but we cannot raise in the Human Rights Commission the question of chemical and bacteriological war-fare in Viet-Nam.

I would like to ask the Minister "Where do you think we stand in the eyes of the world as far as South-East Asia is concerned? Are we on the side of the forces of freedom or are we just calculating and entirely afraid and unwilling to step on the shoes of American imperialists?" Government cannot be so innocent that it does not know who the villain of the peace is in Laos and in Cambodia? That obnoxious dump, the C.I.A. which I hate do have to mention operates everywhere. Now if respect was given to the Geneva Conventions of 1954 and 1960, you could have stopped the monstrosities that are going on in that part of the world and the U.S. *coup-d'etat* in Cambodia could have been stopped. You could have a real settlement of the problems of the people who are fighting for their freedom and their honour. We have to support the democratic forces in Laos, in Cambodia as well as in Viet-Nam. Otherwise our image already dark will be further darkened and we would be looked down by the freedom loving forces in the world to whom the future belongs and to no others. Our image would be darkened.

India's pusillanimity in this regard is due to the fear not only of the U.S.'s displeasure which it is more than time that we shed but also the fear that China might draw dividends from that sort of thing. This is an ignorant and unprincipled approach. Some people in this House might like to pull back the wheels of history. But this cannot be done and let us not always have an idea that we have to truckle down to one great power or the other. Unless we decide that we have to stomach a lot of things which we ought not to stomach. Our support to the forces of freedom fighters in South-East Asia and elsewhere would mean a defeat to hegemonistic ambitions whether those am-

bitions are held by China or by any other country.

The Ministry's report says correctly that we have no permanent hostility with China and that we want a settlement. Do we wish merely to leave things at that? In the meanwhile we hear the declarations in this House and elsewhere about China and Pakistan being the enemies of this country. We say we are prepared to have talks. But can't we, in our own interest, go ahead further? Can't we sound China about exchanging Ambassadors? I can think at least of one old China hand among us who could perhaps help moves in this and other matters. I wish Government to come forward and spell out more concretely what it is doing, actually what initiative it proposes to take in order to solve this problem. Our neighbour might be perverse, but we have to live with her and have to make do with whatever forces we have. That is why a settlement is called for.

In relation to Pakistan, the position should be even clearer. Let us not stand on ceremony. Let us not pose virtuously that minorities in Pakistan suffer. On that score, our record in recent years is too dismal to recall. Let us not harp always on the thesis that Pakistan wants a discussion on Kashmir and the question of river waters. If we adhere to the Tashkent spirit, as we say we do, that we want a settlement on the basis of what? Of bilateral talks, why in the name of goodness must we bar discussion on the assumption that problems just do not exist? If Pakistan is obtuse, must we flatter her by imitation? Is it not more than a rifle disconcerting to read reports of India lobbying to keep Pakistan out of the non-aligned camp? If Pakistan wants to jump into the bandwagon, let her do so, if she can reconcile that with her Seato and Cento posturings. It is her business, not ours. And the whole world is bored to death at the India-Pakistan confrontation and conflict that goes on. 'A plague on both your houses'—that is the attitude of the world outside. We have to put our houses in order. They are part of the same legacy and that is why we have to go ahead and make friends with Pakistan.

I have not the least in little intention of putting a spoke in the wheel of the Farakka Barrage construction which is so important for our country. But I



do not see why when Pakistan raises some questions, we insist on Secretary-level, and no higher, discussion. Dr. K. L. Rao told me that our case is cast-iron, it cannot be defeated. In which case why can't we go ahead? Why can't we want the improvement of relations in trade, in cultural relations and in every other thing? Why can't we hold in regard even to Farakka Barrage, the river waters question, higher level and friendly discussion?

The House knows that the Ganga-Brahmaputra basin, if properly tackled by technology, can bring plenty to an enormous area, and that area comprises not only India and Pakistan but also neighbouring areas, Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim and to a certain extent, even China. It was a good thing when over the Indus waters we had a treaty. What a grand job of work it would be if the entire north-eastern region of India and its periphery could gain from a magnificent project which could be brought on to the order of the day by purposeful discussion with Pakistan? And I think we owe it to the magnificent upsurge of the people, specially of East Pakistan, to make a gesture which would show that we do not want any harm to be done to Pakistan on account of the Farakka Barrage. But we want the Ganga-Brahmaputra basin to be tackled on a Foundation which would bring happiness to large areas not only of our country but of other countries also.

This makes me think of our Himalayan and trans-Himalayan policy. We are not the inheritors of the mantle of the British Empire in this part of the world. We are an area of freedom and of progress, and I feel that if we spell out our position properly, we shall be friends with all our neighbours really and truly and not in the formal-courtesy fashion that exists today.

Nepal, with which we claim historic friendship, is irritating in so many different ways from time to time. One never quite knows what goes on in the mountain fastnesses of Bhutan and sometimes she appears sullen towards us. Even little Sikkim, whose Chogyal seems a somewhat mysterious quantity, has problems and troubles which we do not even try fully to understand. With this allergy of ours is linked up our inability to attach to ourselves the NEFA people, the Naga people. The whole thing is linked. If only we behave pro-

perly, if only we woke up to the facts of life today when the winds of change are blowing in this part of the world, we should pursue a correct Himalayan policy.

I do not have a grouse against the Government in regard to the Middle East where perhaps it is trying to do what it can, but there should be no delay in the opening of a Mission in Mangolia at Ulan Bator. Somebody had a dig at Ulan Bator, I think it was Mr. Mody when he was delivering himself of his oration, but we should have a separate mission in Ulan Bator.

There should be no further delay in giving full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic. Even West Germany is talking in a way which shows that the Hallstein Doctrine is no longer the scarecrow it has been and we need not be scared any longer. More than 200 Members of Parliament recently have asked the Prime Minister to give this recognition, and so, there should be no delay any further about it. After all, we have received as Ambassador from Bonn a former Nazi official. We are going to have another Nazi official. One incriminated Nazi diplomat has been the Ambassador. We are going to have another Nazi official, Herr Diehl, as the Ambassador, but we are not recognising G. D. R. We only have a trade representation, not even a Consulate General.

I wish also that Government tells us something heartening about our role in the fight against colonialism, racism and its concomitants. When I was listening to Mr. Surendra Pal Singh, I wanted to know an answer from Government in regard to the treatment given to a great exponent of classical music, Ustad Imraz Khan, who went on an invitation for concert tours in Europe. He had a six months visa or migration certificate, whatever it is, given by the British High Commissioner here. He came back from Paris after a concert. He was held up in Dover and interrogated for hours and then the Immigration officials struck down the tenure of six months in the passport and brought it down to one month. If an eminent Indian can be treated in that fashion, surely we can quite imagine what is going to happen to an ordinary Indian, whose treatment was sought to be highlighted by Mr. Madhok a little while ago.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

When I heard Mr. Surendra Pal Singh, I also wanted to find out from him how it is that in spite of the PAC report saying that the High Commission carries a load of 30 per cent of strength beyond what is necessary, it has taken such a long time for the High Commission in London to bring down its expenses. Over the Sun House and the construction of other similar amenities, scandals have taken place. The Publication Section of the High Commission is recommended to be abolished as far as Parliamentary Committees are concerned. Let not our money be thrown down the drain. Perhaps my friend the Minister tries to think that we spend very little. Of course, considering what certain other countries spend, we do spend very little. I discover that in this Demand No. 12 for External Affairs Ministry Mr. Dinesh Singh is asking for Rs. 22 crores and odd, and I find from an answer given to this House yesterday, on 6th April, that the United States Embassy in India and certain other agencies spent out of PL 480 funds in the year 1968-69 Rs. 31.90 crores. So, we are spending very little. The United States Embassy and allied organisations in India spend out of PL 480 accumulations every year a great deal more than what my friend the Foreign Minister spends over his Ministry. He might imagine, therefore, that compared to the lords of creation he is spending very little. Even so, we are a very poor country, we can make do and get better work done with much lesser expenditure. No Sun Houses, not that kind of thing which has taken place. Let there be an end to the story. Nobody in India that I know of or Mr. Madhok knows of has ever had a good word to say about our High Commission in London. I know that the High Commissioner today is a very fine person from all reports. I do not know him personally, the accounts are that he is a very fine individual, but some stop there must be to this kind of thing happening. Our money must be spent more economically.

So, my grouse against the Government is that its foreign policy is not a principled enough thing. I see nothing of real radicalism about it, let alone socialism of which so much talk is given and, therefore, a different shape, a different quality has to be given to the operations of our foreign policy. Of that I see no evidence here, but we must live in hopes.

But the country cannot live in hopes for ever. The country is getting intolerant of the kind of inefficiency which the Government has shown in many departments, including the department of Foreign Affairs.

SHRI MOHSIN (Dharwar South) : Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, and while doing so, I wish to offer some suggestions. As it is well-known, India pursues an independent foreign policy, a policy of co-existence and non-alignment. These policies have been appreciated very much in most of the countries. The countries which I have visited recently, the West Asian countries namely, U.A.R., Sudan and Algeria, which are all non-aligned countries, have appreciated the stand taken and the role played by India in all the Conferences, and in international forums like UNO.

The West Asian policy has been criticised by some members of this House. I can understand Professor Madhok criticising our support for the Arab cause because he mistakes the Arab cause for the Muslim cause and whenever the interests of the Muslims come he must oppose it. But I cannot understand how our friend, Shri Asoka Mohta, also opposed our policy towards West Asia. Till recently he was with us and he was supporting the stand of the government on the West Asian problem. I quite remember that he resigned from the Cabinet because he did not agree with the wording of the resolution, which this House passed, regarding the intervention of Russia in Czechoslovakia. It was on that account that he resigned from the Cabinet and later left the party. But he had no sympathetic word for the millions of Palestinians who have been driven out of Palestine, their homeland.

I can understand some people thinking on communal lines. I can also appreciate the stand of some people who think that Israel has become a very strong country and, therefore, we should have friendship with Israel. But that is not an independent foreign policy. That is a policy of convenience or expediency. Our foreign policy is not based on emotions or on parochial views. It is based on the interests of our country.

Let us consider our trade. Our export to the Arab countries is to the tune

of Rs. 108.45 crores and imports from those Arab countries to India is to the tune of Rs. 65 crores. Our import and export trade with Israel is only to the tune of Rs. 35 lakhs. Are we to side with Israel, forgetting this huge trade with the Arab countries? It would definitely not be in the interests of our country if we think like that. Then, what is the population of Israel? There is nearly a 10-crore population in the Arab countries, whereas in Israel it is only three million. Moreover, Israel is not in a position to help India if anybody thinks like that. Israel itself is totally indebted to America. I am told that the total deficit of Israel is to the tune of 454 million dollars and Israel gets about 50 per cent of the revenue as foreign aid from America. What help can we expect from such a country which is mainly depending upon the American aid? It is greatly indebted to the American imperialists.

Some people speak much of its technology, and the technological development that they have made. It is not the technological development that Israel has made: it is the technological development that America has been supplying to them. If Israel has won the war in 1967 against the Arabs, it is not because of their strength; it is not with their weapons; it is only with the weapons and technology of the American imperialists. So, we have to think of this issue in this perspective.

Actually, myself and my friends of the delegation were touring in Egypt, and we were in Cairo when the bombs were falling on the civilian territory. The whole world knows the metal factory near Cairo was bombed, where hundreds of civilian workers died. So many machines were smashed and hundreds of workers were wounded and many were blinded. This barbarous attack on the civilian population was condemned by the whole world and then Israel came out with a statement that it was a mistake on the part of her pilots. Is it for this that we have to support Israel because it bombed the civilian area and led to the suffering of hundreds of persons? Definitely, the world will not support us if we support such countries.

As regards trade with the Arab countries, there is much scope for development. In Sudan, we have got a large

Indian population, about 3,000 of them. They are mostly merchants, dealing with textiles and other articles. The Sudanese as such are very well disposed towards Indians, and they mainly depend upon the exports from India. Our trade with Sudan itself is to the tune of Rs. 20 crores and the import is also a little less. The Sudanese are very courteous, very hospitable and very friendly towards India, and besides, they do not have any communal approach. Some of my friends here are mistaking the problem of Arabs and they call it as a Muslim cause when they say it is Arab. When they say Arab, they do not mean only Arab Muslims; Arab means those who live in the Arab territory. In Lebanon, especially, half of the population is Christian, and even in Egypt, about three million non-Muslims are living there; even Jews stay there. But they do not distinguish between people and people. They have a non-communal approach, and though they call themselves the Islamic republic, they have got a very secular approach.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not call themselves like that.

SHRI MOHSIN: For instance, there is the Republic of Algeria. I am speaking of Algeria also. One of my friends in the delegation, especially Mr. Yogendra Sharma of the Communist party, was very much interested in the discussion, as to how they combined Islam, socialism and secularism together. There was a lively discussion on this subject. They explained the system of Government, how the Islamic republics, promoted socialism or secularism. Islam brought equality. That is how they treat all people. We should not consider that merely because the word "Islam" comes, there is something of a communal nature in it. So, if it is understood properly, the Islamic approach really means secular approach. The meaning of Islam is "Peace with man, peace with God". That is the true Islamic spirit. That is what we have seen when we went there recently. In our delegation, there was a member from the Jan Sangh also. I must say that is he is now a wiser man and he knows their friendship and their secular approach.

As regards the UAR, Algeria and Sudan, their foreign policies are well-known. They never supported the stand

[Shri Mohsin]

taken by Pakistan at the Rabat conference. What was wrong in our delegation going to that conference when our country was invited? If we could not take part in it, it was because later on, they changed their idea and the Morocco Government and the Pakistan Government wanted us not to participate in it. Al Aqsa was not a religious affair. If there was any tampering with or desecration of a sacred place like Al Aqsa, it is for all the humanity to condemn it. It is not with a view to appease the Muslim community that the Indian delegation went here. It was only with a view to respect the sentiments of not only the Muslims alone but all the peace-loving people, and also to condemn such a step by Israelis who desecrated the sacred mosque that India wanted to participate in it. Even in the Islamic summit held at Jeddah, recently UAR, Algeria and Sudan have not supported the establishment of a permanent Islamic secretariat, although they participated in the conference. Algeria might have reserved its opinion, but UAR and Sudan have definitely taken the stand that they oppose such a move by Pakistan.

The embassy and chancery in Algeria is not situated in very good buildings. It requires some more spending of money. No amount of money spent on embassies will go waste. These embassies are doing very good work. The embassies in UAR, Algeria and Sudan are doing really very good work and they are taking care of the Indians there.

With these words, I support the demands of the ministry.

**SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA:** I know that though UAR, Algeria and Sudan are Islamic countries, they are more friendly to India than to Pakistan.

**SHRI C. K. CHAKRAPANI (Ponnani):** Sir, I do not want to give much credit to the ministry because the performance of the ministry during the last one year has not come up to the expectations and admiration of the people of India. I want to confine myself to South-East Asian countries. The report of the ministry says that it is somewhat concerned over the developments in this particular area. We heard Mr.

Asoka Mehta saying today that the withdrawal of American forces from South-East Asia will create some difficulties. He says that North Vietnamese troops are interfering in Laos and Cambodia. I would ask him, what has he got to say about the naked interference by America in Laos and Cambodia? He has nothing to say about the recent coup in Cambodia. What is happening in Cambodia is a great eye-opener to all the anti-imperialists in India. Who organised this coup? It is the CIA and US imperialists who organised and engineered this coup, overthrowing Prince Sihanouk. What is the aim of this coup? The aim of this coup is that America wanted to build up military bases stretching from South Vietnam to Thailand, passing through Laos and Cambodia. Moreover, the American imperialists did not want to pull out their forces from South East Asia, especially from Laos and Vietnam. As far as Cambodia is concerned, it is maintaining strict neutrality because of which its prestige has increased in the international arena. Therefore, the US imperialists and other forces were trying to sabotage the independence and the policy of peace and neutrality of Cambodia. Since Mr. Nixon came to power he was planning and US was engaged in this criminal plan. For the last ten years the American imperialists were trying to sabotage the neutrality of Cambodia. For some time this was resisted by the heroic people of Cambodia, who resisted and defeated the Sinister plan of US imperialism.

Now I would come to another question. What is our role? India, as a non-aligned country, should support the people of South East Asia. First of all, America and its allies began to say that the Royal government in Laos is being threatened. While talking of peace, the US Government is engaged in a bitter war against the people of Laos. The *Newsweek* correspondent wrote recently:

"... within the last twelve months, however, the US has managed to escalate the air war in Laos in the same intensity it once had over North Vietnam".

The problem of Laos is a political one. America has nothing to do with the people of Laos. Even then, US imperialists are interfering very much in the affairs

of Laos. Here I would like to quote a statement of the Laos Patriotic Front:

"The problem of Laos is a political problem. The Laos problem must be solved on the basis of the 1962 Geneva Agreement and the realities of the present situation in Laos. The United States must put an end to its intervention and aggression in that country. Laos must have genuine independence, peace and neutrality."

As far as the problem of Laos is concerned, the problem must be settled among the Laotian parties concerned. The United States must, as an immediate step, stop escalating the war and stop completely the bombing of Laotian territory without imposing any condition.

Well, what is the role of India here? While all these developments are taking place in South East Asia, the Government of India is completely silent over the murderous attacks on the people of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. With the escalation of war in Indo-China, the battle front has come very near to India. Even then the Government of India is behaving as a silent spectator.

The aim of US imperialists is to use Asians fight against Asians. We are completely ignoring this aspect.

Our prestige has very much deteriorated in the eyes of the non-aligned nations because of our pro-imperialist stand. We are not taking a firm anti-imperialist stand. This has created suspicion among our friends. So, I want the Government of India to condemn these acts of America. We should demand the stopping of bombardment over Laos. Moreover, we should not recognise the present government of Lon Nol. We should support Prince Sihanouk for restoring freedom, peace and neutrality in Cambodia. The present government in Cambodia is a puppet government; so, we should not recognise that puppet government.

Another point I would like to deal with is the question of our relations with China. Seven years have passed since then. The report says much about our earnestness in that direction. The question is as to who will take the initiative of breaking the stalemate. Even America is now talking with China in the matter of trade and commerce. Japan is taking keen interest in Chinese affairs. Even the Russian Government has

started trade talks with China in the midst of bitter ideological differences. Therefore I want the Government of India to take the initiative for breaking the stalemate.

The present status of the Consul should be raised to the ambassadorial level. Once the differences between these two countries are resolved, no power on earth can defeat us.

About Korea I must say that the Government of India should support the unification of Korea. Under the cover of UN forces, American forces are instigating the puppet government against North Korea. The Government of India must see that a seat is given to Korea in the UN.

We must see that full recognition is given to the GDR. The West German Chancellor has gone to Germany for talks. Please do not take the position of European countries that they have not recognised the GDR. You should give full recognition to GDR. UAR has recognised the GDR. So also trade with socialist countries, specially with Cuba, should be increased.

Another point is about our membership of the Commonwealth. The main slogan during the freedom struggle was to quit the Commonwealth. Even after 23 years of freedom we are a member of the Commonwealth. We have not yet fulfilled the aspirations and ambitions of the people of India. So, it is high time for us to quit the Commonwealth.

The last point I want to make is about West Africa. As a member of the goodwill mission I went to West Africa. Most of the African countries, specially in West Africa, are under the influence of ex-colonial powers. Though they are free, the French, British and Portuguese powers are playing a game in this area. They are trying to influence these countries under the cover of neo-colonialism.

Moreover, in some of these countries armed struggles against the imperialist powers are going on. For example, a liberation struggle is going on in Portuguese Guinea under the leadership of Amilcar Cabral. The people of Guinea and Portuguese Guinea have great affection and love towards India. So, we should support them.

[Shri C. K. Chakrapani]

When I met Amilcar Cabral, who has great respect for India and the Government of India, he wanted us at least to help them in their struggle against an imperialist country. The African countries expect help from us. When we liberated Goa, Deman and Diu, they told us that it was a source of inspiration to them but they complained that we were not supporting their just struggle for independence and freedom. We have to take steps to see that trade with these African countries prospers. I am glad to note that our missions in that area, specially in Ghana and Guinea, are very much working for cordial relations with these countries.

In short, I want this Government to condemn the American influence in South-East Asia. The Government should not recognise the present puppet Government of Lon Nol. We have to resolve our differences with China. We should quit the commonwealth....

19 hrs.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: What commonwealth we have with the British? He may explain it when he replies.

SHRI CHAKRAPANI: When we were having struggle for freedom, the aspirations and expectations of our people were to quit the Commonwealth

and those aspirations and expectations of the people have not so far been fulfilled. It is high time for this Government to take a bold step to quit the Commonwealth. Then, we have to support the liberation struggle of the people of Portuguese Guinea. Then alone our status will go up. This Ministry has not been able to do much in the last year for which they have to be taken to task. This Government is always dancing to the tune of pro-imperialists. This Government is not openly condemning the atrocities committed by America in South East Asia. It is high time for this Government to support the liberation struggle in West Africa and the liberation struggle going on in Laos, Cambodia and other places.

I conclude by saying that we should not recognise the present puppet Government of Cambodia and that we must support Prince Sihanouk in restoring normalcy in Cambodia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House now stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 A.M.

19.02 hours

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 8, 1970/Chaitra 18, 1892 (Saka).*