

Plant, have not come out with a statement on these matters of vital importance.

One is the strike by 40,000 workers, employees, of the LIC and the other is the lock-out by the Government in the HAL and BEL. (*Interruption*). We must know the position; especially when Parliament is in session, before declaring any lock-out they must let us know the position. I am surprised that without informing Parliament they have done it. Therefore, I want you to adjourn the business of the House and take up the discussion of these two issues—the strike of the LIC employees and the lock-out in those establishments.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : भारत सरकार इन कारखानों और संस्थानों की मालिक है। उसकी ओर से बयान दिया जाना चाहिये।

MR. SPEAKER: When I am on my legs, I request you all to sit down. I would like Mr. Banerjee to take note also of the other rule—rule 341—which is next to rule 340 which you have quoted. Rule 341 says:

"If the Speaker is of opinion that a motion for . . . abuse of the rules of the House . . . he may forthwith put the question thereon or decline to propose the question."

The point is, we are discussing these budget demands. I do not think anybody will be happy to adjourn the House and discuss something else. The points raised by you are important. I do not mean to say they are unimportant. But there is some other occasion for it; we are getting the demands under the Labour Ministry, when we can discuss them. But now to discuss the strike notice of the LIC employees and about their going to demonstrate

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Today they are all on strike. (*Interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER: Today they are on strike; the LIC employees. Tomorrow somebody else may be on strike and the day after tomorrow somebody else. If you adjourn under this rule, do you think Parliament can sit on any day, not only today or tomorrow but on any day?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I request the Defence Minister and the Finance Minister to make statements on the situation.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : मैं इस का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot ask them what the Government will be doing.

श्री रवि राय : सरकार ने खुद माफ़-घाउट किया है। यह बड़ा गंभीर मसला है। प्राय मंत्री महोदय को बयान देने के लिए कहें। श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र बयान दें ।

12.13 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1968-69—
Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—
Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the point is, we have only two hours left for the demands for grants under this Ministry. The Prime Minister will have to reply roundabout 3.15. I may say for the information of the Members of the Congress party that they have got only 45 minutes and the Opposition has 45 minutes. I am sure the Prime Minister will need half an hour or 45 minutes. Therefore, within the time available, I can only call one or two speakers; the Opposition have also got a chance: one or two Members from the SSP and the PSP, and Independents also.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar): You have got your discretion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. But at 4 O'clock there is non-official business. I cannot help it. The non-official business cannot be taken away unless the whole House agrees. It is not in my hands.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna): May I request that you will give me five minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, Acharya Kripalani wants five minutes. Bakshi wants five minutes. Yesterday Mr. Abdul Ghani Dar was angry and walked out. I do not want to be miserly with the time, but unfortunately it is so limited and so I am not able to oblige every Member. May I now request the SSP Member to speak?

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डोज (बम्बई-दक्षिण): अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल विदेश मंत्री, श्री बलिराम भगत, ने इस बहस के बीच में बोलती हुए कहा था कि यहाँ पर जो शिकायत की गई है कि हिन्दुस्तान की वैदेशिक नीति काम-याब नहीं रही है, उस में कोई तथ्य नहीं है। मगर उन से पहले उन्हीं के दल के एक माननीय सदस्य, श्री अशोक सेन, की ओर से यह शिकायत की गई कि जब दो बार हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण हुआ, 1962 में चीन की ओर से और 1965 में पाकिस्तान की ओर से, उन दोनों मौकों पर कोई भी ऐसा राष्ट्र नहीं था, जिस ने हिन्दुस्तान का पूरे ढंग से समर्थन किया हो। सिर्फ समर्थन की ही बात नहीं है, श्री अशोक सेन ने तो यहाँ तक कहा कि हमारे लिए दो आंसू बहाने वाले और चीन तथा पाकिस्तान की निन्दा करने वाले भी कुछ लोग दुनिया में देखने को नहीं मिले।

वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्रालय की पिछले साल की जो रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आई है, उस का पहला वाक्य इस प्रकार है :

"Over the last two decades India's foreign policy has been

one of building bridges of friendship and co-operation with countries regardless of their economic or political system."

सरकार की ओर से कहा गया है कि दुनिया के मुल्कों के साथ दोस्ती कायम करना उस की वैदेशिक-नीति का बुनियादी सिद्धांत रहा है। जब सत्तारूढ़ दल के सदस्यों को ही यह शिकायत करनी पड़ती है कि दो ऐसे मौकों पर, जो कसौटी के मोके थे, किसी भी राष्ट्र ने हमारा साथ नहीं दिया, तो फिर सरकार की वैदेशिक नीति की काम-याबी के बारे में मामला अपने आप साफ हो जाता है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि असल में हिन्दुस्तान की कोई वैदेशिक नीति नहीं रही है। यह ठीक है कि 1962 तक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में हिन्दुस्तान का अपना एक स्थान रहा है जब तक रूस और अमरीका, इन दो गुटों के बीच संघर्ष चलता रहा, शीत-युद्ध चलता रहा, तब तक उन के लिए यह जरूरी था कि ऐसा कोई बड़ा राष्ट्र हो, जो उन के बीच झगड़े के वक्त दलाली करने का काम करे। वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दलाल का काम हिन्दुस्तान ने 1962 तक जरूर किया। लेकिन 1962 में जब क्यूबा को ले कर अमरीका और रूस के बीच में एक नया रिश्ता शुरू हुआ, मैं नहीं समझता कि तब से हिन्दुस्तान की उस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दलाली के लिये कोई भी स्थान रहा है और इस लिए अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में हिन्दुस्तान का कोई भी स्थान नहीं बचा है।

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South De'hi): The word *dalali* does not sound very nice. Let him use some other word.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डोज : "मध्यस्थता" कह सकते हैं, लेकिन उस का काम दलाली का ही था, मध्यस्थता का नहीं, क्योंकि यह

सरकार दोनों गुटों को साथ साने का ही काम करती थी, उस के सिवाय और कोई काम नहीं करती थी।

1962 में इस देश पर चीनी आक्रमण हुआ। सरकार पंचशील और "भाई-भाई" का जो फ्रिजल और बेमतलब नारा दुनिया और इस देश को देती रही थी, उस का भी खात्मा उस आक्रमण से हो गया। मैं समझता हूँ कि 1962 से हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश-नीति बिल्कुल दिशाहीन नीति बन गई है और सरकार उस नीति को कोई भी दिशा नहीं दे पाई है।

दरअसल जिस मुल्क को रोटी और बन्दूक के लिए दूसरे मुल्कों का सहारा लेना पड़ता है, मैं नहीं समझता कि वह मुल्क कोई अपनी विदेश नीति नहीं बना सकता है। आज रूस और अमरीका, दुनिया के इन दो बड़े राष्ट्रों की ओर से हिन्दुस्तान को हर बड़े काम में मदद पहुंचाई जाती है। रोटी के लिए इन दोनों राष्ट्रों पर, खास तौर से अमरीका पर, हम निर्भर करते हैं। लड़ाई के साधनों के लिए भी हमेशा इन दोनों राष्ट्रों पर निर्भर रहने की हमारी आदत रही है। और कुछ मजबूरी भी रही है। असल में सरकार ने अपने देश के लोगों पर विश्वास रख कर एक नीति बनाने का काम कभी नहीं किया है। इस सरकार ने न तो अन्दरूनी मामलों में और न इस मुल्क को मजबूत बनाने की दृष्टि से इस मुल्क के लोगों पर विश्वास किया है।

मुझे सरकार को कहना है कि अगर सरकार अपने ही लोगों पर विश्वास रख कर, अपने मुल्क को विश्वास में ले कर, कोई नीति बनायेगी, तो उम को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में इतनी लाचारी में खड़े रहने की कोई जरूरत नहीं होगी, जैसी की वह आज महसूस कर रही है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार दो काम करे: एक तो वह अन्दरूनी नीति और वैदेशिक नीति के बारे में कुछ संकल्प बनाए और उस के

बाद वह पुश्तकार्य के साथ उस संकल्प को पूरा करने के काम में लगे। किसी भी प्रश्न के सम्बन्ध में सरकार की नीति में आज ये दोनों बातें देखने को नहीं मिलती हैं।

सब से पहले सरकार इस देश की सीमाओं के बारे में एक ठोस और स्पष्ट नीति बनाए। आज हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों में से एक भी ऐसा नहीं है, जिस ने हिन्दुस्तान की कुछ न कुछ जमीन पर कब्जा न किया हो। चीन तो एक बहुत बड़ा राष्ट्र है, ताकत के लिहाज से भी और आबादी के लिहाज से भी; उसने हमारी हजारों वर्ग-मील भूमि ले ली है।

दूसरी तरफ सीलोन जैसा राष्ट्र जो हमारे पड़ोसियों में सब से छोटा है और सब से कमजोर है उस ने भी अभी चन्द दिनों के पहले कच्चा तिवू को अपने कब्जे में लेने का कार्य किया है और अपनी जल-सेना को इस्तेमाल कर के कच्चा तिवू को अपने अधिकार में ले कर बैठा है भले ही हमारी सरकार कितनी भी गलत बातों को सदन में रखने का काम करती रहे। बर्मा की ओर से श्रंढमान के कई द्वीपों पर किसी न किसी ढंग से कब्जा लेने का प्रयास चला है और पाकिस्तान वाली बात तो बिल्कुल साफ है जिस में कच्छ के बारे में एक बात मुझे आप से कहनी है। कच्छ का फैसला आया और सरकार ने कोई विचार न करते हुये जिन दिन अखबारों में आया और आकाशवाणी पर यह रपट आ गया कि कच्छ की सादेतीन मी वर्गमील जमीन को पाकिस्तान को देने का काम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय ट्रिब्यूनल ने किया है, तो बिना कोई सोच विचार किए और बिना हम सदन के लोगों या मुल्क के लोगों से सलाह मशविरा लिए सीधे तौर पर यह एलान कर दिया कि हम अपनी भूमि को दान करने के लिए तैयार हैं। और यह भूमि का दान करने का काम हो गया। आज अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब इस मुल्क की भूमि पाकिस्तान को देने की बात की जा रही है तो

[श्री जार्ज फरनेडीज]

कम से कम एक चीज संविधान के अनुसार करनी आवश्यक थी कि सरकार इस सदन के सामने आजाय और संविधान में जो संशोधन या तरमीम करने की आवश्यकता है उस काम को करे। लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमें तो बहुत ही अफसोस है कि न इस सदन को विश्वास में लिया, न संविधान के अन्दर जो जरूरी फर्क करने की आवश्यकता है वह करने की तैयारी की और साढ़े तीन सी बर्गमील जमीन को देने का काम चल रहा है। सरकार की नीति मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि शायद इस विचार से चलती है कि पड़ोसियों से मित्रता का मतलब हमें अपनी भूमि का दान उन को करना चाहिए। मैं सरकार से बिलकुल साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि भूमिदान कर के अगर मित्रता को हासिल करने का ख़ाब देखते बैठ हों तो दुनिया के इतिहास में आज तक कोई ऐसी घटना कहीं भी देखने को नहीं मिलेगी कि जहाँ भूमिदान से किसी भी राष्ट्र की मित्रता किसी भी राष्ट्र ने हासिल की हो।

पाकिस्तान के बारे में हम 20 सालों से गलतियाँ करते आ रहे हैं। काश्मीर के मामले में हम ने वही गलती की, कच्छ के मामले में वही गलती की, पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के मामले में वही गलती की और पख्तूनिस्तान के मामले में वही गलती की। इस सरकार की कोई नीति नहीं है पाकिस्तान के बारे में। रोज इस सदन के अन्दर और बाहर बहस चलती रहती है कि पाकिस्तान की ओर से कैसी कैसी और क्या क्या परेशानियाँ हो रही हैं लेकिन अगर सरकार से एक बात हम लोग कहें कि आप क्यों नहीं मदद करते हो पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के लोगों की जो अपनी सरकार के खिलाफ बगावत कर रहे हैं। तो उस पर यहाँ कहा जाता है कि यह सोचने के लिए कहा हुआ एक सुझाव है। जब हम प्रश्न करते हैं कि क्यों नहीं पख्तूनिस्तान के लोगों

को मदद करते हो, क्यों नहीं खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खाँ की मदद करते हो तो भी यही कहा जाता है कि वह भी सोचने के लिए कहा हुआ एक सुझाव है। इस किस्म की बात कह कर इन बातों को टालने का काम सरकार करती आई है। हम तो अध्यक्ष महोदय, पाकिस्तान के बारे में यह चाहेंगे कि वह हमारा सब से नज़दीक का पड़ोसी है, इतना ही नहीं बल्कि इसी मुल्क का वह एक अंग है जिस को 20 साल पहले अंग्रेजों ने अपनी नीतियों के कारण हम से दूर करने का काम किया। हम चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के साथ महासंघ बनाने की हम शोगों की जो कल्पना है सरकार उस कल्पना को अमल में लाने के लिये कुछ ठोस कदम उठाये। पाकिस्तान से कहे कि काश्मीर के मामले के उपर दस या बीस साल के लिये कोई चर्चा न करें और दोनों राष्ट्रों का एक महासंघ बनाने का काम करें जिसमें विदेश नीति संरक्षण नीति और विकास का कुछ योजनाएं हम दोनों मिल कर बनायें, काश्मीर के प्रश्न को दस बीस वर्षों के लिये अलग रखें, इस प्रकार का सुझाव सरकार को पाकिस्तान के सामने रखने का काम करना चाहिये। और यह करती हुये, दोनों राष्ट्रों को एक करने का प्रयत्न करती हुये दूसरी तरफ हमारी नीति यह भी रहे कि पाकिस्तान को हम यह बतायें कि मित्रता के हाथ का मतलब कोई कमजोरी का हाथ नहीं। अगर आप हमारे सुझाव को मंजूर करने के लिये तैयार हैं तो हम आगे बढ़ाने के लिये तैयार हैं वरना हिन्दुस्तान पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के जो बगावत करने वाले लोग हैं उनको मदद करने का काम करे। उसी तरीके से ख़ाँ अब्दुल गफ्फार ख़ाँ की पख्तूनिस्तान की जो मांग है उसको मदद करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये। कई बार इस सदन में यह बात आई कि ख़ाँ अब्दुल गफ्फार ख़ाँ को हिन्दुस्तान में बुलाया जाय, उनको दावत दी जाय। लेकिन

हमें बहुत अफसोस होता है कि जिन्होंने हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी, जिनके कर्षों के कारण हम आजाद हो गये, हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के लिये जिन्होंने यहाँ बैठे हुये किसी भी व्यक्ति से कम कुर्बानी नहीं की, उस हिन्दुस्तान में उन को एक बार भी बुलाने का काम न किया जाय। उन को यहाँ पर एक बार भी बुला कर उन का स्वागत न किया जाय इस से बड़ी शर्म की बात और क्या हो सकती है ? ... (व्यवधान) ... नहीं बुलाया है। अगर बुलाया है तो व्यक्तिगत तौर पर दावत देना अलग बात है लेकिन राष्ट्र का यह फर्ज है कि कानूनी तौर पर और राष्ट्र के स्तर पर उन को दावत दे और मुल्क में उनका स्वागत किया जाय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जैसे यह हमारा नजदीक का पड़ोसी है वैसे ही और जो हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्र हैं उन के बारे में भी कोई ठोस नीति बनाना आवश्यक है। छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र हैं जो हमारे पड़ोसी हैं जिनका संरक्षण हमारी कानूनी और नैतिक जिम्मेदारी है। नेपाल है, सिक्किम है, भूटान है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमें बहुत अफसोस है कि इन मुल्कों के बारे में जो हम लोगों की नीति है, वहाँ जिस किस्म की राजशाही कहिए या तानाशाही कहिए, चल रही है, उसका समर्थन करने वाली जो हम लोगों की नीति है यह आज नहीं तो कल भारत को बहुत खतरे में डालने वाली नीति है। हमें कोई नई नीति, कुछ नई योजनाएं इन पड़ोसियों के बारे में बनानी पड़ेंगी। इन मुल्कों में, नेपाल में, सिक्किम में, भूटान में, जो आज प्रजातंत्र की ओर चलने वाली शक्तियाँ हैं वह चाहती हैं कि यहाँ प्रजातंत्र आ जाय। उस के लिए वहाँ आन्दोलन चल रहे हैं कि उन्हें अपने मुल्क का, अपने छोटे से देश का राज करने का अधिकार मिल जाय। इस के लिए वहाँ जो प्रयास चल रहे हैं उन को मदद करने का काम हमारे देश

को करना चाहिए। यह हम लोगों का इतिहास है और यह हम लोगों की जिम्मेदारी है। नेपाल में, नेपाल की आजादी की लड़ाई के कितने ही नेतागण जेलों में पड़े हैं। वहाँ के विद्यार्थी जो हिन्दुस्तान में पढ़ते हैं कितने परेशान हैं? जब हिन्दुस्तान के प्रजातंत्र को देखते हैं तो कहते हैं कि इस किस्म का प्रजातंत्र हमारे नेपाल में अमल में लाने के लिए हम को मदद मिलनी चाहिए। लेकिन भारत की ओर से न सरकारी पैमाने पर और न किसी दल के पैमाने पर उन को मदद देने का काम हो रहा है। कुछ गलत ब्यालात को लेकर हम पड़े हुए हैं कि राजाशाही को कैसे हम कमजोर करें। राजाशाही का कैसे हम विरोध करें? राजा से जो सरकारी रिश्ता है, वह जरूर रखने का काम करिए लेकिन वहाँ की जो प्रजा है, उस प्रजा के साथ में, उस प्रजा को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए, उसे प्रजातंत्र के रास्ते पर आगे चलने के लिए जो मदद पहुंचानी है, वह मदद पहुंचाना हमारा फर्ज है, और इस फर्ज को हिन्दुस्तान को प्रदा करना पड़ेगा। अध्यक्ष महोदय, अपने पड़ोसियों के बारे में ऐसी कोई एक नई नीति बनाने का काम हम करें और दूसरे यह जो ब्याब कई वर्षों से हम लोग देखते रहे हैं उस को अपने मन से निकालें तो आज दुनिया के बड़े राष्ट्रों और खास तौर से गोरे राष्ट्रों को नेतृत्व देने का काम हम कर सकते हैं।

हमें अध्यक्ष महोदय एशिया और अफ्रीका के राष्ट्रों की ओर देखना पड़ेगा। उन की समस्याएँ और हमारी समस्याएँ जो हैं वह करीब करीब समान हैं। अफ्रीका में आज भी कई देशों में वहाँ के साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई का काम चल रहा है। रोडेशिया का मामला है अंगोला का मामला है और दक्षिण अफ्रीका का मामला है। दक्षिण अफ्रीका के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। अगर अन्कटाब की यह कान्फ्रेंस बिल्डी में न होती

[श्री जॉर्ज फरनेन्डीज]

तो यह चीज इस तरह से सामने नहीं आती। दक्षिण अफ्रीका के मुटठी भर गोरे लोग वहाँ के लाखों नहीं करोड़ों रंगीन लोगों के साथ जिस किस्म की नीति अख्यार कर रहे हैं यह दुनिया में और कहीं नहीं होता। तो अख्यार महोदय हमारा यह फर्ज रहेगा करना भगत साहब की जो बेइज्जती होगी जब वह केन्या में गए थे वह तो और ज्यादा होती रहेगी क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान को ऐसे मुल्कों की आजादी के लिये मदद करने का ले राष्ट्र के रूप में कोई नहीं देख रहा। साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने वाली यह एक शक्ति है जो एशिया और अफ्रीका के राष्ट्रों को मदद करने वाली है यह भी हम लोगों की तरफ देख कर कोई नहीं सोच रहा है और यह जो बिगड़ी हुई हम लोगों की तस्वीर है दुनिया के सामने उस को दुस्त करने का काम सरकार को तत्काल करना पड़ेगा। रोडेशिया के मामले को लेकर और अफ्रीका के दूसरे देश जो साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने वाले हैं उन के मामले को लेकर हम एक तो यह मांग कर रहे हैं कि यह सरकार कामनवेल्थ से हट जाये लेकिन इस के साथ साथ हम यह भी मांग कर ना चाहते हैं कि सरकार तत्काल अफ्रीका और एशिया के राष्ट्रों का एक सम्मेलन बुलाने का काम करे और अपनी खोई हुई जो तस्वीर है उस को एक बार फिर बनाने के लिये कुछ ठोस कदम उठाए। इस के साथ साथ अपने मुल्क की प्रतिष्ठा इन देशों में बनाने के लिये हमें कुछ और भी काम करने पड़ेंगे और एक नये ढंग से सामने आना होगा। पता नहीं हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को जानकारी है या नहीं कि रोडेशिया जैसे देश के साथ दक्षिण अफ्रीका जैसे देश के साथ हमारा जो सब से बड़ा दुश्मन है चीन यह अपना व्यापार का सम्बन्ध रखता है और बड़े पैमाने पर इस का व्यापार वहाँ चल रहा है। एक तरफ उन्हीं अफ्रीका के देशों में चीन की तयबीर ऐसी बतायी जा रही है कि यह साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने वाला मुल्क है और दूसरी तरफ वही चीन जब रोडेशिया के साथ या दक्षिण

अफ्रीका के साथ व्यापार चलाते हैं जब अख्यार-लियत को लोगों के सामने रखता था हमने कभी कोई कदम नहीं उठाया। हम यह चाहते हैं कि सरकार की ओर से कुछ ऐसे कदम तत्काल उठाये जायें जिस से हम लोगों की इज्जत इन देशों में इन देशों के लोगों के बीच में बढ़े।

एक और मसला है आणविक हथियारों का मसला, नॉन-प्रोलिफेशन ट्रीटी जिस के बारे में इस इस सदन में और इस सदन से बाहर चल रही है। इस सिलसिले में एक ही जुमला आप के सामने पेश करना चाहूँगा, पांच राष्ट्रों के हाथ में आज अणु बम है। और ये पांच राष्ट्र इस बात का प्रयास और प्रचार कर रहे हैं कि यह दूसरे किसी देश के हाथ में न जायें। हमारा कहना यह है कि भारत को अणुबम बनाना चाहिये या नहीं बनाना चाहिये—इस वक्त विवाद का प्रश्न यह नहीं हो सकता है। हमारे पास सब से पहला प्रश्न यह है कि इस मुल्क से गरीबी दूर हो। जब इस मुल्क से गरीबी नष्ट हो जायेगी, तब इस देश के लोगों के मन में देश की इज्जत ही नहीं ताकत के बारे में भी नई कल्पनायें पैदा होंगी। लेकिन यह गरीबी नष्ट होने के बाद ही मुमकिन है। तो सब से पहली लड़ाई हमारी गरीबी के खिलाफ है, हमें उसको चलाने के लिये काम करना होगा। बम हम बनायें या न बनायें, इस में न जाते हुए, एक चीज बिल्कुल साफ कर देनी चाहिये। कि हम अपने हाथ को बम बनाने के बांध कर रखने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की जो परम्परा है इतिहास है इस मुल्क को शान्ति के रास्ते पर ले जाने की उस को ब्याल में रखते हुए जब एक तरफ अणुबम नॉन-प्रोलिफेशन ट्रीटी पर दस्तखत न करने की बात कहेंगे, वहाँ यह भी साफ कर देना होगा कि बहुत अछूत-ब्राह्मणवाद को भी नहीं चलने देंगे। जब यह बात कहें, तब इस ठोस बात को भी साफ तौर से कहें कि हम

दुनिया भर के भ्रणुशस्त्रो को खत्म करना चाहते हैं, जो भी प्राणविक हथियार हैं, हम उन को खत्म करना चाहते हैं। यह बात दुनिया के उन देशों के सामने रख कर जिन के पास भ्रणु बम नहीं हैं, उन की सहायता ले कर इन पांच राष्ट्रों के मुकाबले सब राष्ट्रों की एक नीति बनाने का काम हम को लेना चाहिये।

प्रध्यक्ष महोदय, गरीबी का मसला भ्रणु बम से इतना जुड़ा हुआ है कि दुनिया के भ्रमीर राष्ट्र और दुनिया में शांति स्थापित करने की कोशिश करें तो वियतनाम की लड़ाई पर फ़रोड़ों डालर खर्च कर के शांति नहीं मिलेगी। लेकिन अगर दुनिया के भ्रमीर राष्ट्र—खास तौर पर भ्रम रूस, अगर दुनिया के पिछड़े हुए लोगों को ऊंचा उठाने की कोशिश करें, उन की गरीबी को नष्ट करने के लिये कोई ठोस कदम उठायें, तभी गरीबी नष्ट करने का कोई तरीका आज दुनिया में बन सकता है और उससे दुनिया में भ्रमन और शांति हासिल हो सकती है। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का आज यह फ़र्ज है कि इन दोनों राष्ट्रों के नेताओं से कहें और हमेशा कहती रहे, हर मौके पर कहती रहे कि तुम दुनिया की गरीबी को नष्ट करने की जिम्मेदारी उठाओ। अगर तुम दोनों क्षिप्त जाओ—आज जानसन हैं, कल कोई और आ जाय, आज कोसिगिन हैं, कल कोई और आ जाय, लेकिन आज इन दो बड़े राष्ट्रों के नेताओं को एक साथ बैठना चाहिये और गरीबी को नष्ट करने की जिम्मेदारी इन दोनों को उठानी चाहिये और इस तरह अपने काम को आगे ढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। गरीबी को दूर करने के लिये संसार विकास योजना बनाने का काम इन दोनों को मिल कर करना चाहिये।

प्राखिरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है—आज बड़ी बड़ी बातें कही जाती हैं—हिन्दु-

स्तान का दुनिया के सामने क्या इमेज है, क्या इज्जत है, इस बारे में काफ़ी बहस होती है। हमारी विदेशी नीति को चलानेवाला एक तरफ तो मंत्रालय है और दूसरी तरफ़ अलग अलग मुल्कों में जो हमारे राजदूत हैं—आज लगभग 100 देशों में हमारे राजदूत हैं, मिमन्ज हैं, इन पर जिम्मेदारी होती है कि हमारे देश के इमेज को किस ढंग से उन लोगों के सामने रखें। मैं इस सिलसिले में प्रापका ध्यान हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स के 28 फरवरी के एक लेख की तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ—भ्रमीरका जं: कि दुनिया का एक सबसे भ्रमीर देश है, जं: कि दुनिया में ढंग से काम करने वालों में गिना जाता है, जो इस बात की कोशिश करते हैं कि वक्त की बर पदी कभी न हो अपने दिये हुए निर्णयों में कोई गलती न हों, ऐसा सोच कर चलने वाला जो देश है—वहाँ पर हमारे राजदूत की जो कचहरी है, उस के बारे में 28 फरवरी के हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में झुण्ण भाटिया की रपट है, जिसका एक ही जुमना पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ। वह लिखते हैं कि हमारी एसेम्बली वाशिगटन में कैसे काम कर रही है। श्रीमती विजयलक्ष्मी पंडित यहाँ पर बैठी हैं, जो एक जमाने में वहाँ पर एम्बेसेडर थीं, मुझे उन के प्रति कोई शिकायत नहीं है, लेकिन उन के जाने के बाद ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा हुई, मैं चाहूँगा कि वह भी इस पर प्रकाश डालें—

“Officially, the embassy opens at 9.30 a.m. Till recently, the prescribed hours of work were from 9.15 a.m. to 5.45 p.m. But it is rarely that anyone is there much before 10 a.m. On the only occasion when I happened to visit the embassy before 10 a.m., I found PAs and secretaries walking in blithely unmindful of the fact that they were late. Many senior members of the staff are usually not available till well after 10 a.m. In my

[श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज]

brief stay in Washington, I have discovered that calling a senior officer before 11 a.m. is almost futile. He is usually 'expected any minute' or has gone to the State Department which is the local version of the declaration one heard in Delhi that 'Sahib is in a meeting'. Only recently I found a head of a section shaving at home when his secretary had assured me earlier that he had gone to meet a U.S. Government official."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस से हमारी वहां पर क्या तसबीर है, वह बिलकुल साफ़ हो जाती है। मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार यह जिम्मेदारी उठाले कि एक तरफ़ अपनी ठोस नीति बनाने का काम और दूसरी तरफ़ हमारी इन नीतियों को अमल में लाने वाले अलग अलग गुल्कों में जो हमारे प्रतिनिधि हैं, उन की ओर से बड़ा जिम्मेदारी का काम— इन दोनों चीज़ों को करने का काम सरकार करे। यह अपेक्षा करना तो गलत होगा कि यह ठीक से होगा या नहीं होगा, क्योंकि कोई बड़ी उम्मीद आज तक हमने इस सरकार से नहीं की है और आज भी नहीं करता हूँ, चूँकि वहस यहाँ पर चल रही है, इस लिये अपने विचारों को रखने का काम मैंने किया है।'

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not propose to go over the ground that has already been covered. I have only one thing to say. Yesterday, the Minister of State said that we will have cultural and economic co-operation with the countries in South East Asia, but we will have no military co-operation with them. He has also, I think, said that they do not want it. But I have seen in the papers that they are really frightened because Britain has already left this area and America is likely to leave it.

I was told by a representative of Cambodia that there are at least 50,000 Communists whom they do not want in their country and who have come from North Vietnam. I have heard it said that politics is a game of the possible. Sir, is it possible for these countries to defend themselves? Of course, we are a big country and I am sure our Defence Minister will tell us and his predecessor told us that we are good enough to meet both Pakistan and China together. That may be very well, but will the South East Asian people alone be able to resist China? It is possible for them and if it is impossible for them, is there not a danger to our country? I remember when China invaded India, I saw on the next day Jawaharlal Nehru and I asked him, 'Have you sent for arms from England and America?' He said, 'We are getting arms from small countries and small arms'. Why? Because his Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon, had declared that to take arms from any country, especially from America and Russia, would be tantamount to be in alliance with them. Afterwards, Sir, as you may be knowing, we were obliged to get arms both from America and England. So, we must remember that it is not always possible to defend one's country alone. I do not think even America or Russia can do it. And that America could not do it is plain from the fact that in the Second World War, whatever were the differences between America and Russia, and between England and Russia, they joined Russia. Russia wanted their cooperation. Russia asked for their cooperation. But here we have become so brave, we are such a powerful nation, our military strength in the Air, in land and sea is so great that we do not require any help from anybody, nor are we prepared to give help to anybody. If this is our view, then I can tell the Government: Do what you will, you will have no

friend left in the world.' Friends can only be had if you are prepared to help them; if you are not prepared to help them you cannot expect them to help you when you need help. I remember that when China had occupied Tibet, I asked some representatives of nations here 'What are you people doing?. They said 'What do you want us to do? You are the persons concerned in this matter. If you do nothing, how do you expect us to come from outside, cross your territory and go to defend Tibet? It is impossible. If you are not interested we are not interested in it'. If we are not interested in that, then I say, we are not interested in the defence of our own country. It is impossible, as I said, that they can defend our country, and we must remember that politics is a game of the possible and international politics is more the game of the possible. Is it possible for Laos, for Cambodia or for Indonesia to defend themselves? I believe it is not possible for us to go it alone. I think that some deep thinking will have to be done in this direction. Or else we will find ourselves stranded when we are in difficulties as we found ourselves stranded when China invaded our territory. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call other hon. Members, there are some unattached independent Members who have not participated and who have given names. A number of names are here, but I do not see those Members here. I find the names of Shri Chittaranjan Ray, Shri Sheo Pujan Shastri, Mahant Digvijai Nath, Dr. Surya Prakash Puri and Shri B. K. Das Chowdhury. I am reading out the names so that they may be ready in the afternoon. Two or three will be given a chance. They have not taken even one minute and after that we will see if others can get a chance. Of course, Dr. Puri is here. They will be called in the afternoon. We have got 1½ hours

in the afternoon. Shrimati Vijaya Laxmi Pandit.

SHRIMATI VIJAYA LAKSHMI PANDIT (Phulpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my mind, I always think of foreign policy as a precision instrument, which if correctly balanced and delicately controlled can be really effective but if the balance is upset then things begin to go wrong. That is what has happened. Sir, in our country. The balance is upset and many things have not moved in the right direction. This remedy does not lie either in criticism or attack. It lies in an objective assessment of the situation, and then the necessary pruning, alterations and adjustments which changing times demand. If we can do that, then in spite of a certain stalemate we can move forward into progress.

A number of sweeping statements have been made in the House about the failures of Indian foreign policy. It is not necessary for me to remind hon. Members that, like individuals nations also are judged in terms of their failures and not of their achievements. India has a large number of achievements of her credit. I cannot go into them here for lack of time but they are there—She is also has some failures. These can and do happen in the best regulated nations. One cannot merely by condemning those failures seek to remedy them. One must find out the real reason for them—it is well to remember that no oratorical flourish, however eloquent, can take the place of truth. And the truth is that in spite of the failures, and I believe there have been far too many, we have progressed and we are moving forward, though the peace may be very slow.

Our foreign policy could have been far more dynamic, and far more effective if instead of the kind of criticism that is made in this House, there could have been constructive

[Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit]

criticism and some coming together between the Government and all sections of the House so that the collective wisdom of the people could have helped us cross the bridge in moments of difficulty. I hope that this can still be done. But when I say this, I would like to point out that we ourselves are not entirely devoid of responsibility for some of the things that go wrong.

We should remember that every fault cannot be laid at the door of the Government. There are a number of things which we can do and which we should do particularly in this constant thing that crops up from time to time about India's image. I think apart from the Government policies and whatever may be wrong with them, a lot of us help to tarnish India's image when we go abroad and at least these small things we can remedy.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee said yesterday that we took pride in our foreign policies in the past as compensation for our failures at home. This is not true. We took pride because our policies were correct and through their we achieved results. After Independence the position India occupied in the world—I am talking only of foreign policy—was one which helped every Indian to walk with head erect, which helped all of us to feel that we had something to contribute, and in fact, we did play a significant role on the world stage. It is not correct to say that pride which we had in our foreign achievements was merely a shelter behind which we tried to escape because of our failures at home.

Today we may have fallen from that position but we are still the same Indians and we still have it in us, to direct our energies to re-fashion India's foreign policy so that it becomes an instrument of good for ourselves and for the world.

The position today needs strengthening in many ways. Government is sometimes extremely maladroit in dealing with delicate situations. Take, for instance, what happened in Kenya the other day—I refer to the visit of the hon. Minister of State. I do not know what went on behind the closed doors of the External Affairs Ministry because, Sir, there is no one who lives in such complete isolation as an ex-ambassador whose advice is not sought even on matters with which they have been connected all their lives. There is no doubt something did happen, and it was serious for us, and the incident in Kenya has distressed us and pined us.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: If they cannot consult her, how can they consult us?

SHRIMATI VIJAYA LAKSHMI PANDIT: However I am glad that the Prime Minister and the Government have faced this incident in a quiet and mature way devoid of hysterical criticism and anger—we can reserve our anger for other causes and not vent them on a friendly African nation.

Talking about Kenya, one is inevitably reminded of the question of the Commonwealth. Each time there is a foreign affairs debate, the Commonwealth is attacked, but strange to say, attacked by people who know nothing about the Commonwealth, what is actually happening there. I think I can claim to have a better inside view of this strange association of Nations called the Commonwealth than most people in India, and I assure you that the inside picture is not a rosy one.

In the early days of the United Nations, it was the custom for the countries of the Commonwealth to get together in the senior partner's—I mean the U.K.—room and discuss

the resolutions before the General Assembly. What this actually meant was that discussions related to situations which had reference to the white part of the Commonwealth. The rest of us said one piece and tagged aloof. You will remember that in 1946 India presented the case on discrimination against the people of Indian origin by the Union of South Africa. At that time, we had a pretty good insight into what the Commonwealth thinks about its sister nations, and the problems which were of such vital concern to them. The ex-colonial powers all abstained on the vote in the General Assembly. The reason given was that it would be highly improper for members of the Commonwealth to take sides in a domestic matter of this kind. So though the resolution was passed by a two-thirds majority, it was not effective.

Then next year came the question of apartheid, which was a much more serious affair. Again, in spite of conferences and confabulations, among ourselves, the white Commonwealth again abstained.

I believe that if at that time the countries of the Commonwealth had stood together, and voted against South Africa's racial policies, the situation that has since developed would never have happened. Step by step, conditions have been deteriorating until racism has been rampant and is a threat to the peace and progress of the world. Another event which is much more recent, hon. Members will remember, how during the Indo-Pak war, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom branded India as the aggressor, and why did they not think at that time that India was a sister Commonwealth country? South Africa was a sister country of the Commonwealth and could not be branded as an outlaw in the United Nations, but India which had been brutally attacked by Pakistan could

be so branded why? Because England had sent some arms supplies to Pakistan and her approach to Pakistan has been on quite another level, a closer and more intimate level Sir, for the people of the United Kingdom I have the highest admiration: they possess some of the qualities that are needed for all of us in order to attain leadership and to be better human being, but with the Government of the United Kingdom, I am sorry to say, I have no kinship. I think the time has come when we should not judge the advisability of remaining in or out of the Commonwealth merely by the hospitality extended to Parliamentary delegations going abroad or by the kind of things said to members when they are in the U.K. in connection with their work. This question must be looked at dispassionately, calmly, with the assistance, of all parties and in the interests of India and India alone.

And if we decide that the link must be severed, it is no great threat to anybody. We can and must still remain friends with all the Commonwealth countries. I feel the link which binds us has lost its significance. The past is dead and should be decently buried and a new and more useful link established. Thinking along these lines was going on, during Shastriji's time, and that is why the then Prime Minister sent his special representatives to de Gaulle and Adenauer and I had the honour to conduct those talks, but all that now seems shelved and we are back in unwilling relationship with the group between whom and ourselves there is little in common.

The world is changing, rapidly. Unless India changes with the world she will not be able to forge ahead. We have played a good part in shaping some of the important decisions of the world. We can still play a good part, but there are certain things of which we have to be careful, and one of them is that we must not be

[Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit]

carried away by sentiment, by emotion. Let us face facts as they are and do our best to adjust our thinking and our actions to those facts.

It has been a great relief and satisfaction to me, along with many others, I am sure, in this country, the turn events have taken in Vietnam. One hopes that these unhappy people who have suffered so long and so tragically can be freed from the terror and suffering of the last many years. What is most pleasing in the situation to me is that it was the force of public opinion in America and in other places that compelled President Johnson to take the stand he did. I think we should take note of this and be glad that even at such a moment, when America is beset with a number of other problems, the people of America compelled the President to take a step fraught with important consequences for the world. The fact that President Johnson finally did bow to public opinion is, I think, in his favour. I hope sincerely that now this opportunity has come. India will be able to take the initiative and be of some real use in helping to solve the complex problem in the interests of justice and of the people of Vietnam.

13 hrs.

Another matter of vital concern to us is the non-proliferation treaty, and here I stand solid behind the stand that the Government has taken. I am also delighted to find that I am in agreement with my hon. friend, Shri George Fernandes. I was going to say exactly what he has said, while we have object poverty in this country, whilst we have the kind of situations which stem from poverty, we have in our midst bigger and more potent bombs than the nuclear weapons of the big powers. We must deal with these things first. We must use all our resources on the amelioration of existing conditions, for the raising of our people, and then the country can think about the pos-

session of the bomb and, obviously, it would be the will of the people that will decide this matter. So far as I am concerned, I am incompetent to speak about this matter because I belong to a very small minority which does not rush after new-fashioned modes of political thinking. I am content to abide by the thought that man is greater than the weapons he makes and the mind of man is the only deterrent from evil in this world, in whatever shape it comes. The talk that China may attack us and take some territory tomorrow or Pakistan may attack us the day after is irrelevant; it is the man behind the gun that counts, and unless you are training your men to be loyal, to understand the implications that are inherent in all the situations which are so inter-dependent and inter-linked with each other in the world, the biggest nuclear weapons are not going to help us.

One thing I would like to say here. I hope that the Government would not be high-pressurised into signing any treaty which is not in India's interest. There is no need to do that through fear. I would like to remind the House that aid today is not given out of a feeling of philanthropy. It is given because the giver hopes to get something in return. America cannot afford to deny aid to this country. If she wants to preserve democracy in India, she will give you aid whether you sign or you do not sign. It is for our government to take a strong stand on the matter. Speaking for myself, I would like to say that we may be materially poorer if aid does not come, but morally we shall be inconceivably richer in our own esteem and in that of the world.

Now, as I said, we all agree that there is something very wrong in India today and I hope the Government will forgive me if I in my rash manner give vent to one or two of my thoughts about what is wrong

with the situation. Now, we know very well that where there is no vision... I would not finish the saying, because surely everybody knows it. That vision has been lacking and you cannot have policies, domestic or foreign, unless there is vision. Gandhiji had a vision and so, on the strength of that vision, moved the country forward and won a spectacular victory unrecorded in human history.

We must have a vision and that vision must lead to correct thinking; in other words, there must be precision in our thought processes because only precise thinking leads to correct decisions. If we have the vision, if our thinking is precise and if that leads to right decisions, then the next step for us is to act and our acts must be implemented.

Today we live in a world which is changing. There are new slogans and new ideas and we must go along with this world and clothe our own thoughts in the new garb that is acceptable to the world today, not give up our fundamental beliefs but clothe them in the way in which we can make them acceptable, not cling to the things that are old and outworn but cling only to those things which hasten our progress along the path. I shall very earnestly appeal to the Government, and specially to those who are in charge of foreign affairs, that there should be vision, precision, decision and implementation of decisions. Nobody can hold us back if these things are there.

India stands at the crossroads today. She has once again, after a long time, I think reached a point when, if she takes the right turning, she can go forward. But she is not completely out of the wood. I would like to make an appeal to everybody, in this House and outside, not to think in terms of petty things, in terms of small personal things that affect one but to once again rise to the heights which we have climbed many a time

in history and think in terms of India because we all have a stake in India no matter which party or group we belong to. Unless we can do this we shall not be able to fulfil any promise that we have made to ourselves or to the people of India. But I have faith both in the people and also in the hon. Members who represent them in this House. I do feel that the united strength of this House can help the country to unite and that soon, if these things can really come from sincerity, understanding and conviction in our hearts, India can walk out into the sunlight and regain the place which she has lost.

13.10 hrs.

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

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at two minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1968-69—
Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
—Contd.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI (Bilhaur): Most of the learned speakers who have preceded me have waxed eloquent in their condemnation of our foreign policy. It is always easier to condemn than to construct, and I am sure, you will agree with me on this point.

But, may I know what is the foreign policy of any country? It is to be decided by any individual incidents, by sporadic cases that may loom large over the international horizon as happened in the case of Kachhativu on Kena or alleged hoisting of Burmese flag over an island? Or is it to be decided on a long-range basis, as a long-term policy, keeping the basic interests of the country at heart? Various diplomats have defined foreign policy in their own way. Mr. Palmerston said that England

[Shrimati Sushila Rohtagi]

had neither permanent enemies nor permanent friends, but it had only permanent interests.

Now what are the basic interests of this country today? The first consideration is that of alleviating the misery, the poverty, the economic disparity, with which we are constantly waging a war, and as Panditji said in the Constituent Assembly in 1947, ultimately the foreign policy is the outcome of economic policy, and until India has properly evolved her economic policy, her foreign policy will be rather vague, rather incoherent and will be groping.

Thus, our economic affairs alone should have been the criteria for giving a vision, a direction and a long-term range to our foreign policy. With this purpose in view, certain basic principles were laid down, and the first and foremost of these is the policy of non-alignment. How far this policy of non-alignment has proved successful is to be seen from the history. Non-alignment has been helpful and successful not only internally because it has given a common platform for the extreme sections of our society to rotate round one centre and give their hand to Government, and even externally also this non-alignment policy has been very very helpful in allowing India to steer her course between two aligned nations at a time when the world was divided into two Blocs, at a time when the world was in the vortex of war and was hovering on the brink of war. At that time because we pursued a policy of non-alignment, India was able to get aid in various forms and it is because of her successful implementation of the policy of non-alignment that today India finds itself very much an advanced country. It is being able to modernise her industry; it has been able to come on the verge of self-sufficiency so far as food is concerned; it is able to modernise her defence cell. India of today is not the same

as it was many years back, and that is a very very great tribute to the policy of non-alignment which we have pursued for the last few years. I would like to pay a tribute to the architect of this foreign policy, late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and we find that this policy has been extremely successful.

But today the entire context of international history has changed. There are no two separate Blocs; these two super-powers, which were previously divided into two Blocs, communicate directly with each other today. India has to see how far the non-alignment policy will be the proper policy to be carried on today. We find that in the President's Address this year, the word 'non-alignment' has not been mentioned, but more emphasis has been given to peaceful co-existence. So, by giving a greater emphasis to peaceful co-existence, we have to improve our relations with our neighbouring countries. Fortunately, with the exception of Pakistan and China, all the other neighbouring countries are in very very good terms with us, and except with these two countries, we find that peaceful co-existence has been very successful. India has to judge how far this policy of peaceful co-existence can be utilised for eliminating the differences with these two countries also. So far as America's plan to manoeuvre Pakistan to its side and then its plan to manoeuvre India into its camp is concerned, it has been very very successful there. But I must say that our diplomacy, our External Affairs approach has not been very successful as might be expected because Pakistan has certainly been getting full support from America directly and also as a member of SEATO and CENTO and also through third countries. Only recently we have heard that it got 100 tanks through Italy and NATO countries. At the same time it has also been able to play its diplomatic relations

with China. So, while Pakistan has been gradually strengthening its powers there, much to the detriment of India, which America has been fully conscious of, India must see how far it can take up the same line. But it must take the initiative and build a line of its own and try to normalise and restore normal relations with Pakistan. We find that there has been an effort on the part of the Government of India. They have been trying to normalise our relations with Pakistan by the resumption of the tele-communications system and by other efforts also. How far Pakistan has been reciprocating, it is not easy for us to say. But we recommend that there should be a persistent effort in that direction and Government given every encouragement to pursue the policy of peaceful co-existence.

So far as China is concerned, we know very well that China has been following a policy of perpetual revolution internally and aggressive expansionism outside. It does not agree with India, but even then we find that India is trying at the same time not to increase the tension with China any further. In fact in the Presidential Address we find that it was clearly enunciated that subject to the condition that China does not interfere in our domestic affairs, subject to the condition that China does not provoke us to any aggressive act, we are prepared to come to normal conditions and talk with China also. After all India knows that we cannot depend on these Western Powers any longer. They have not stood by us at the time when we wanted them. Of course, they have given us aid. To-day a stage has come when India cannot depend on aid alone. At the recent UNCTAD conference it was manifestly evident that so long as we have been asking for aid, we have been getting it, but no aid is given without any political strings. Apart

from this, one should not forget that India is a major power not because it is a huge country but because of its great cultural heritage, its great past and its even greater future. So India must assert its right as a great power. It must align itself more to the Asian policy and fortunately for us, in the South East Asian nations, we have a very good chance in that direction because of the vacuum which may be created there. We need not enter into any military pacts with the South East Asian countries because it has not been India's intention to enter into any military alliance and if we enter into any military alliance with the South East Asian countries, it will provoke China and may jeopardise any effort to normalise our relations with China. But, Sir, I would certainly say that the time has come that the Government of India must create close relations with amity and goodwill with the South East Asian countries and tell them that we, as an Asian bloc shall stand together wherever it comes to a matter of mutual progress and mutual prosperity and we must make that extremely clear to them.

Secondly comes the question of Vietnam. Here, India has always stood unequivocally and clearly for the fact that there must be an absolute cessation of hostilities. To day fortunately the way is paved for that and that itself shows that India's incessant efforts have been partially successful to make even the mighty America realise that no country, howsoever strong it may be, can for long go on resisting the nationalist sentiments of any country. By all the sufferings the Vietnamese have undergone, the public opinion which was mobilised in America and by the incessant voice raised by India and other peace-loving people, it has been conveyed to the almighty powers, America included, that it was wrong to go on in this way in utter disregard of the nationalist feel-

[Shrimati Sushila Rohtagi].

ings and waging a war. Our learned friend, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee said that the Vietnamese story has a lesson for us. Of course, it has a lesson for us and it has a lesson for every country in the world and that lesson is that the forces of nationalism are a force to be reckoned with, that the forces of nationalism can only be decided not by war, but by peaceful negotiations and this is the theory which has been adopted from the very beginning and propounded by India and it must continue in that direction. So, what is happening in Vietnam to-day? The parleys have opened up, a new passage, a peaceful avenue has opened up. That is precisely what India has been expecting and wanting. I would say that India, as the Chairman of the International Control Commission, must take a greater initiative. It must make greater efforts and assert itself and see that whatever step is necessary for the consolidation of peace, is taken.

Another point which is very much troubling us today is the question of nuclear armament. Certain hon. Members have said that India must go the nuclear way. I do not agree with my friends of the Jan Sangh party in this respect. About two or three years back, at a meeting in Helsinki, I met the sole survivor of the Nagasaki and Hiroshima bombing. The story of that suffering, torture and anguish was writ large on his face and it was much more eloquent than any words which I can use on the floor of this House. Against medical advice he travelled to demonstrate to the world the havoc caused by bombing, of nuclear weapons. India has always been a signatory to the banning of the nuclear weapons and nuclear tests. India has always stood for total and complete disarmament, that there should be total non-proliferation, that there should be no stockpiling of armaments. Why should India

suddenly change its attitude today? Why should India suddenly change its soul today? Why should India change the stand for which Buddha, Gandhiji and Nehru lived and preached? There must be some reason for it. By changing this attitude what do we gain? We lose prestige and we cease to be a peaceful nation. Even if we produce a few bombs that will not be able to help us or to protect us since it will be incompatible to meet the demands of the race of the nuclear nations, and we would only deviate from our stand, and at the same time we mortgage the future of our country.

What do we find today in our country? We are just reaching the take-off economy. It is only now after 20 years of independence that India has started to realise that it can achieve prosperity and modernise its industry. But if today all that money is going to be used for producing armaments, what will happen? We were spending Rs. 247 crores in 1960 on our Defence. Now, because we are modernising our defence we find that thousand crores are going to be spent on defence. We have to spend much more on defence if we are to guard our coastline and get modern equipments and if we have to make our defence up-to-date. But if we mortgage the future what will happen? There are signs and symptoms in the country that the vast majority of our population are in frustration. The youth of the country is not able to channelise its activities and there are no opportunities available for the students. The country is smouldering in discontent and is in a great mess. We have to take stock of the situation and greater vision is wanted now. What is needed today is to study India in the proper perspective.

We find that Sheikh Abdullah has been preaching that Pakistan has a

locus standi in Kashmir. How can we rest with disturbing developments in Kashmir? How can we sit at rest with China troubling us, with the Mizos and Nagas in the east, and how can we sit at rest when the South is preaching its fissiparous and secessionist tendencies? We should take stock of the situation. We should see that we build up a united India, strong and consolidated India. If we go the nuclear way all this will be frustrated and we will gain nothing.

I wish to say one thing more, and that is, regarding the recognition of East Germany. I realise that times have changed and India also needs to move with the times. Now that the militancy of the cold war has diluted, we have to understand this. If West Germany is carrying on its diplomatic ties with many countries which have relations with East Germany, what is there to prevent India from having at least a trade representative in East Germany?

With these words, I support the Demands of the External Affairs Ministry.

SHRI CHITTARANJAN ROY (Joynagar): I rise to oppose the Demands of the Ministry because Government have failed to interpret and understand the real dangers of the international political arena. The policy which it has deduced therefore is not what logically it should have concluded, although it is true that we have gone through what they have done so far in the international political arena.

The main question today is the American aggressive nationalism. We are finding this aggressive American nationalism in all cases and in every country and not merely in the case of Vietnam. The case of Vietnam has revealed this more vividly than any other instance, and everybody knows that. Through their CIA activities, through their economic power and economic might, and

taking advantage of the weakness and poverty of the country they go on exploiting many of the newly independent countries; not only do they take advantage of their weakness, but they do these things in the name of fighting communism. Some may agree with communism while some others may not. But whenever the Americans have unleashed their fight or struggle against communism we have found that those countries have actually come into the grips of the American imperialists. That has been the case with Thailand, that has been the case with the Philippines, and that has been the fate of Malaysia and other countries also. In regard to whatever injustice has been done by America to Vietnam, we find that all these satellite governments and puppet governments just ditto the American policy. Why are they doing so? They are doing so because they have virtually been converted into satellite States of the American imperialists. That is why I say that whenever somebody starts unleashing this movement against communism, ultimately it would be found that they are sure to fall into the hands of the American imperialists and that is the real danger in the international political arena.

Nationalism does not necessarily mean doing injustice to other people. It is not something which is going to do harm to the other countries. But we find that they approach this question according to their convenience. They approach this question of nationalism and democracy according to their own convenience. Whenever it suits their convenience they make it nationalism and whenever it suits their convenience they make it democracy. I would submit that this question should not be dealt with in that way.

That is why we find that the Government of India have been pursuing a weak-kneed policy in regard to the UAR-Israel war. We know that

[Shri Chittaranjan Roy]

Government have condemned Israel for the aggression. But there is a plan behind it. Government did not condemn the American imperialists who were behind it. For, as everybody knows, it was not Israel which had so much power as to launch an attack on the UAR, but it was due to the American instigation and their power that they fought and it is on the basis of that that they are fighting the Arab people even today. The main thing is that this injustice was unleashed by America. That is why our voice should be raised against it.

In regard to Vietnam also, we have often raised the question here that the bombing of North Vietnam should be stopped. But we find that our Government have never condemned America for its activities of aggression.

I would submit that the present policy of persuasion and this weak-kneed policy of our Government cannot help us in the present international politics. The urgent need of the hour is for Government to change their policy. We have got a tradition of anti-imperialistic struggle; we know how these imperialists suppress the people and their aspirations for independence and we know also how they go on suppressing the people. Perhaps today we have forgotten all those bitter experiences, and that is why we cannot stand boldly against all the injustice done by the American people, the American imperialists and their Government.

Therefore, I would submit that Government should go through this matter very clearly. I am sure that they can again find a way out so that they can raise their voice once again in the international political arena. I know that there is poverty still prevalent in our country and they are giving us aid in times of exigencies

by way of foodgrains or other loan and assistance. But we cannot concede whatever they say and we cannot concede to them at the cost of our morality, ethics and values and at the cost of our anti-imperialist tradition.

It is true that foreign policy is the extension of the home policy. If our home policy is capable enough, if our home policy is powerful enough so that our people are strong, then we need not be afraid of anything. I knew that a sensation has been created in the country that China or Pakistan may swallow us. But I would submit that that is not such an easy thing. No country today can swallow a big country like India which is so powerful and which is so great in magnitude and size and which has a vast population. That is why this kind of war psychosis or war-fanaticism cannot work. This threat of swallowing is just a hypothetical illusion only. It is just a clamouring on the part of some people and nothing more.

We see that there are fissiparous tendencies and secessionist tendencies and so on. I would submit that these fissiparous and parochial ideas that prevailing in the country are due to the unwise handling of the problem that exists. We know that there are communal riots in the country. I am referring to this matter in this debate because I want to illustrate the point that these riots are nothing but the results of the wrong policy pursued by Government. All the time they are talking of secularism. They have not, however, been able to interpret what secularism actually means. Secularism in the proper sense of the term means non-recognition of the supernatural entity and leaving religion alone as a private affair. But in our country we are finding that all the Ministers and all the statesmen go to patronise all the

religions. Then, what is the difference between Pakistan and India? Pakistan is patronising only Islam. but we are patronising all the religions together. If Pakistan is a theocratic State, India has become converted into a multi-theocratic State. That is the only difference between India and Pakistan. Religion should be left alone as the private affair of the people and they will deal with it as they like. The State should have nothing to do with religion and it should leave religion alone. The State should not patronise any religion. But we often find that the Ministers and statesmen go on patronising all the religions and there lies the real cause of the danger, the root cause of communalism which prevails in our country. If we go on allowing this kind of thing, I am afraid that the country can never get rid of this problem.

Of course, politically we are an independent country, and economically also we are an independent country, but emotionally, culturally, aesthetically and morally we have been divided into many castes, many creeds, many religions, many States and many linguistic groups. Our unity can be fostered only by a scientific understanding of the problem, and a real solution of the problem can come only out of the process of reasoning. For this purpose, we have to keep ourselves free from all preconceptions and ideas. It is to emphasise this that I have referred to this question.

With these words, I submit that I cannot support these Demands.

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN (Chamba): The present criticism of the foreign policy of India springs from the lack of understanding of the mainstreams of the foreign policy. The criticism reminds me of the story of the four blind men and an elephant, each describing the elephant in a different way. When the

criticism comes from the left-wing party, they think that the policy is Western-oriented and it is under the influence of the USA and Britain. When the rightwing parties criticise the foreign policy, they think that it is pressurised by Russia and various shades of left and right describe it differently.

One of the Members said that the foreign policy was in shambles. It is not the foreign policy which is in shambles, but it is the Opposition parties which are in shambles, and now they want to divert the attention of the people from the failures which they are suffering at the Centre and also at the State levels. This year has been a year of disillusionment and disenchantment for them, and to divert attention from their failures, they are attacking the foreign policy of India. They have not been able to understand the main principles and the fundamentals of the foreign policy of our country. The foreign policy of a country springs from certain fundamental principles, keeping in view the national security, the national interest and the economy of the country.

The national and economic interests of the country demand a policy of non-alignment, and a policy which seeks co-existence. They had even not understood the meaning of non-alignment. They confused it with neutrality. Neutrality is passivity in international affairs and non-alignment is a dynamic concept. It means that you keep your judgment independent. You take an independent decision on every issue. You are not pressurised by any group and the passage of time has shown that we have succeeded in it. When India became independent that world was divided into two major groups, the western group and the eastern group. The passage of time has shown that these groups have started dissolving, and many countries have followed the policy which we enunciated and some of them have said that we should

[Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan]

join this group or that group. But history has shown that even these groups are not supporting each other and they are formulating a policy which is called the policy of non-alignment also.

The foreign policy also springs from historical background. Our country was dominated by the Britishers when we were subject to humiliation and their arrogance. So we can realise the sufferings of the under-developed and the colonial nations and that is one of the main reasons why we have always supported the colonies and the African nations. No country has pleaded their cause better than our country. So far as Africa is concerned, we have pleaded the cause of Africans in South Africa, i.e. the Africans in South Africa, the Africans in Southern Rhodesia and the colonies. Then I submit that there is criticism without putting forth concrete proposals.

One instance that I may give is Vietnam. Speaker after speaker has risen and said that India, exactly in a callous manner is standing aside and watching what is happening in Vietnam. One of them has said that India should have taken the initiative. They have said that India should have taken the initiative. But no proposal has been put forth in what form they want India to take the initiative. If the initiative means that you ask, you persuade the different nations to come to a compromise, that initiative is already there. Nobody can say that India has not condemned bombing. But in the zeal of condemning India's foreign policy, they have attacked American foreign policy and tried to show that India's policy is practically that of America. One of the speakers practically devoted two-thirds of his speech to the American doings in South-Vietnam. I thought we were discussing India's foreign policy and not American foreign policy. Therefore, I submit that

so far as Vietnam is concerned, India has taken up the initiative which a peaceful nation can take and should take and not go beyond that. India is doing that.

So far as our neighbours are concerned we have been helping in the development of the economies of various countries of Southeast Asia and Africa. This is the only way which can create stronger ties of friendship, and countries like Nepal, Burma, Malaysia and Ceylon are more friendly to us than before. The recent UNCTAD, though it has not come to our expectations, yet it has focussed the attention of the world to the problems of the underdeveloped countries and to that extent, I submit, the achievement is enough.

There are two countries which in spite of our efforts have still remained hostile to us, that is, Pakistan and China. Both the countries, especially Pakistan, depends for its very existence on hatred, by whipping up hatred against India. So, in spite of our best efforts, we have not been able to befriend Pakistan, and when a nation lives on the hatred of a country it is difficult for another country to befriend that country. Some of the Members have said that we have not been able to create friendly relations with China. China has developed a policy of creating more and more difficulties and subversion in India. The best way of meeting the Chinese challenge would be the strengthening of our economy and the economies of the South East Asian countries.

A slogan is often raised that we should quit the Commonwealth. When the Immigration Bill was passed by UK the slogan was raised that we should quit the Commonwealth. When the Rhodesian crisis deepened, again the same thing was said. I am all for quitting the Commonwealth provided that will solve any of our problems. But if the idea is that in a huff we have to take a decision, I am against it. But if any member or party suggests convincingly that by leaving the Commonwealth we can help the cause of Indians living in Kenya, we should quit the Commonwealth.

So far as Kenya is concerned, India has done all that it could to plead the cause of the Asians in Kenya. It is true that the Kenyan Government has behaved in a way which is unbecoming of a civilised government. But less than sending an army to Kenya, I would submit that India has done everything. The complaint often heard is that India has not done sufficiently. But sufficiency depends upon the circumstances, what an independent nation can do to help the people living in another country.

Further, a suggestion was made that we should expel all the British nationals living in India. I would have concurred with him provided there were not half a million Indians living in Great Britain. We should not take a decision where the remedy will be worse than the disease. There are only 60,000 Indians in Kenya who can be absorbed by India, because our population is increasing at the rate of one crore a year. If necessary, we can absorb them very easily. For the sake of these 60,000 Indians we should not jeopardise the interests of half a million Indians who are living in Great Britain.

There is a strong plea made by some members that we should sign the non-proliferation treaty. By joining the non-proliferation treaty there is no guarantee that we will be protected if we are attacked. It is a vague sort of undertaking. Further,

even assuming there is a guarantee, it can be broken. There is no surety bond attached to it, that if you are attacked you will be protected. Then, take the other aspect. Suppose we do not sign that treaty. It is not definite that they will not come to our aid, in case we are attacked, on the ground that we have not signed the treaty. So, either way, our not signing it will not harm our interests.

Finally, no nation can claim that its policy has always succeeded. But, by and large, we have succeeded. As I have already submitted earlier, the attack on our policies is mainly due to the shambles in which the opposition parties are. I will end with the old saying that two persons looked out of the window; one looked at the stars and the others..... our friends know what!

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my first duty is to thank you for calling me, even though at a very late hour. I feel that our Foreign Ministry faces three very grave, serious and long-range problems and unless they are faced boldly our foreign policy will not be as fruitful, as effective and as influential as it should be.

Our first problem is that we should eliminate the hot-house atmosphere in the Ministry of External Affairs. What I mean by this is this. The windows of this Ministry should be kept open to all the winds that are blowing in all parts of the world.

It is not that we should try to shut our eyes to one part of the globe and keep our eyes open to the other part of the globe. This means that our foreign policy should be based on value; it should be value based and not totally self-interest based.

I think, there was a statesman of England—he might have been a very wise statesman according to the British people—who said, "We have no eternal principles; we have only eternal interests." I think, that might

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

have been true in the nineteenth century but it cannot hold good in the twentieth century

Therefore we do not follow this cynical line of approach, this grossly selfish line of approach in our foreign policy. Our foreign policy is based on certain values which endure. They may suffer eclipse at one time; they may suffer from recession at another time; they may have regression at one particular moment, but I think that the value for which our foreign policy stands will endure. Therefore we should not be tinkering with our foreign policy in the External Affairs Ministry in one way or another when something untoward happens.

This foreign policy is the great handiwork of the great Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and nobody can deny that when Egypt was invaded, so far as the Suez Canal is concerned, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's heart beat in unison with that of Colonel Gamel Nasser. What advantage are we going to reap from that? Have we got something out of that stand? Perhaps, we have not reaped any material advantage from that stand. But, all the same, I believe that this policy of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was applauded and understood all over the world and India's stand was taken to be a great stand worthy of a great and ancient country like India. Therefore I say that this is what is to be done.

Unfortunately, the External Affairs Ministry has been, for some time, the playground of mediocrities and parochial forces and of people who do not understand the global movements that are going on all the time. Sometimes a Foreign Minister may say in reply to, "Where is North Vietnam?" that North Vietnam lies to the north of South Vietnam. If we have a person who understands global geography and global movement in this way, I think, our foreign policy cannot succeed. Therefore, this foreign

policy cannot succeed. Therefore, this foreign policy of ours has to be rescued from the morass of stereotypedness and from the bog of conventional thinking and from all those influences that have submerged it all these days.

I am glad that the daughter of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has taken over the Foreign Ministry now. (Laughter) My hon. friend over there laughs, but if Khrushchev's son had taken over from Khrushchev he would have been very happy. She has stood for those values for which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stood. What is our stand on Vietnam? Of course, Vietnam is as much our problem as it is a problem of all the countries of the world; it may be more a problem of ours than of other countries because it is so near. But there is no doubt about it that the stand that we took in the case of Vietnam has been vindicated and I want that we should take such stands on global affairs as history vindicates, as time vindicates.

Again, our stand on the non-proliferation treaty, I think, should be adhered to. Now, people say, there are some nuclear haves and there are some nuclear have-nots. No. There is the third category also. There are nuclear haves, there are nuclear have-nots and there are nuclear able-to-haves. That is the third category. Japan is like that; India is like that. Therefore, I think, if we sign the treaty, we should reserve to ourselves the right to act in any way that the political exigencies of our country demand. I think, that is the line which the Prime Minister of India has taken.

So far our Embassies have remained isolated from the public. Shri George Fernandes read out an extract from the *Hindustan Times* about some Embassy of ours. I have visited some of these Embassies and I can say that these Embassies are islands

which have no commerce, no intercourse, with the outside world. They live in a circle of their own, in an orbit of their own, and I would, therefore say that these Embassies should be out-going, forwardlooking and should be such as can make friends. I remember meeting a great statesman of a country—I do not want to mention the name of the country—and he said, "There are three lobbies in my country; one is pro-Pakistan lobby, one is anti-Indian lobby, and there is a gentleman who used to go to that country on behalf of my country, and there is anti-that-gentleman lobby also." Asked if there was no pro-Indian lobby, he said, "No." Therefore, I would submit very respectfully that wherever our Embassies are, wherever our missions are, of whatever kind, of whatever dimensions, they should build up a pro-Indian lobby as much as they can. They should win friends and influence people. They should not remain isolated from the currents that are going on in the country in which the Embassy is situated. You want people these days who can mould public opinion and public opinion is a great asset and unless that is done, nothing happens.

We talk of the fourth estate. Now, the fourth estate is the youth of the world. Everywhere you find that youth is restless. We should send out such Ambassadors who are able to shape the ideas of those persons. I do not say that we should try to do propaganda for them. But I do say that we should not send such Ambassadors who are only confined to the four walls of the Embassy and who are not able to go out and meet those persons. Unfortunately, I have found that some of our Ambassadors do not meet even the Indians who live in that country. They behave in a way which is not conducive to good relations between themselves and the Indians who are domiciled in that country. I want that our Ambassadors should be such who can bridge the gap not only between themselves and the Indians who are domiciled

in that country but also between themselves and the people of the country there. Rulers come and go. I have seen the era of Eisenhower in USA; I have seen the great and glorious epoch of Kennedy in USA and we are, obviously, seeing the epoch of Lyndon Johnson. These persons come and go but the people remain there. Therefore, we should not send as Ambassadors such persons who are adept in passing orders on files only, but we should send as Ambassadors such persons who can do something so far as the people are concerned.

Sometime back there was a question regarding our High Commissioner in London about something having appeared in some papers. I think, it was in *National Herald* that I read an article; it came in two instalments—"what is our secular Democracy". I am very happy he has given the lecture in London on Secular Democracy. I felt very happy about it and I said that this gentleman had opened the window of our Embassy to the people of England. He has done well. So, you should send such Ambassadors who can talk to people in the language which they understand, who can talk to people in the idiom which is their own, who can talk to people about the values which we hold and we should not send those Ambassadors who say, "Do not send us to 'C' Stations; please keep us out of 'C' Stations; please despatch us to 'A' Stations." Let this difference between 'A' 'B' and 'C' disappear; otherwise, all these Ambassadors will be trying to go to 'A' Stations and nobody will look towards 'B' and 'C' Stations. Therefore, I would say that these Ambassadors should be such as can put across the values for which India stands, the great culture which India has produced. For that, I would suggest that half of these posts should go to career-diplomats and another half should go to public men. It is not necessary that you should always have career-diplomats. These career-diplomats are very good; I have nothing against them, but they are the

[Shri D. C. Sharma].

prisoners of files, prisoners of office, they are the playthings in the hands of bureaucracy who serve them, but a public man can sometimes take a stand of his own and can do some good to India.

My third point is that India has to follow a policy of concentration. In a country like ours we cannot dispense with this. We must concentrate on some countries; for instance, Bhutan, Sikkim and Nepal are our neighbours. I am glad that we have been trying to be friendly with them, but I would submit very respectfully that we should concentrate on some countries; Bhutan, Sikkim and Nepal and other countries which are our neighbours; Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and so on. The year 1968 should be a 'good-neighbour year' and 'good neighbour means that we should stretch our hands of friendship to them and we should go even out of the way to help these countries more effectively. If they want some economic aid, we should give them; if they want something else, we should come to their help. Of course, I do not want to use the word 'aid' and 'help' in regard to these countries because they are sovereign, independent countries. But we should do something. More than this, I would say that we should build a bridge between East Bengal and India. We should build a bridge between Pakistan and ourselves. I do not want that we should do anything of the kind that will increase the already existing bitterness between us. I want, Sir, that a bridge that can be built between West Pakistan and India will be a bridge of goodwill if we try to do something to encourage Urdu. I tell you, Sir, that this will be a real and lasting bridge of goodwill

between India and West Pakistan. Therefore, we should try to give a great deal of attention to Urdu so that West Pakistan becomes emotionally allied with India.

At the same time, I would say that East Bengalees are our own brethren, the people of West Punjab are also our own brethren. I say that because I come from West Punjab. The East Bengal people love nothing more than Bengali. Therefore, you should try to give them fine specimens of Bengali literature and we should try to see that they get it.

One more word and I have finished. Sir, Indians are to be found in almost every country of the world. Whenever I have been abroad, I have seen Punjabis, Gujaratis, Bengalis, South Indians and Maharashtrians and if I have not found Maharashtrians, I have found my Sikh brethren and if the Sikh brethren are not there, the Rajasthanis are there and if the Rajasthanis are not there, I have found the Sindhis there. So you find India everywhere, a small part of India everywhere and, Sir, they hold British passports, Canada passports, passports of any country.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You should try to finish now.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA: We should remember that they belong to us and we should welcome them and hug them to our bosom, make them our own and never say anything which would show to them that the country of their origin has disowned them. They are flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood and we should own them fervently and unambiguously.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): I have gone through the report of the External Affairs Ministry with the utmost care and caution. This report gives neither information nor any analysis of the forces that confront India vis-a-vis the world, and to try to solve

them merely by silence is to misjudge the temper and mood of the contemporary international scene.

The report is prepared, may I say, in the *Bhagvat Gita* spirit of non-attachment. Sir, our foreign policy is a policy of non-alignment. But this policy of non-alignment is not to be carried into the vertex of non-attachment to our national interests. Our foreign policy of non-alignment was evolved some two decades ago, but, as Mr. Mahajan said, the international scene is dynamic and is moving. Here, I remember what Mr. Nehru said once—I liked the sentence very much—that one cannot be static in a dynamic universe. When the universe is dynamic, when the international scene is dynamic, some of our foreign policies are static. I do not want this Government to abandon the policy of non-alignment. All that I want is certain modifications commensurate with the changes in the international situation today. Sir, Madam Pandit stated something about America giving us aid in her own interests. What about Soviet Russia? Soviet Russia also gives us aid in her own interest. It is the national interest that must constitute the rock bottom of any nation's external policy and that should apply to us also.

15 hrs.

Sir, it is an open fact that our major neighbours like Pakistan and China are both hostile to us and that they would not miss an opportunity to subvert us, if not by physical attack, at least by encouraging the divisive forces in this country as they are doing now. They are out to destroy us. Now I remember what Jesus Christ said, 'Love thy enemy'. We have to reverse it and say, 'Hate thy enemy'. It is the positive of hatred that we have to develop against these countries which are openly hostile to us. I do not mean that we have to develop a kind of hostilities for the people of these countries. We have to have sympathy for them and we should try to develop the posture of hostility

towards the rulers of these two countries, Pakistan and China. And what is the psychology that we represent, Sir? This report claims that the Tashkent Declaration has led to a certain extent towards the normalisation of relations with Pakistan. But has it done so? The Tashkent Declaration is dead as the dodo. I think the Tashkent Declaration is a bilateral agreement between two countries, Pakistan and India, under the auspices of Soviet Russia. Now, after Pakistan has thrown the Tashkent Declaration to the waste-paper basket can there be a unilateral implementation of a bilateral agreement? I don't understand that. How can that be? When Tashkent Declaration was signed and Mr. Shastri of revered memory affixed his signature to the Tashkent Declaration we felt that the Tashkent Declaration was a mistake. Mr. Shastri could understand the defect inherent in the Tashkent Declaration. That is why I find, it was a strain on his emotions, because he was an intelligent man, and it is under the strain of these emotions that he died in a far, distant country. He found this about the Tashkent Declaration. Mr. Shastri knew this also that the Tashkent Declaration might ultimately prove ruinous to the people of India because Pakistan has refused to touch it with a pair of tongs.

There are some people who say that once the so-called problem of Kashmir is solved there would be a rainbow of peace and friendship knitting the Pakistani sky with our Indian sky. I do not understand that at all. But what is the solution? What is the solution in clear and precise terms so far as the so-called problem of Kashmir is concerned? Friends of Pakistan like Sheikh Abdullah and Mr. Jaya Prakash Narain have not been able to give any precise or clear solution to this problem. What Sheikh Abdullah is saying in Srinagar, Mr. Jaya Prakash Narain is repeating in New York for his American audience. That is what I find. I do not understand how an Indian can go abroad and try to destroy the image of his

[Shri Hem Barua]

own country. That pains me very much. When an Indian goes out he must try to preserve the image of the country. Even if you deliver Kashmir wrapped up as Easter egg and give it to Pakistan, Pakistan will not be satisfied. If you read Ayub Khan's *Friends, not Masters*, you will understand the psychology of the rulers of Pakistan. Pakistan wants to be a friend of India after being a master of Kashmir. But there is duplicity in that also. I think Government have not tried to analyse and examine their forces within the framework of the reality and relevancy to our national interests.

What about China, Sir? China has never concealed her intentions to destroy India by whatever methods. I mentioned earlier about the Chinese intentions on the Floor of this House. During Mr. Nehru's times, Mr. Dange who used to sit on these benches, said that China being a socialist country would never attack India. But what has happened? China attacked us and we knew about the intentions of China. China mounted attack at Nathu La and Cho La and by subversive and other methods China wants to destroy India and there is no doubt about that. So we should consider this and modulate our foreign policy in that context.

When that so-called revolution took place in Naxalbari, the Peking radio beamed out Mao's thought. This, they are doing now, in relation to the Naga and Mizo hostiles. There was a patient suffering from cancer in a hospital in Peking and they placed a book, *Mao's Thoughts* on his head and he recovered. My good God! All sorts of superstition is growing about this. They are trying to grow superstition round Mao's thought. Whatever that might be, due to the emergence of the armed might of China, there is a consequent loss of face, loss of image, loss of stature so far as India is concerned in the eyes of the world today.

Now what happened? When the West Asian crisis took place, when there was a conflict between the Arab States and Israel, we offered our support to the Arab States. I do not want to go into the merits of that.

15.06 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

We were the first to offer our support to the Arab States. But then what did King Hussain of Jordan say as late as January 1968 is most revealing and very interesting. Here it is:

"Pakistan was the foremost amongst the friends who stood by Jordan and the Arab countries in their hour of trial. The people and leaders of Pakistan will always remain in the hearts of the Arab people. They, Jordan and Pakistan, have stood by each other in the past and will do it in the future".

Now, where is India? India is nowhere in the picture. I am taken aback by this. I think there should be a limit to ungratefulness also. So far as Jordan and the Arab States are concerned, there is no limit to ungratefulness even. King Hussain of Jordan forgot to mention India's name even. He mentioned Pakistan of course.

What is happening? Madame Pandit spoke about the role we have played in the world and how our image has gone up.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): In the past.

SHRI HEM BARUA: In the past. May I tell you that the prestige that Shri Nehru built for India by sheer force of his personality has been squandered by his daughter's inaptitude and vacillation? There is no doubt about it. In the context of international politics, a nation, in order to be heard and respected in the comity of nations, must be strong,

both militarily and from the point of economic strength. Unfortunately, India is strong neither militarily nor economically. That is the trouble. We must have a sound industrial base. After the Chinese attack in 1962, I remember our then President Dr. Radhakrishnan speaking about our being strong so far as military strength and economic strength are concerned.

Now China has emerged as a full-fledged nuclear power which poses a great danger to India's security. Because of China emerging as a nuclear power, what has happened to us? We requested both the Soviet Union and the USA to guarantee or give us a joint nuclear umbrella. Now both the USA and USSR as well as Britain have come out with a proposal for a nuclear umbrella. But that proposal confirms our apprehension that this nuclear umbrella, if given to us, would not open when actually the rain comes. That is the trouble. Before it opens the UN will have to define what 'aggression' means. This important body has failed to define aggression during the last twenty years. Now can you think that it will be able to define aggression just before the umbrella is passed on to our hands? This is something that cannot be understood. I am happy that our Government does not propose to sign this nuclear non-proliferation treaty along the dotted line. That is a great thing they are doing.

I do not want to stray into problems that do not immediately affect our interests. But I must congratulate President Johnson on the bold stand he has taken in de-escalating the war in Vietnam. Unfortunately, there are hawks and doves in Hanoi as there are hawks and doves in Washington. Hawks and doves are everywhere (*Interruptions*). By my information is that President Johnson consulted Soviet Russia two days before he made his announcement publicity. But what about us who go about making noises but nobody listens to us because we

are weak militarily, weak economically, weak politically, weak internally and all that?

This Report is ominously silent about the position of Indians abroad. Now you know how Kenyan Indians are driven out of Kenya and how Britain has treated them ill. I remember what Shri Nehru said in a preface to a book published by the AICC in 1940 entitled *Our Countrymen abroad*. This is it, a very revealing thing:

"India is weak today and cannot do much for her children abroad, but she does not forget them, and every insult to them is humiliation and sorrow for her. A day will come when her long arm will protect them and her strength will compel justice to them".

What about India's 'long arm' today? The long arm is palsied. Does anybody bother about a palsied arm? What is it that India has done to protect her children abroad? India has forgotten her children abroad. India has gone back on her word to them, the word that Shri Nehru wrote.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was long ago.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Might be long ago. But these are his words and his words are quoted when it is convenient to quote them and they are not quoted when it is inconvenient to do so. That is the trouble.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD): As he is doing.

SHRI HEM BARUA: There are thousands of Indians in Africa, there are thousands of Chinese in Africa. Has any of the African countries treated the Chinese there as Kenya is treating Indians in her country?

AN HON. MEMBER: It dare not

SHRI HEM BARUA: They are treating Indians in a bad manner

[Shri Hem Barua]

because they know that India is not capable of stretching out her arm to protect her children abroad.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA: What did Indonesia do to the Chinese?

SHRI HEM BARUA: I am speaking about Africa. Indonesia is the only country in the world that has taken that stand, and no other country in the world where Chinese are has ever taken that stand.

Now it is no use trying to accuse Britain for betraying the Indians of Kenya who hold British passports. Betrayal it is, no doubt. But what have we done? Have we not betrayed our Indians in Kenya? We have also betrayed them. When Pakistan committed aggression on us in 1965, I remember the then Prime Minister wanted Indians in Kenya to contribute liberally to the defence fund of India. But when they are in difficulty, we just forget them.

Another thing. In all matters, what has happened? The India Government is subservient to England. Is it because we are a member of the Commonwealth? Madame Pandit has given a very nice analysis of the association called Commonwealth. What is the Commonwealth? What is common about the Commonwealth except the common hall where the deliberations take place. Not even the wealth is common.

What has happened is that London has become almost a Mecca for our Ministers. Whenever an opportunity presents itself, our Ministers go to London on the Indian taxpayers' money. I remember one Minister went to London during last October, for what? In order to learn the techniques of crime detection at Scotland Yard. This could have been done by any Indian police officer. I remember I was in London during October last on an invitation from the British Government. (Interruption). There is a difference between people going

abroad at the expense of the Indian taxpayers' money and on invitation from the British Government. Dr. Channa Reddy was then there and what happened? Dr. Channa Reddy had addressed a press conference, and the next day, in the *Daily Telegraph*, I read a press report of what he had said. The report was there under a double-column headline. And there was a picture along with the report, and underneath was written, "Dr. Channa Reddy, Indian Minister." Then, when I looked at the picture I discovered that that was not the picture of Dr. Channa Reddy but that was the picture of Dr. Triguna Sen. Do you find any physiognomic resemblance between the two doctors? Our Ministers, whenever they get an opportunity, run to London. But how many of the British Ministers come to India? Very few. A Minister of State came some time back, I know.

By hanging these martyrs in Rhodesia, the white regime in Rhodesia has committed a crime against humanity. There is no doubt about it. What happens? Prime Minister Harold Wilson will never apply force against the white regime although Zambia has offered her territory to be used as military base against the white regime in Rhodesia. Why is it so? Because the Britishers have their economic interests in Rhodesia. Do not forget that there are even today 200 British banks functioning and operating in Rhodesia: Grindlays, Barclays, Standard Bank of England—all these have their branches there. Do not forget that Rhodesia has the largest air force in Africa and the greatest contribution made to that air force has come from Britain. We call ourselves an independent nation. Although we call ourselves an independent nation, the High Commissioner's office in London bears the insignia of the British Crown there. Should it happen in relation to an independent republic like ours?

AN HON. MEMBER: The crown of the Queen of England.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Whatever that might be. We are an independent nation, a republic. But have our Government the courage to tell the Prime Minister—Mr. Harold Wilson—that if he does not bring the illegal white regime in Rhodesia to its knees we are going to quit the Commonwealth and break away from it? We do not have that courage to say so. What happens? Because of our weaknesses, some of our neighbours are in illegal occupation of our territory. Who does not know that Pakistan holds some Indian territory in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area in Assam and that China holds 14,500 square miles of Indian territory in Ladakh? Who does not know that even Ceylon has made a claim of the Kachchativu island in the Palk Strait? It is because we are weak, and unfortunately our Government have admitted that Kachchativu island is a disputed territory.

May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to what Mr. Dinesh Singh, when he was Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, had said? He said on 7th May, 1966 that Kachchativu island was part of the estate of the Raja of Ramnad and it was not in dispute. My submission is, if the Kachchativu island was not in dispute in 1966, how can it be in dispute in 1968?

श्री शिवप्रसाद शर्मा : (विक्रमगंज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, किसी भी देश की वैदेशिक नीति समझने के लिए वर्तमान संसार की तस्वीर ध्यान में रखनी होगी। कहा जाता है और ठीक ही कहा जाता है कि वर्तमान संसार दो गुटों में बंटा हुआ है। लेकिन ये दो गुट दो देशों के नहीं, दो विचारों के हैं। एक तरफ कम्युनिस्ट देश हैं, जो साम्यवादी विचार-प्राण के मानने वाले हैं। चाहे किसी प्रकार के भी कम्युनिस्ट हों, चाहे वे चीन के हों या रूस के, वे सब मानते हैं कि उन का एक ही दुश्मन है—साम्यवाद, और उन का एक ही लक्ष्य है—साम्यवाद।

दूसरा गुट अमरीका का है जो पूँजीवादी विचारधारा का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है।

एक तरफ यह माना जाता है कि राजनैतिक स्वतंत्रता ही सब कुछ है और दूसरी तरफ यह माना जाता है कि आर्थिक स्वतंत्रता ही सब कुछ है। लेकिन इतिहास हमें यह सबक सिखाता है कि एक के अभाव में दूसरा ही नहीं सकता है। जिस मुल्क में सिर्फ राजनैतिक स्वतंत्रता है और आर्थिक स्वतंत्रता नहीं है वहाँ राजनैतिक स्वतंत्रता भी कायम नहीं रह सकती है। इसी तरह से जिस मुल्क में सिर्फ आर्थिक स्वतंत्रता की बात की जाती है वहाँ अगर राजनैतिक स्वतंत्रता नहीं है तो आर्थिक स्वतंत्रता भी नहीं हो सकती है। यह संसार का आज का सत्य है जिस पर बिना विचार किये हम वैदेशिक नीति नहीं समझ सकते हैं।

जब देश ने गुट-निरपेक्षता की बात की, तो हमारे ध्यान में यही आता है कि शायद दिमाग में तस्वीर यही थी। दूसरी दुनिया का तस्वीर क्या है? एक महायुद्ध के बाद दूसरा महायुद्ध हुआ और दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद तीसरे महायुद्ध की तैयारी हो रही है। सभी विवेकशील आदमी मानते हैं कि अगर तीसरा महायुद्ध हुआ, तो मानव-जाति ही नहीं रह जायेगी। इस लिए हर विवेकशील आदमी सोचता है कि अब से पहले ऐसी कोशिश हानी चाहिए कि संसार में युद्ध का अन्त हो जाये। इस लिए विश्व-शान्ति पहली शर्त है।

अगर हम इस कर्सीटी पर अपने मुल्क की वैदेशिक नीति की जांच करें, तो हमें मानना पड़ेगा कि हम असफल हुए हैं। यह कौसी विडम्बना है कि जिस मुल्क में गांधीजी पैदा हुए, जिन्होंने कहा ही नहीं, कर के दिखाया कि शान्ति से, बिना हथियार उठाए विलायत जैसे मजबूत दुश्मन से आज्ञादी ली जा सकती है उस मुल्क में आज हम लाचारी प्रकट करते हैं कि स्वतंत्र भारत में हम उस सिद्धान्त का पालन नहीं कर सकते हैं और आज हमारी ओर से यह भाग हाँता है कि युद्ध की तैयारी की जाये, नर-संहार लीला की तैयारी की जाये, ज्यादा से ज्यादा खूबार हथियार पैदा

[श्री शिवपूजन शास्त्री]

किये जायें, जिस से ज्यादा से ज्यादा इन्सान मारे जायें। क्या यह गांधीजी के सिद्धान्त के अनुरूप है ?

इस लिए मैं माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान इस सत्य की तरफ खींचना चाहता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि सदन को इस पर जरूर विचार करना चाहिए कि एक तरफ विश्व-शान्ति की इच्छा और दूसरी तरफ युद्ध की तैयारी, ये दोनों बातें एक साथ कैसे चलेंगे। इसी तरह से एक तरफ विश्व-पंचायत की बात करना संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ संगठन को दिनों-दिन मजबूत करना उस के द्वारा पास की हुई चार स्वतंत्रतायें लागू करना और दूसरी तरफ अपने मुल्क में गरीबी बढ़ाना जबकि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ मानता है कि संसार के किसी भी कोने में अगर गरीबी है तो वह पूरे विश्व को अशान्ति का कारण है, ये दोनों बातें एक-साथ कैसे चल सकती हैं ?

इस लिए अगर हम विश्व में शान्ति चाहते हैं, तो हमें संसार के किसी भी कोने में गरीबी नहीं रहने देनी चाहिए, हमें अशान्ति को जड़ काट देनी चाहिए। अगर हम अशान्ति को जड़ काटना चाहते हैं, अगर हम देश की गरीबी और बेरोजगारी मिटाना चाहते हैं तो वह हम युद्ध की तैयारी कर के तो नहीं कर सकते हैं। बस घर बरखा हमारे पास बिचाई, अस्पतालों का उद्योग के लिए नहीं है लेकिन नर-संहार के लिए है हालांकि उस के बारे में हम बहुत सुन्दर शब्द कहते हैं कि वह आत्म-रक्षा के लिए है। दुनिया में कौन ऐसा मुल्क है जो कहता है कि हम दूसरों पर हमला करने की तैयारी कर रहे हैं। हर देश यही कहता है कि हम अपनी आत्म-रक्षा के लिए फौजी तैयारी कर रहे हैं। यह परस्पर-विरोध है।

इस लिए यह भी मानना होगा कि आज राष्ट्रीयता संसार को नहीं बचा सकती है। राष्ट्रीयता सिर्फ अपने मुल्क पर ध्यान दिलानी है संसार को भुलाती है। जो पक्का राष्ट्र-

वादी है वह यही कहता है कि दुनिया जाये जहन्नुम में, हमारे राष्ट्र की तरक्की होनी चापिए। भूगोल की सीमा में रहने वाला अमुक इलाका दुनिया का सब सुख भोगे, उस से बाहर का कोई मुल्क चाहे कितना भी गरीब हो, उस को चाहे कोई सुविधा न हो, यही राष्ट्रीयता है। हम राष्ट्रीयता को जितनी भी सफाई दें, लेकिन राष्ट्रीयता एक भौगोलिक पूजा के अलावा और कुछ नहीं है।

इसलिए राष्ट्रीयता का युग समाप्त हो गया है अब तो मानवता का युग आया है या तो पूरा मानवता को जिन्दा रहना है या मर जाना है इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर हम को अपनी वैदेशिक नीति ठीक करनी पड़ेगी।

यह बात सही है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति अबलम्बित है गृह नीति पर। हमारे घर में अगर शान्ति है, हमारे देश में अगर सुख है, हमारे देश में अगर लोगों में मिल्लत है, तो हम दुनिया को बिना सबक सिखाये सिखा सकते हैं, उस को यह सन्देश दे सकते हैं, कि हम कितना सुन्दर राज्य चला रहे हैं। लेकिन दुनिया हम को क्या कहती होगी। जब यह पढ़ती होगी कि आज भी इस मुल्क में एक इन्सान जलाया जा सकता है दूसरे इन्सान द्वारा ? हम को कौन मुंह है दुनिया को उपदेश देने का ? जब हम अपने घर में, जिस को हम सही मानते हैं, उस को कर के नहीं दिखाते हैं, तो हमें दुनिया को कहने का क्या हक है ?

इस लिए हम को ऐसी योजना बनानी पड़ेगी, ताकि गांधी जी की रूह, उन की आत्मा, हमें कोसे नहीं। और वह तभी हो सकता है, जब हम फौजी तैयारी की तरफ ध्यान न दें। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों को यह बात बहुत बेबुजो लग सकती है, क्योंकि वे इस के विरोधी हैं।

श्री रणजित सिंह (खर्ललाबाद) : माननीय सदस्य पहले ही मान रहे हैं, इसलिए हम भी मानते हैं कि यह बेदंभी बात है।

श्री शिवपूजन शास्त्री : मैं मानता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य के दिमाग में वही बात है।

मैं सिर्फ दो तीन मुझाव यहाँ पर रखना चाहता हूँ। मेरा पहला सुझाव यह है कि वैदेशिक नीति में स्वावलम्बन की बात त्याग कर परस्पर अवलम्बन की बात सोवनी चाहिए। मेरा दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि परिस्थिति का गुलाम न बन कर पस्थिति पर कब्जा करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए और जहाँ तक हो सके, हो कम फौजी तैयारी करना चाहिए, क्योंकि तभी हम गरीबों में गुट-निरपेक्ष रह सकते हैं।

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there have been many interesting speeches in this debate. There are over a hundred cut motions but the main points which have concerned hon. Members are Vietnam and the Non-Proliferation treaty.

I was glad that the speeches this time were more pointed and did not attempt to range over the whole of human history. I am glad also to see that the induction of hon. Member, Shri Sondhi, into the Jana Sangh Parliamentary Party has brought a new awareness of foreign policy in that party. Before that, they were constantly blaming us for paying for too much attention to international affairs.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): Thank you for the compliment.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The hon. Members of the Congress Party have lightened my task by dealing very ably with most of the points which have been raised by the Opposition. The hon. Member who initiated the debate, Shri Masani, seemed to have made a speech in defence of America pleading for U.S. policies at a time when U.S. itself is engaged in revising them and trying to change them. The timing of the debate is such that it is natural that our attention should be specially focussed on Vietnam. On the 31st March, President Johnson made a speech of historic significance. It was a courageous initiative and I am glad it has evoked a positive response from Hanoi. Shri Masani used a rather strange word—I believe, he said that the United States Government had done what we, that is, the Government, had been “clamouring” for. I do not know with what significance Shri Masani meant to clothe that word ‘clamour’. Was there a certain disappointment that the United States should have taken a step which approximates 90 per cent to what we had been advocating for some considerable time and that our stand, so long maligned, so long criticised, now stood vindicated? When faced with such moments in human history, it is not enough to come out with statements and to rush to the press. It is important to examine the issues posed, to initiate processes and consultations. This we have been doing. We have been in touch with a number of friendly countries both through their Ambassadors and through our own Missions there. I sent personal messages both to President Johnson and to President Ho Chi Minh and, I am sure, that we would all like to see that these processes which have fruition in bringing peace to the tormented land of Vietnam.

Our effort has always been directed towards the narrowing of whatever

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

differences still exist and in overcoming whatever difficulties remain. We hope that the two sides will meet and we hope that, as a result of this meeting, conditions will be created for an uninterrupted dialogue. We have always felt that the Geneva Agreement of 1954 provides the framework within which the Vietnam problem could be resolved.

If I may refer once more to my distinguished friend, Shri Masani, he presumed that our stand in favour of the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam was based on our advocacy of 1954 provides the framework of North Vietnam's cause, I may say that the question of the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam has been advocated by a very large number of countries and by the distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations, because all these people realise that the issues in Vietnam are susceptible only to political solutions and that there could be no military solution to the problem. We believe also that these issues are far too serious to be made a subject of partisan propaganda. We have assured all the parties concerned that both as a peace-loving country and as Member Chairman of the International Control Commission, we would always be willing to shoulder whatever responsibilities devolved upon us.

We are glad that we are not alone in this. We have the support of many countries and the vast majority of mankind. We should like to share with them the task of bringing peace to Vietnam. It is understandable that there is still considerable mutual suspicion and questioning of motives. Statements by one side are not taken at their face value by the other. It is our task to bridge this gap of suspicion and distrust which divides the two sides. Hence our effort to contact all concerned parties and to bring them closer together, in the hope and belief, that direct contacts may per-

haps pave the way towards sincere and genuine contacts which would lead to a solution.

References were made by many Members to the question of the security of the South-East Asian region. My colleague, the Minister of State: Shri Bhagat, dealt with this in his speech yesterday. Some Members accused us of not playing an effective role in developing regional security arrangement for the defence of South and South-East Asian countries from Chinese expansionism. Hon. Member, Shri Sondhi, also spoke of this. I am glad that he has recently discovered Cambodia. We have had long-standing and friendly relations with that country and, in particular, with the distinguished head of the State, Prince Sihanouk. Those relations are purposeful and are based on mutual understanding, trust and confidence. There was concern amongst some parties that we should enter into agreements or arrangements with different nations of this region. Now, when we look back into recent history,—the post-war era, we find it littered with the remains of dead and dying security arrangements. I believe that this is bound to happen when international relations are subordinated to opportunist considerations. Our concept is different from that of the Swatantra Party and the Jan Sangh; our policies are not governed by conditioned reflexes but by deeper considerations. The security of South and South-East Asia will not be made more secure by alliances or treaties. We believe that security will grow out of mutual co-operation and the growth of identity of interests, and on our part, we have been doing everything possible to explore all avenues of such mutual co-operation in economic and other fields. We hope that when peace comes to Vietnam, the real security needs of the area will be seen more clearly. The main security is the strengthening of

these countries, and I do not believe that they can be strengthened by any kind of foreign interference.

Let us take a broad look at our external relations over the past year or so. Any objective observer will admit, and the overall impression that we got from the speeches of even those hon. Members who seem to oppose our policies was, that we have not been so badly off after all. With our two immediate and difficult neighbours, there has been no deterioration of relations. With Pakistan we are straining every nerve to effect some improvement and I have no doubt that we can succeed. Of course, it is not possible to have any spectacular or dramatic development. But we must work, we must make an attempt to work, together. Just now, the hon. Member, Shri Hem Barua, said something about having blind faith in the Tashkent agreement. It is not only that the Tashkent agreement is a matter of principle; it is mainly an instrument, through which the two countries could normalise their relations. We have had many difficulties in its implementation; we are far from implementing it perfectly or even in a large degree, but, nevertheless, I can say that we have proceeded a little bit in that direction. Some small steps have been taken and I personally feel that the atmosphere is better. But here again the responsibility lies on all of us. Because, being such close neighbours, having the type of contacts which we have had, having also the history of bitterness which we have had between us, any stray remark made by anybody can be exaggerated, misconstrued and lead to straining of relations. Therefore, this is a matter in which . . . (*Interruptions*) we must all endeavour to try to improve the relations.

Voices have been raised here on this occasion and on other occasions demanding that we should quit the Commonwealth. I am not insensitive

to the feelings which impel such demands. As I have said on previous occasion, leaving the Commonwealth cannot be considered as a mere subjective response to any given situation. Historically speaking, we joined the Commonwealth at a time when the world was divided into two hostile and opposing camps. And it made sense that some countries which were not involved with either of these camps should get together and explore their own common interests. Subsequently, with the rising tide of liberation, more countries became free and they became members of the Commonwealth. To-day there are 22 member states drawn from the areas extending from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific and embracing all continents of this earth. It is true that the festering of the Rhodesian sore is poisoning Commonwealth relations and the longer it is allowed to do so, the more corrosive will be its influence on the health of the Commonwealth. We are aware of this and deeply concerned. So are other Members of the Commonwealth. We hope, however, that the collective wisdom of members of the Commonwealth will help to solve this problem and to retain the multi-racial character of this association.

With the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., our contacts are increasing and our relations are developing very favourably in all fields. With the sister nations of Africa and of Asia there is, by and large, a record of progress.

One hon. Member referred to black racialism. Racialism, whether it be black or white, is anathema to the civilised world. We here in India have a proud record of fighting racialism in all its forms. We have done this not because of any moral sense of duty, but because we realise that the world cannot be stable if the political and economic conflicts are made more complex by a new dimen-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

sion or racial contacts. We shall continue to strive against racialism in all its manifestations. We have the friendliest of feelings for our brethren in Africa. We understand their difficulties many of which are due to the remnants of the old colonialism. We have to fight against this and we shall do so.

In the Commonwealth we have had many ups and downs and yet, on the whole, here again, friendship and co-operation is growing.

With the Socialist countries of Europe friendly ties continue to strengthen, especially, in the fields of economic and commercial exchanges. Western European countries have also shown friendship towards us in many ways which we have tried to reciprocate.

Mrs. Pandit made some thoughtful remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: But you were not here when she spoke.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I was a little surprised to hear her suggesting that because of our relationship with England or the Commonwealth, we had neglected our relations with France. Far from it, Sir. In the last two years we have come much closer not only to the Government of France but also, if I might say so, with the people of France. My hon. friend interrupted just now to say that I was not here to hear her speech. But I would like to tell him that I heard every word of all the speeches delivered before lunch.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): Had you invited De Gaulle to India?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Both with France and the Federal Republic of Germany our relations are advancing steadily.

The countries of Latin America, though geographically distant, share

many ideals with us and we hope to do more to know each other better and co-operate in various fields. But I realise that much more needs to be done and that in the past we have been a little aloof.

Except for some minor disappointments and occasional irritations we can confidently say that we have moved steadily forward in our international relationships and contacts. What is more, we have strengthened our existing friendships and have built bridges to expand our relations with others.

I should add that with our two neighbours on our western flank, we are establishing new relationships of mutual confidence and understanding. We were happy to welcome to Delhi, even though briefly, His Majesty the Shah of Iran, with whom we had a useful exchange of views which we are confident, will lead to the strengthening of our relations in the future. With the Foreign Minister of Turkey also a wide spectrum of problems was discussed and I feel that we understand each other a little better now. Economic exchanges are developing very satisfactorily with both these countries and this will provide a sound frame-work for building up a relationship based on mutual confidence and respect.

In Foreign Affairs there are no set positions. Some of these countries have not always been very friendly to us. I believe, that where there is friendship we must enlarge it, where there is indifference, we must remove it, and where there is hostility, we should try to blunt it. What are permanent and set are certain values and interests on which we cannot compromise.

Now I come to China. Some hon. Members have spoken of cutting off relations with China altogether; on the other hand some have talked of

raising them to Ambassadorial level. We have diplomatic relations with a large number of countries. In fashioning these relations, we do not look into the political and social composition of the Governments concerned. We believe that that is the responsibility of the people of the country concerned. What happens internally in other countries cannot be a subject-matter of public comment.

The hon. Member, Shri Sondhi, criticised me for not giving a report on some of the countries of Eastern Europe. But if a dignitary visiting our country were to return and make a report on the internal affairs of India, I am sure that hon. Members would not be pleased. Our differences with China arose mainly from the fact that China is not prepared to accept this elementary code of international conduct. The day they accept it, we would have gone a long way towards normalising our relations. I have no doubt that through a process of trial and error, the Chinese Government will one day realise that the world is much too complex to be reduced to some uniform pattern however shining and bright that pattern might appear in the eyes of the hot gospellers of our present-day world.

Hon. Member, Shri Umanath, should understand a very simple and elementary proposition. It is that India's social transformation can only be effected by the people of India themselves, in the light of their own history, tradition and experience. It will not be effected by Mao's thoughts and little red books.

A hardy annual which comes up with monotonous regularity concerns the functioning of our diplomatic missions abroad. The work of our missions must, of necessity, be performed quietly, without any fanfare of publicity. That is the very nature

of diplomacy, involving a careful survey of the ground, meticulous preparation and discreet contacts and discussions. The fact that our relations with countries all over the globe have been advancing is due in no small measure to the silent efforts of our missions. Our Foreign Service had to be created from scratch and we had no precedents or previous experience to go by. Yet, our diplomats have established great reputation abroad and in all international gatherings their voices, raised on behalf of the country, are heard with attention. And some have been singled out for service on important international missions.

The critics of our missions sometimes tend to judge their performance by impressions casually gathered during fleeting visits. Such judgments are fair neither to the critics themselves nor to our missions. Of course I must admit that there is always room for improvement and we are constantly trying to improve the performance of our missions.

SHRI M. L. SONDHU: Set up a Parliamentary Committee.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: And, any incident or information that comes to the knowledge of hon. Members of Parliament is always useful to us in seeing how these Services and Missions can be improved. But when we talk of publicity abroad or of the image of India which our Missions are projecting, let us remember that we are dealing with sovereign independent States who have their own assessments of their national interests. They are not concerned with our national interests; they are concerned with what picture suits them and that is the picture which is normally projected in that country.

Our task, therefore, is to seek their co-operation in matters where our interests converge as they do with

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

many countries and to seek adjustment and a accommodation wherever there are divergencies.

This process is a continuing one in the capitals of the world. In criticising our missions, it seems that Shri Hem Barua would also hold the Government of India responsible for the misprints or mistakes of British newspapers!

Amongst the measures taken to obtain better performance has been our decision to make our Heads of Missions themselves responsible for public relations work as well as the promotion of economic relations. This should give a stimulus to our efforts to improve our trade situation and to establish solid economic ties with other countries. Public relations work needs an imaginative approach, and one cannot have any set rules. With our Heads of Missions paying personal attention, we hope that the impact will be greater. But as I have said before, our image abroad will inevitably be a reflection of our situation at home. We know, when we passed through a difficult period of food shortage last year, what a very bad image of India was projected all over the world. Now that the situation has improved that image also is a vastly improved one. We hope that the country will now present a picture of unity and not of division, of progress and not of stagnation, of purposeful activity and not of meaningless dissension. All this will condition and influence our external relations and what others think of us.

I now come to the question with which not only Members of Parliament but the entire country seems to be deeply concerned. Almost everybody who spoke has spoken of the non-proliferation treaty. I myself . . .

SHRI RANJIT SINGH: Don't sign it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: . . . made a statement on that subject in this House on the 14th March. That statement stands. I should like to assure the House that we shall be guided entirely by our enlightened self-interest and the considerations of national security and, of course, adherence to our values, as Shri D. C. Sharma has pointed out.

We have already made it clear that the draft treaty in its present form does not fully conform to the principles enunciated in the General Assembly Resolution No. 2028 of the 20th session.

Mankind today is at the crossroads of nuclear peace and nuclear war. There can be no doubt that we should take the road to nuclear peace. But the first step in this direction is not yet in sight. It is vitally important, therefore, for the nuclear weapons powers to undertake as soon as possible meaningful negotiations on a series of measures leading to nuclear disarmament. The present draft treaty acknowledges the need for such negotiations, but unfortunately, the non-participation by some nuclear weapon powers will make it only partially effective, and what is more, the other nuclear weapon powers insist on their right to continue to manufacture more nuclear weapons. This is a situation which cannot be viewed with equanimity by non-nuclear countries, especially as they are called upon to undertake not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons for their own defence.

At the same time, we have stated that the Government of India do not propose to manufacture nuclear weapons. This is a decision taken many years ago and is unrelated to the

treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We shall continue our efforts for nuclear disarmament because it is only through nuclear disarmament that discrimination would be eliminated and equality between nations re-established.

The draft treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will now be discussed by the resumed session of the General Assembly towards the end of April this year. Several amendments have already been proposed by some non-nuclear countries and there may be more to come. These amendments will receive our careful consideration, and we shall continue to impress upon the nuclear powers the need for a balanced and non-discriminatory treaty.

The issue before us is essentially a political one. And it also has serious implications as regards security matters. The treaty and all its implications are under continuous study and the Government will give careful thought to the views of Members as expressed in this House.

All parties, with the exception of the hon. Member Shri M. R. Masani, have generally supported the stand taken by the Government of India in not signing the treaty in its present form. Government are fully aware of the serious issues involved. I would again assure the House that in any decision taken, the best interests of the country and of world peace will guide and inform our deliberations.

At the same time, I should also like to warn the House and the country that not signing the treaty may bring the nation many difficulties. It may mean the stoppage of aid and the stoppage of help. But we are . . .

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: Freedom was won with sacrifices.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: That was just what I was going to

say. Since we are taking this decision together, we must all be together in facing its consequences. I personally think that although it may involve sacrifice and hardship, it will be the first step towards building the real strength of this country and we shall be able to go ahead on the road to self-sufficiency.

The hon. Member Shri V. Krishna-moorthi's speech showed a recognition that foreign policy concerns and touches our national interests and should not, therefore, be viewed in terms of party politics. I earnestly hope that this trend will gain wider acceptance and will govern our attitude towards our foreign policy.

I would now commend for the acceptance of the House the Demands for Grants placed before them and express the hope that the various cut motions would not be pressed.

16 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the cut motions to vote.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): We would like cut motion No. 78 to be put to vote separately.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. I shall now put cut motions Nos. 42 to 45 and 62 to 77 to the vote of the House.

The Cut motions Nos. 42 to 45 and 62 to 77 were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

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

[Failure of the Government to play an effective role in developing regional security arrangements for the defence of South and South-East Asia from Chinese Communist expansionism in collaboration with the countries of South-East Asia, Japan and Australasia, the need for which has become more urgent in

[Mr. Speaker]

view of recent developments.
(78)].

Let the Lobby be cleared.

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 14]

AYES

[16.03 hrs.

Amin, Shri R. K.
Dandehes, Shri N.
Deo, Shri P. K.
Desai, Shri C. C.
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Girraj Saran Singh, Shri
Khan, Shri H. Ajmal
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali
Koushik, Shri K. M.
Majhi, Shri Mahendra

Mody, Shri Piloo
Naik, Shri G. C.
Naik, Shri R. V.
Ranga, Shri
Sequeira, Shri Erasmode
Solanki, Shri P. N.
Somani, Shri N. K.
Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
Xavier, Shri S.

NOES

Abraham, Shri K. M.
Adichan, Shri P. C.
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu
Ram
Aga, Shri Ahmad
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Anirudhan, Shri K.
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Baswant, Shri
Bhagaban Das, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhandare, Shri R. D.
Bhargava, Shri B. N.
Bhattacharyya, Shri
C. K.
Chakrapani, Shri C. K.
Chanda, Shrimati
Jyotsna
Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj
Singh
Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
Dalbir Shingh, Shri
Dass, Shri C.
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Dhillon, Shri G. S.
Dixit, Shri G. C.
Ering, Shri D.
Esthose, Shri P. P.
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Ghosh, Shri Parimal

Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Laxhan Lal
Hari Krishna, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
Jadhav, Shri V. N.
Jaggaiah, Shri K.
Jaipal Singh, Shri
Jamir, Shri S. C.
Kalita, Shri Dhireswar
Kamala Kumari, Kumari
Karan Singh, Dr.
Kasture, Shri A. S.
Kavade, Shri B. R.
Khadiikar, Shri
Khan, Shri Latafat Ali
Khan, Shri M.A.
Khanna, Shri P. K.
Kinder Lal, Shri
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Kripalani, Shrimati
Sucheta
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Lakshmikanthamma,
Shrimati
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Lutfal Haque, Shri
Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Mahajan, Shri Vikram
Chand
Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Malimariyappa, Shri

- Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Marandi, Shri
 Meghachandra, Shri M.
 Mehta, Shri Asoka
 Menon, Shri Vishwanatha
 Minimata Agam Dass
 Guru, Shrimati
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mohsin, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Nagnoor, Shri M. N.
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwanath
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Rajasekharan, Shri
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshankar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jaganath
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Reddy, Shri Ganga
 Reddy, Shri Surendar
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saigal, Shri A. S.
 Sambasivam, Shri
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Sen, Shri Dwajpayan
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethi Shri P. C.
 Sethuramae, Shri N.
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Shri M. R.
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Shinde, Shri Annasahib
 Shiv Chandika Prasad Shri
 Shukla, Shri S. N.
 Sidayya, Shri
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Sinha, Shri Mudrika
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Suryanarayana, Shri K
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Ulkey, Shri M. G.
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Yadav, Shri Chandra
 Jeet

MR. SPEAKER: The result* of the Division is: Ayes 19; Noes 140.

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put the demand to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1969, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 13 and 14 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

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

Demand No. 13—External Affairs

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,94,31,000 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, 1969 in respect of 'External Affairs'.

Demand No 14—Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16, 71, 13,000 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, 1969 in respect

*The following Members also recorded their votes:—
AYES:—Shri K. P. Singh Dev
NOES:—Shri Surendra Palsingh, Prakash Puri,

of Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs.'

MR. SPEAKER: We will take up the non-official business now.

16.5 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Devgun.

16.05½ hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT

श्री हरदयाल देवगुण (पूर्व दिरली) : मैं निम्नलिखित प्रस्ताव करता हूँ : "कि यह सभा गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के विधेयकों तथा संकल्पों सम्बन्धी समिति के 26 वें प्रतिवेदन से, जो 3 अप्रैल, 1968 को सभा में पेश किया गया था, सहमत है।"

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd April, 1968."

The motion was adopted.

16.06 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: QUITTING THE COMMONWEALTH—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We will now take up further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri George Fernandes about quitting the Commonwealth. Only 17 minutes are left.

rded their votes:—
 Shri Manikya Bhadur and Dr. Surya