

सदस्य भी अपनी जिम्मेदारी निभा सकते हैं और जब उन की प्रत्यक्ष रूप में गवाही हुई, जब वह समिति के सामने पेश हुए और समिति के प्रति योग्य सदस्यों ने बार बार उन से प्रश्न पूछे तो उस समय भी उन्होंने किसी प्रकार की अपनी गलती को स्वीकार नहीं किया बल्कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि मैंने इस सदन के किसी भी विशेष अधिकार को भंग नहीं किया है। हालांकि बार बार हमारे माननीय सदस्य उन के ध्यान में यह चीज लाये कि चाहे आप का इरादा नहीं होगा, आप की नीयत नहीं होगी, लेकिन इस लेख को पढ़ कर हर एक व्यक्ति इस नतीजे पर पहुंचेगा कि जो इस सदन के सदस्य हैं वह गैर-जिम्मेदारी से व्यवहार करते हैं, तो भी उन्होंने अपनी इस गलती की क्षमा याचना नहीं की। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सदन ने बहुत बड़ा बड़प्पन का सबूत दिया है कि इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंच कर कि सम्पादक महोदय ने विषाधिकारों की अवहेलना की है, विषाधिकारों को भंग किया है, उस के बावजूद भी उन को किसी प्रकार का दंड नहीं दिया। मैं यही इस समिति का बड़प्पन समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस को नजर-अन्दाज किया है। लेकिन आज इस विवाद के द्वारा मैं यह बात इस सदन के स्वरूप रखना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस देश ने लोकतंत्र की पद्धति को अपनाया है और जब इस लोक तंत्र में सम्मानित सदस्य भारत की सारी जनता के वयस्क मतों से चुन कर आते हैं तो उन के संबंध में अपने लेख द्वारा, अपने कुछ हितों की रक्षा के लिए या उस के जो अखबार के मालिक हैं केवल उनके हितों का विचार कर के सारे सदन के ऊपर जिस प्रकार कीचड़ उछाला गया है मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत अनुचित बात है और इस से सदन की गरिमा को भी बड़ा भारी धक्का लगा है। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि यह जो आवेदन है इस को यह सदन स्वीकार करे।

MR. SPEAKER : Before anything is done, I wish to say that according to the rules, the hon. Member is entitled

to move a motion. Now that the Committee has gone into it and made some recommendations, we may proceed with the next step without any further speeches. Mr. Goel has made a long speech and that is enough for the day. Mr. Khadilkar's motion is also coming.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : Sir, is the Committee of Privileges superior to this House ?

MR. SPEAKER : It is a creature of this House. How can it be superior ? I am not here to answer which is bigger or which is more powerful. This House is supreme.

The question is :

"That the Fourth Report of the Committee of Privileges presented to the House on the 12th December, 1967, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted

MR. SPEAKER : Now Shri Khadilkar.

SHRI KHADILKAR (Khed) : Sir, I move :

"That this House agrees with the Fourth Report of the Committee of Privileges presented to the House on the 12th December, 1967."

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Fourth Report of the Committee of Privileges presented to the House on the 12th December, 1967."

The motion was adopted.

12.11 HOURS

MOTION RE : INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : The House will resume further discussion on the motion regarding the international situation. 2 hours remain. The PSP has not participated in the debate.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिबेट का जवाब कौन देगा— न यहां पर प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं और न डिप्टी प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं।

MR. SPEAKER : The Prime Minister is not, going to give the final reply.

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) : When is the Minister going to reply, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER : Today we are having lunch hour. The Minister will reply at 2.30. Now, Shri Nath Pai.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know if this debate was just an academic exercise or a serious effort on the part of Government. As I listened to the Prime Minister yesterday, I had an uneasy feeling that I was reading that annual document which the External Affairs Ministry presents to this House called the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs. I felt that the same dosage of unadulterated drabness was once again being distributed to the House. The debate began with a whimper and it ended yesterday at least almost with a shriek.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to one serious aspect—the absence of the Prime Minister. The technical aspect of it has been dealt with by Mr. Masani yesterday and you have tried to mollify the feelings of the House. But there is a serious aspect as to who replies on behalf of Government. The House has allowed this change in the Ministry of External Affairs to go unnoticed. Neither Parliament nor the Press nor the country has taken cognizance of the fact that there has been a change in the Ministry of External Affairs. Originally we thought that the change of portfolio was a temporary one and other permanent arrangements would be made. Now we have this change which has been made very imperceptibly, but nonetheless it is a major change. It seems the Prime Minister is going to hold the portfolio. Who holds the portfolio of which department is absolutely the concern of the party in power, but so far as the absence of the Prime Minister today is concerned, I appreciate she has gone on a legitimate duty. But I would like to know, is the office of the External Affairs Ministry such a minor one that it can be attended to when one has

the leisure? I think the formulation of foreign policy, the assessment of the reaction of other countries to that policy and the adjustments necessary in the light of the dynamics of the international situation is a continuous process. It is not a process which can be attended to in a half-hearted manner. The External Affairs portfolio should not be made a part-time job. The Prime Minister has to look after the Centre-State relations. She has to look after the Atomic Energy Department; she has to look after Planning, not to mention the necessity of looking after the affairs of the Congress Party and the necessity of settling scores with Mr. Kamaraj or disciplining Mr. Patil. With all these worries and anxieties and pre-occupations of the Prime Minister, I would like to ask, is it fair to the portfolio, is it fair to Parliament and is it fair to the Prime Minister herself that she should be saddled with this responsibility. I have regard for the Prime Minister's undoubted talents and unchallenged charm. But even granting this, one has to raise this legitimate question, whether foreign affairs is such a minor thing that it can be relegated to a part-time job. I would like Government to clarify its position on this issue.

One gets an impression that Government regards external affairs mainly as a kind of a large-sized hospitality centre and travelling agency. The External Affairs Ministry today is becoming nothing more than a well established and fairly run hospitality centre-cum-travel agency looking after the arrangements of State dignitaries who come as the guests of India and, ultimately, it seems that for the conduct of foreign affairs the main pillars and props of India are not the experts in foreign affairs but, credit will have to be given by this country to them, the pilots of international airlines, who bring the distinguished guests, and the cooks and servants of the Rashtrapati Bhawan, because that is what foreign affairs is coming to.

When we have a look—I will not have the time to go into it in details—when we have a close look at the personnel who manage, I am reminded of

modern painting. I am sure, Sir, sometimes, when you find time, you too go and visit some of the modern exhibitions of modern paintings. Why do I say I am reminded of modern painting. When I look at the arrays and hordes of ambassadors, envoys, Joint Secretaries, Secretaries, Special Secretaries and Secretary General, as the modern painting is often rather bewildering to a common man so is the Ministry to me. It is a massive block. If you look at a modern painting. . . .

SHRI M. A. KHAN (Kasganj) : We have no Secretary General.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am taking a survey of the Ministry. Once you are quite right. I was talking of the Ministry, how it functions. If you do not have one today, tomorrow you may have. It depends upon who is the next aspirant. These are not permanent things. If the aspirant is sufficient important he can change the administrative rule and say that there should be a post of Secretary General created. If he is just, I do not say normal or ordinary man, a man more concerned with his duty and not designation, then of course we do not have it. I would like to point out why I am reminded of a modern painting. There is a massive centre block of dull grey drabness with occasional patches of bright features. In the same way, where the massive block is of mediocrity, grey and yellow, there are some bright people too in the Ministry.

How are ministerial appointments made, ambassadorial appointments made. I would not go into the details of that today. Since a reference was made and the Prime Minister has thrown a challenge asking us to give specific examples and then she will look into them, I know of two cases. You will be amazed to know that in one case the Ambassador decided, to accept a particular post, not because he was specially qualified to go and represent India in that country, not because he was familiar with the history and tradition of that country, but because his wife found the reception room in the ambassadorial, residence suitable for

holding receptions. After having a look at it they said : "we shall go as ambassadors to this country".

AN HON. MEMBER : Who was it ?

SHRI NATH PAI : *Hum Nahi kahenge.* I never mention names, but normally this House knows that this fact must be correct. In another case a certain ambassador went and had a look at five countries. Then he decided after talking to his wife. He said : "This seems to be the most spacious house." "Yes, darling let us stay here." He became the ambassador there. This is how it is normally happening. I am reproducing verbatim conversations. It is not the dedication of a man to his job, it is not the qualifications of a man for the job, it is not the missionary zeal of a man that enables him to be posted to these jobs. It is the policy of 'I scratch your back, you scratch my back' that is followed. This is the case in the higher echelons of the Ministry of External Affairs. When I say this, I am aware that there are some men dedicated, passionately dedicated, sincerely dedicated, to the pursuits of such a foreign policy as there is. And now I may say that there is not much of a foreign policy left today. Because, the government has persuaded itself that the drafting of some communiques, making some visits to some countries and receiving some guests, that is the sum total of a foreign policy. I must point out that the going on State visits, being well received, and then coming and receiving in return the Heads of other countries cannot make for the absence of a realistic, dynamic foreign policy which this country is entitled to.

We often flatter ourselves because of the courtesies that are shown to our guests and think we are making success. I will recall to this House a reference to the State visit made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when President Kennedy was still alive. Professor Schlesinger, in his monumental work on President Kennedy, points out—I would like people not to misunderstand, because Professor Schlesinger is a brilliant scholar of history and is a relentless critic of his own government too

[Shri Nath Pai]

as those who are familiar with his writings and his recent contributions to the *New York Times* must be aware of—referring to the Prime Minister's visit to the United States, that it was proclaimed as a triumph for diplomacy and statesmanship; the Indian radio and the press told the people, and the Parliament was persuaded into believing that it was an unadulterated triumph of Indian statesmanship and Indian diplomacy, this visit of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru; and what was the impression of the President at the receiving end? This was the most disastrous visit of all the State visits. The President had expected a lot from the Prime Minister of India. He was more or less a father figure for him. But, when the visit came, it was nothing but bitter disillusionment and disappointment. This is what happens very often, because when we make State visit we persuade ourselves into believing that we are succeeding in winning friends, we are succeeding in influencing countries in our direction. The reason is very simple. An essential modicum, an irreducible modicum of India's national interest in terms of security, in terms of our sphere of influence and in terms of our economic interest has never been defined by this government, and that is why we find ourselves content by making some communique. A smart stenographer can draft these communications. Cordial exchanges took place, mutual exchanges in very cordial and frank atmosphere, friendly exchanges—all these inanities are repeated in every communique. Every time a spokesman of India signs such a communique, he persuades himself into believing that he has signed a new page, written a new page in the history of India and mankind. Now, these platitudes and inanities, even if we produce them in mountains, they do not make one single line in the history of man. But, somehow or other, the Government of India and its draftsmen persuade themselves into believing that it does.

Now, having said something generally, I will try to draw the attention of the House to three specific issues before I

sit down. Of course, there is so much one can cover in a subject like this but I have no time. Our relations with the two super-powers leave much to be desired. The Government never tries of telling us that everything is all right. I think the relations with both the United States and the Soviet Union, whatever the appearance, leave much to be desired. In the case of one country the relations have reached the stage of cold stare and, in the case of the other country, the relations smack of suspicion of one another. Is this a very satisfactory state of affairs? If not, what shall we do? The reason why it is reduced to this state of affairs is very simple. There is never any frank dialogue with the United States. There is never any cordial dialogue with the USSR. We go, we are contented with the courtesies, inanities, platitudes and mutual compliments and we think we have done the job.

It is imperative, it is absolutely essential, it is necessary that when the statesmen and leaders of India go to the United States, and other countries they sit down with the leaders of those countries and in a candid manner define the areas of agreement, the areas where there is disagreement and limit the areas where there is likely to be conflict. I do not think that ever has a spokesman of India bothered to go into those essential aspects, the essential concomitants of a worthwhile foreign policy.

Therefore we find that we go like a pendulum from one end to the other end, either coldness or hostilities with the United States. I do think, there is an imperative necessity for going into a dialogue but the Government of India think that all that needs to be done has been done if we go and get some wheat, some aid, some assistance.

The same is true with the USSR. We think, if we get some equipment, particularly in terms of some arms which we badly need, all is all right with the USSR and Indian relations.

Sir, yesterday a reference was made in this House to the broadcasts from Radio Peace and Progress. I have kept silent though these broadcasts have been

going on for very long, nor do I want to go into details about it. But it is a very significant development if we know how the Soviet leaders try to make a projection of what they feel, not always in a direct manner but in an indirect manner. If one reads the monitored reports of what Radio Peace and Progress stands for, one begins to wonder if all is all right between New Delhi and Moscow, between South Block and the Kremlin.

I for one feel that it is far from being all right. The Soviet Union is beginning to equate Pakistan and India. Are we aware of this? Even the May Day slogans this year in the Moscow Parade and the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Revolution were: Long Live Friendship with India, Long Live Friendship with Pakistan. *Prima facie* what is wrong, you will ask. Very true. I do not want other nations, with whom we are not friendly, also to be unfriendly. That is not my demand. But the important point remains that the Soviet Union is showing a gradual tendency to equate India and Pakistan. Have the Government of India sat with the leaders of the Soviet Union and told them, "You are free as a sovereign nation to make friends with others but so far as Pakistan is concerned there is some irreducible minimum of India's interest."?

And, what is this? That is Kashmir, the delimitation of the borders and security of the border in the eastern region. Have we ever taken any guarantee like that? I wonder if we have ever dared to mention it to the leaders of the Soviet Union. If they draw conclusions and if they are sure that whatever they do, India will be okaying it after a minor perfunctory protest, will we be justified in blaming them?

Neither with the Soviet Union nor with the USA is there a meaningful dialogue on the basis of equality. Ultimately, foreign policy means mutuality and reciprocity of obligations. I do not think, we have tried to provide this basis.

In this regard I do not know why unfortunate souls seek this country for their asylum. Perhaps, they are tempted by the tradition of India's hospitality. They remember the hospitality of India but perhaps they are not familiar with the timidity of the present Government of India. I have in mind the young man who is wanting to seek refuge here. Since the matter, I am told, is being delicately handled, I do not want to prejudice it, but one thing this country will demand. If he may like to go to his country, he must not be prevented; if he likes to go back to his motherland, he should be free. If he wants to stay here, it must be made available to him. If he wants to go somewhere else, obstacles must not be put in his way under the garb of somebody being offended. We must not allow ourselves to disown our obligation of hospitality.

I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not here and, therefore, some of the things I wanted to say, I will be restrained and inhibited in saying because when I want to make criticism I like to make it in the face of the person concerned and she is not here today.

Apart from the necessity of putting our relations with the Soviet Union and the USA on a firm basis of mutual trust and friendship lifting it from the basis of our dependence, I would make a plea. Every time the Government comes and tells us that we get aid. There is a sycophantic undertone in the statement of the Government of India that we need some aid. I am one to acknowledge it readily from those countries who give it, but that should not make me subservient and appear as if I alone need friendship. I need it, but India has much to give too. When we take aid let us not be defiant, I agree, but let us not appear to be subservient as if we are the only people who need friendship. Friendship is a thing which we need; we need the friendship of these two countries but these countries too need the friendship of India and those countries who want the friendship of India will get it only on the basis of reciprocity.

[Shri Nath Pai]

I will now emphasize very briefly the necessity of giving more attention and taking more interest in South East Asia. Often, for the Government of India there is only West Asia. I do not know how a map is made only with the west without the east. Sometimes to the complete neglect of the east we are preoccupied with the west. I think, I have said about the west once and I do not want to repeat it, but I want to ask: Is our interest in South East Asia of such a marginal nature that spasmodically the Government of India will be taking interest and then again lapsing into its traditional indifference towards the countries of South East Asia?

Last year, Mr. Chagla made a good beginning, after he was goaded by the House, made a tour of the South-East Asian countries and he achieved limited but certain results. I do not know why he was eased out. I have no time to discuss that. But there is a mystery surrounding his going out. All kinds of explanations are made and given. The fact remains that Mr. Chagla who brought much sophistication and a little of culture to his task lost his job and, I think, he had self respect that, before he was thrown out, he resigned. But there is a mystery surrounding his going out, not familiar in a democracy. Somebody should try to remove it. Was it the cause that he disagreed on the language policy of the Government or were there some other causes? You, Sir, and I are entitled to know it.

Then, there is the question of South East Asia. These countries matter to us vitally. I am not going to propound a theory that there is a vacuum. But there is one thing that I would like the learned scholars of the External Affairs Ministry to do and that is to read what Prof. Marguntha has written in a recent article in the *Foreign Affairs Journal* of the United States:

"Any country which is powerful and strong, invariably, tends to interfere in the affairs of other countries."

Let us not go on persuading the world—the world will not believe it—that we

are so pious and good. Sometimes, non-interference is a reflection of political impotence. Here, I come to the basic problem. Our foreign policy is losing its credibility because of general instability in this country and almost our harrowing on the verge of economic instability. There is political instability and there is economic instability in this country. The world is becoming to be wondering. Where is India going?

The other day, I was distressed when Mr. Y. B. Chavan made an admission that money came to this country, not from one side, from both sides. Was that a matter to be told to the House with so much aplomb? What does it mean, that the people are beginning to interfere in the affairs of this country without fear of being challenged, without fear of being punished? The Home Minister ought to have said that we take a very grave view of it. There is non-alignment? Not only one side is trying to influence the electorate in this country but both sides are trying to influence the electorate in this country. So, what is there to be worried about? Both sides are trying to interfere and giving money. That was the reply given by the hon. Home Minister. It is alarming. That means, firstly, nobody is taking this country seriously and, secondly, an ominous inference is being drawn by super powers that India is beginning to crack. One side is trying to help one group and the other side is trying to help the other group. But the sinister meaning you should not escape and the leaders of the Government should not say, "It is all right. Both sides are involved in this. There is nothing to bother about." I think, there is a must to be worried about, there is a must to be concerned about. I would like to know: Would the United States be happy if it was established that Indian money was being poured into that country either to Rockefeller or Regan? What would be the reaction of the United States? (*Interruption*). I know it is impossible to do that. Would the Soviet Union be enthusiastic if it was known that we were trying to influence their elections to the Supreme Soviet? (*Interruption*). But according

to the Constitution, there are elections there. I do not want to comment on the internal affairs of other countries. The Soviet people are free to decide the form of Government they want just as I am free to decide the form of Government I want. I would like to know what would have been the reaction of these two super powers. I tell you, it would have led to a major crisis in our relations. Here is a Government which does not bother and worry about it.

I would like to point out two dangerous symptoms about this. India's sovereignty is, gradually, diminishing and already there is an indication of that. I am glad that with agony in your face, Sir, you are agreeing with me. This is the feeling of every patriot.

MR. SPEAKER : He may conclude now.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am concluding.

Sir, let us ponder over seriously. I am not happy in just castigating the Government. Let us try to evolve a policy worthy of the country. That is my final submission.

This is the non-proliferation treaty. I would once again warn the Government of being pressurised into signing this treaty, the draft treaty which we first saw in this House and Mr. Chagla denied it. I had submitted to the House that the treaty is a joint product of both Moscow and Washington and we should oppose it, not because it is a joint product but because it is patently discriminatory against this country and against other under-developed and developing countries. What an irony of fate! I have before me the famous speech of Mr. Gromyko of 14th February, 1947. You should know Mr. Gromyko was taking a stand which I am taking today for my country. When the Baruch Plan was presented to the United Nations by the Spokesman of the United States, the Plan was nothing different from the Joint Treaty now presented to India. The Baruch Plan and the so-called Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty are identical in their essence, though the terms, words, syn-

tax and grammar change here and there because the terminology changes. But the essence is the same. What happened? The Soviet Union, which was opposing tooth and nail the Baruch Plan, wants India to accept it because there is a major difference. I will tell you this. Logic tells us that any idea may be reduced to an absurdity, Mr. Gromyko says. This applies even to good thoughts and ideas. I want to tell the leaders of the Soviet Union that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is a good treaty, a good idea, but the way in which they are presenting it and are trying to twist the arm of India is not a good thing. If they succeed perhaps in twisting the arm of the Government because it is very susceptible to arm-twisting, the people will not allow their arms to be twisted. This is the warning that we want to give to the Government.

There is one redeeming feature. The stand which the hon. Defence Minister took in his speech made in the United Nations was a proper stand and he deserves credit and congratulations for that. There was also a speech made by India's representative at the U.N. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Conference in Geneva. Both are before me. I want them to stick and adhere to this policy. I want to quote one sentence from Mr. Gromyko. Let not those who are fighting today say, Russia wants it, America wants it. Russia did not want to sign it when it was against Russian interests. Why should India be compelled to sign? Because this Treaty is not just a Disarmament Treaty. This is not concerned with arms. A genuine *bona fide* effort to put an end to nuclear non-proliferation should be welcomed by us. There is going to be proliferation on the part of nuclear powers. But those who are unarmed are to be condemned to remain unarmed. Those countries which have nuclear arms are to develop them, produce them and go on amassing them, but those who do not have them, in the name of mankind, are to be condemned to this second-class citizenship in the world. India should refuse to be a vassal, to be a satellite. This is a new type of imperialism, the nuclear im-

[Shri Nath Pai]

perialism, in which the two partners are the Soviet Union and the United States, and this country will have to resist it. I trust such a valiant policy, such a worthwhile policy, such a realistic policy is the policy which, for long, this country has been demanding. We want to know when we could look forward to the dawn of such a policy.

श्री न० कु० सांघी (जोधपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी विदेश नीति के बारे में यहाँ यह कहा गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान की कोई नीति ही नहीं है। वह किसी भी नीति पर चल नहीं रहा है। फिर चाहे वह अमरीका के प्रति हो या रूस के प्रति हो। लेकिन मैं दो देशों की बात न करके अपने पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ और खासकर ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट जो हमने उसके साथ किया है, उसके बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट करके हिन्दुस्तान ने यह आशा की थी कि इन दोनों देश के बीच शान्ति स्थापित होगी और पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ दोस्ती का हाथ आगे बढ़ायेगा। लेकिन वार्ता के बाद हमने देखा कि पाकिस्तान ने अभी तक अपने नापाक इरादे छोड़े नहीं हैं और अपने इरादों को वह तेजी के साथ और मजबूती के साथ आगे बढ़ाता जा रहा है। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट के पीछे हमारा एक खास मकसद यह था कि दोनों के सम्बन्ध सामान्य होंगे और दोनों दोस्ती के साथ, शान्ति के साथ रहेंगे। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो सका है।

मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट में हमने यह व्यवस्था की थी कि असम के जो नदी के रास्ते हैं, जो समुद्री रास्ते हैं वे एग्रीमेंट के बाद बातचीत द्वारा खुल सकेंगे और उन रास्तों से हमारे जहाज सामान तथा मुसाफिर आदि ले जा सकेंगे। लेकिन अभी तक ऐसा नहीं हो सका है। हमारे पास जो उनके जहाज थे उनको तो हमने वापिस कर दिया लेकिन हमारे जहाजों को उसने अभी तक वापिस नहीं किया है। हमारे जहाज अभी तक भी असम में गोहाटी]

में पड़े हुए हैं। आज तक हम उनको समुद्र में नहीं ले जा सके हैं। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट के बाद भी हम उनको नहीं ले जा सके हैं। ये हालात हिन्दुस्तान में आज भी बने हुये हैं। मैं आपका ध्यान राजस्थान की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। ताशकंद एग्रीमेंट के बाद जहाँ पाकिस्तान का एट्रिग ब्रिगेड हैदराबाद सिंध में रखा हुआ था, वहाँ आज एक पूरा डिविजन है और राजस्थान बार्डर से चालीस मील दूर छोर में उस का डिविजनल हेड क्वार्टर बन गया है। यही नहीं वहाँ पर करीब एक दर्जन से ज्यादा हेलीपेड बनाए गए हैं और बहुत सी सड़कों का भी निर्माण किया गया है।

MR. SPEAKER : I want to remind you, Mr. Sanghi, this is a Foreign Affairs debate, it is not a debate on Defence.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI : Sir, I was trying to draw your attention to the fact that Pakistan after signing the Tashkent Agreement has not honoured it, and this raises a fundamental issue. The Tashkent Agreement which we signed with hope of peace and progress has not been beneficial as far as India is concerned. The Tashkent Agreement has created terror and hostility right on our borders from one end to the other. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that where there was previously only one Brigade at Hyderabad (Sind), Pakistan has now one full division at Chor. A dozen helipads have been constructed right on the borders of Rajasthan. They have created trenchways and roads. Sir, these roads, one can understand, have not been laid to make courtesy calls on India. In these conditions, it becomes necessary for us to give another thinking about Tashkent Agreement whether India is giving a proper dimension to the agreement that we have signed with Pakistan.

I would then draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Indus Rangers and Mujahids have been openly violating our borders. They have been uplifting our men and a number of cases have been reported and they have been accepted by the authorities also.

During the last six months more than a dozen such cases have happened and the Government has failed to recover these people. These people are still in Pakistan and their whereabouts are not known. Sir, our Government have not taken effective measures in bringing them back to our country.

Sir, these are grave conditions to which we have to give thought before we give effect to the Tashkent Declaration. It has been recently reported that Pakistan has built up a wall north of Khem Karan. All these activities of Pakistan naturally create a doubt in our mind whether our policy in regard to Tashkent Declaration has been beneficial to this country.

I would like to draw your attention to another area where we have good relations. With Burma, Ceylon and Nepal which are the other countries bordering India we have very good relations. We have very good relations with Afghanistan. Afghanistan has suffered at the hands of Pakistan. Recently Pakistan has been wooing Russia and has been having many trade agreements. For the first time you will see that mercantile goods have been allowed to go to Pakistan through Afghanistan. Sir, I think we will have to give another look at our relationship of forging stronger friendship with countries like Afghanistan.

Sir, there are other countries in West Asia like Kuwait. We have very good relations with them. We are having an export of about Rs. 100 crores and we have major petroleum deals with them. It is high time that we give more attention to these small countries. I would particularly suggest to the hon. Minister to appoint a High Commissioner in Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw your attention that India was chosen as the Chairman of the International Control Commission by the unanimous decision of all the major powers that got together in Geneva. But, after this escalation of war that has been going on in Viet Nam. I think it is very proper for us to give another thought whether there is any

purpose left for India to continue as the Chairman of the Control Commission. If we had not been able to help in stopping this war, if we had not been able to help in bringing peace, I think it is high time that we leave the chairmanship and let South Vietnam and North Vietnam and the powers themselves decide the matter between themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to West Asian crisis between Israel and the Arab countries. One thing has become very clear. The war between Israel and the West Asian States has been a holy war when we remember the fact that all the Arab countries, whether they belong to the left or right, whether they have joined the Eastern or Western Bloc, have united together in waging this war against Israel. India had taken active part in bringing peace in this region but failed in taking active lead in Vietnam and we should have taken more interest in bringing peace between North and South Vietnam.

Our foreign policy has been very much criticised and it has been said that the foreign policy of India is no foreign policy. I would like to draw the attention of the House to this fact that our foreign policy has now been tested amply. Even an important power like France has advocated our foreign policy. As you would recall, recently, France has removed herself from the NATO power bloc and further she has asked for the removal of the NATO headquarters from France. Recently, President De Gaulle has clearly advocated that he would not like to be aligned with the eastern or the western block but would advocate a policy of non-alignment, and non-interference, and whatever causes we are taking up, which is rightly done. From this also you will see that the policy which the Government has advocated all these years, namely, non-alignment and non-interference, peace with other countries and propagation of peace in the world has been advocated by an important power like France also.

One important question which arises and on which I would like to say some-

[Shri N. K. Sanghi]

thing is in regard to our relations with Kashmir. Kashmir is an integral part of our country, economically, legally and constitutionally it is an integral and indivisible part of India. Therefore, there does not arise any question of arbitration, mediation or plebiscite etc., as far as this question is concerned. But one thing that gives rise to some thinking in the minds of people is the special status that has been given to Kashmir. When we talk internationally, I would submit that this particular aspect has got to be looked into. We have to appreciate it ourselves that Kashmir is not yet on par with the other States of India in all respects. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : I would request Members not to come to the Chair. When a Member is speaking, I am expected to hear his speech and not have any discussions with other Members near the Chair.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI : Our accepted foreign policy has braved the challenge of the times. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that possibly the fault lies in our foreign services and in our diplomats who are working abroad. They have failed to understand the urges and thoughts and aspirations of the people. They have failed to carry the message of friendship and good-will and our desires and thoughts to the other countries. Here, I would like to refer to the news item of *The Statesman* of the 20th instant, in which it has been stated that more than a dozen diplomats are presently away from their countries of posting, such as for instance important countries like China, Pakistan, Russia. In U.K. the envoy who has been posted has not yet taken charge. These are circumstances which are very bad, Government should take care to prevent such things and to see that our diplomacy works properly. I would say in conclusion that if only we could bring our foreign service personnel back to India after a certain period posted

abroad, so that they could understand the bearings, the working of the country and the thoughts and urges and aspirations of our people and then send them back, it would help in creating a better climate abroad.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai has very aptly described the performance of our Prime Minister. All that I can add is that she indulged in generalities and did not answer the criticism that was made here whether by one group or by the other group. Rather, she said that the Opposition parties were divided. She failed to realise that the Opposition parties were completely united in condemning her foreign policy. However, divided they may have been among themselves, she forgot this fundamental unity that was there namely that both sides, the Communists as well as the non-Communists condemned her foreign policy.

I was once in a few countries in Europe, and every country that I visited told me that it was friendly to us. My reply was 'You must be friendly to us, because you are not our neighbours; it is only our neighbours about whom we have to think.'

Let us see how our policy, so far as our neighbours are concerned, has succeeded or failed. The tree is known by the fruit that it bears. First of all, I think that our foreign policy succeeded very eminently in bringing about the downfall of a buffer State of Tibet. Then, we went on fraternising with China, never knowing what its philosophy was and what it stood for. I do not want to repeat what has been already said several times. But our own former Rashtrapati Dr. Radhakrishnan was constrained to say when there was an invasion by China on our territory, that we had been negligent and credulous. The Prime Minister was talking of the division in the Opposition parties, but here was the Head of the State castigating the foreign policy and saying that we had been negligent and credulous, which means that we had been

gullible. Is that a successful foreign policy? There must have been something very wrong if the Head of the State had to castigate the Government's foreign policy. Even today, our representatives in China are ill-treated, and here we do nothing about it.

Foreign policy is concerned with mutuality. As regards internal policy, one may not do wrong because the other party has done some wrong. But in foreign policy there must be tit for tat; whatever they do unto us we should do unto them. For, in foreign politics it is not a question of non-violence and it is not a question of our being sadhus and sanyasis but it is a question of mutuality. Between China and India there is no mutuality and we do nothing about it.

It is a very old maxim of international politics that our enemy's enemy is our friend. There is Chiang Kai-shek's China; there is Formosa. We refuse to have anything to do with Formosa. Yesterday the Prime Minister said that we recognised Israel because it was in the UNO. Much more is Formosa in the UNO, and in fact, she is an original member. In spite of the enmity with Communist China we have nothing to do with Formosa. I cannot understand what this foreign policy is. The very elementary maxim of foreign policy has been forgotten.

Having said so much about China, let us come to our other neighbours. Take the case of Burma. We have peace with Burma and we are friendly with Burma. But what did Burma do? If packed off all our nationals who were established there for generations, without bag and baggage, and they drove them away. What did Ceylon do? Ceylon also did the same. It has obliged us to take people who have been established there for generations. It is just like the Americans telling the Irish people to go home, and the Irish Government accepting that and inviting them to return back. These things are not done. We do not know what our foreign policy is like. At least Jawaharlalji, when he was in charge of foreign

policy, went on postponing this question of Ceylon's demand; but one fine morning it was decided that we must get back all these people who for generations had been living there, who were the citizens of Ceylon. We consented to bring them back. I suppose we bring them back at our expense, and they must leave all that they have got there. This is not foreign policy. That is what I find hard to understand.

Then, we have the habit of being the peacemakers of the world. Yesterday, one Communist member, Mr. Ramamurti, was waxing eloquent. He is an orator, I cannot compete with him. Whatever happens in Vietnam, how are we concerned? Because we happen to be in some Commission, it does not mean that we are interested. Who are dying in Vietnam? Either the Vietnamese or the Americans. Do we love Americans more than the American authorities there? Do we love the Vietnamese more than the Vietnamese themselves? I can understand that you give an opinion once, that there should be a cease-fire and the *status quo* should be maintained, but not taking up cudgels on behalf of others. And when we take up cudgels, what do we do? We sing in one tune in America, in another tune in Russia and in a third tune here, because we have taken upon ourselves, a task which we cannot perform, which has nothing to do with us, with which we are not concerned. I do not say that the Americans are fighting in Vietnam the battle of democracy in South-east Asia or anything of that sort, but how do we come in this quarrel, I do not understand.

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (बाडमेर) : खिलाफत में क्यों घायले थे आप ?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : What is he talking? I think that the Congress people have lost their balance. Where is the question of khilafat here? The question of khilafat here does not arise, because then we were helping our own countrymen, we were helping our Muslim brothers here.

Then, take Israel. I simply suggested that we might have a resolution here,

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

that our friendship with the Arab countries is well known, especially with UAR, but we only want that the parties go back to their original position. That would have been a very reasonable attitude for us to take, but we go out of our way and say that such and such a body of persons or such and such a nation is the aggressor. Only three or four days back the UNO appointed a committee of some 50 people or so to define the aggression; but we took upon ourselves to say that the Israelis the aggressors. How were the Jews aggressive? Because, I suppose they blocked for themselves the Gulf of Aqaba? Because they asked the international force to retire from the position they held. All these things were done by the Arabs and UAR was massing troops on the borders. The Jews were a shrewd people; they understood what was coming. I do not know even who drew the sword first or who fired the first shot. But whoever might have fired, the previous things that took place before shooting must be taken into consideration.

13 Hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: We are adjourning for lunch; is he concluding?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: I am concluding. For us to go out of our way to say that Israel was the aggressor is beyond my power of comprehension. You were not there; we do not know. Hostile actions had taken place before the armed conflict began. Why should we take upon ourselves to give judgment in matters where we are not concerned? It is enough to say that the Arabs are our friends and we are friendly to them and that Israel must go to its original position. That was enough.

So, I say, Sir, that judged by results so far, where our interests are concerned, our foreign policy has failed.

One more thing, I would say. We are not concerned with Europe and America so much as with Asia. We must send there our best representatives, with their best wives if you would have it so. (*Interruption*) Mr. Nath Pai was saying that the ambassadors are sent because their wives want to go somewhere or

the other. I remember in this House our first Prime Minister had said that one has got to look to the wives of the ambassadors also because they are great assets. But since then wives have become even more important, because now we have the rule of women in India. You can select such ambassadors who have very attractive wives, very smart wives.

श्री रत्न राय (पुरी) : दादा, क्या वही मापदण्ड होना चाहिये ?

MR. SPEAKER: The time is up.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI: If the time it up, I shall conclude now. I would suggest to the External Affairs Ministry that their best ambassadors must go to south-east Asia, and to west Asia and they might as well forget Europe and America. We are not concerned with their politics; they are not concerned with our politics; this habit of ours, thinking that America is our friend, that Soviet Russia is our friend should go. About Soviet Russia, I do not want to repeat what Mr. Nath Pai has said. I entirely agree with him that we were hugging to our breasts the idea that Soviet Union is our greatest friend and that it will help us in Kashmir and other questions. But the Tashkent agreement, I believe, was concluded under coercion. And who signed that treaty, that undertaking? The man who had said here several times that whatever we have occupied in Kashmir is our own territory and it will not be given up. Pressure from Russia made our last Prime Minister signed that agreement. That agreement has done no good. If we had only looked to the past, we would have seen that so many agreements have been arrived at with Pakistan, but none of them have been observed by Pakistan. This agreement also is violated by Pakistan. Yet, we are crying day and night "Tashkent spirit". It is not the Tashkent spirit, but the Tashkent spirits which have affected the brains of those . . .

SHRI NATH PAI: Mr. Swaran Singh is a teetotaler.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I am glad he is a teetotalter, but there are many nowadays who are not teetotalters. Let them have liquor if they like, but not the Tashkent spirits.

13.06 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Prem Chand Verma—I would request hon. Members to confine their remarks to ten minutes so that I can accommodate more hon. Members.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वर्तमान अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति व उस के सम्बन्धों में जो प्रस्ताव माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने सदन के सामने रक्खा है मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

इससे पहले स्वतंत्र पार्टी, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, जनसंघ और कुछ निर्दलीय सदस्यों ने इस विषय पर भाषण दिये हैं। मुझ से पहले श्री मसानी ने जो कुछ कहा उस में सब से अधिक जिक्र उन्होंने रूस की नोवोस्टी, न्यूज एजेंसी का किया है। मैं नहीं समझता कि उन्होंने अपनी सारी जो तकरीर थी; सारा जो भाषण था उस में उन्होंने जोर दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि भारत सरकार की मिनिस्ट्री आफ इनफोरमेशन एंड ब्राड-कास्टिंग के एक अफसर जिनका कि नाम श्री भारद्वाज बतलाया उन्होंने उस में एक बड़ा भारी अपराध किया है और उन के साथ एक वह समझौता किया है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर ऐसी कोई बात अमरीका या रूस कहते तो मैं मान लेता कि यह उस के मन का सही नक्शा है।

लेकिन माननीय सदस्य इस हाउस के एक आदरणीय सदस्य एक पोलिटिकल पार्टी के लीडर अगर यह बात कहते हैं तो यह एक अच्छी बात नहीं है क्योंकि इस सिलसिले में इनफोरमेशन और ब्रोडकास्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री के हमारे मंत्री महोदय यह बात पूरी तौर पर कह चुके हैं कि उस में न तो किसी अधिकारी का कसूर है न सरकार ने किसी ऐसी बात से कोई समझौता किया है जिससे कोई पोलिटिकल बात उस में साबित हो तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि उनका यह जो आरोप है वह निराधार है। दूसरी ओर श्री नाथ पाई ने भ्रमी कहा कि हमारा जो विदेश मंत्रालय है उसका काम जो है वह राष्ट्रपति भवन के कुक और इंडियन ऐयरलाइंस के पायलेट करते हैं। माननीय सदस्य की मैं बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ लेकिन जहां उन्होंने यह भाषण दिया है उस भाषण से यह साफ जाहिर होता है कि वह निन्दा करना चाहते हैं सरकार की और केवल निन्दा के लिए वह निन्दा करना चाहते हैं। इस के अलावा उन के मन में उन की जो क्रिटिसिज्म है वह कंस्ट्रक्टिव नहीं है।

दूसरी ओर उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री का जो भाषण था वह नीरस था। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती कि उसमें रस कैसे भरा जाता है? विदेश कार्यालय मंत्री एक हैं या दो हैं। प्रधान मंत्री में जो भाषण दिया वह नीति के बारे में था। वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति के बारे में था। उसमें जो हालात वहां पर हैं वही तो उसमें कहे जा सकते हैं। उस में किसी ड्रामे या सिनेमा की बात तो कही नहीं जा सकती है। उस में रस नहीं भरा जा सकता है। उसी तरीके से मैं कहूंगा कि माननीय सदस्य में, उस भाषण को भी, उस पर क्रिटिसिज्म करने के लिए भी, जब उन को कोई शब्द नहीं मिला तो उन्होंने नीरस उस को कह दिया। मेरा ध्यान से इतना कहना है कि जो विरोधी सदस्य हैं वे एक ओर तो अमरीका और इंग्लैंड की बात करते हैं तो दूसरी ओर वह रूस व चीन की

[श्री प्रेमचन्द वर्मा]

बात करते हैं। इस के अलावा वह किसी भी दृष्टि से किसी भी तरीके से किसी भी ढंग से हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति को नहीं देखते हैं। उन का खयाल यही रहता है कि रूस और चीन के इंटरैस्ट को यहां पर कैसे सुरक्षित रखा जाय। दूसरे उन का खयाल यह रहता है कि अमरीका और इंग्लैंड के इंटरैस्ट को किस तरीके से यहां पर सुरक्षित रखा जाय? मैं जानना चाहता हूं सदस्यों से कि जब यहां पर बड़े बड़े मसले आते हैं, बड़ी बड़ी बातें आती हैं तो उन पर तो वह कोई ध्यान नहीं देते हैं कोई बहुत तत्व नहीं होता है उस समय उन की बातों में लेकिन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर विचार करने के लिए जिन सदस्यों ने और अन्य नेताओं ने जोर दिया कि यह सारा टाइम उस के लिए हो और अन्य तमाम कार्यों को पीछे करो तो उस के डिवेट में उन लोगों ने केवल नोवोस्टी का या अमरीका की कुछ बातों का जिक्र करने के अलावा और कोई ठोस सुझाव व विचार नहीं पेश किया है। एक ओर के माननीय सदस्य चाहते हैं कि इस ओर चीन की कठपुतली बन जाये और दूसरी ओर के कहते हैं कि अमरीका आदि पश्चिमी देशों की बन जाए। कुछ माननीय सदस्य जो यहां तक कहते हैं कि कुछ इलाका दे कर हम को चीन के साथ समझौता कर लेना चाहिये। वे यह भी कहते हैं कि रूस जैसे चाहता है हम काम करें और चीन के माओ और चाऊ के फोटो यहां लगा दिये जायें। यदि ऐसा किया जाय तभी हिन्दुस्तान की नीति सफल हों सकती है। कुछ माननीय सदस्य समझते हैं कि चीन को अपना रकबा दे कर, अपना इलाका दे कर देश का विभाजन करके चीन को खुश किया जाए और तब वे भी खुश होंगे और कहेंगे कि हमारी नीति ठीक है वर्ना नहीं है। जो माननीय सदस्य यह कहते हैं कि अमरीका और पश्चिमी देशों की यहां पर कालोनी बन जाए, उनकी यहां पर फेक्ट्रीज लग जाएं, बड़े बड़े कारखानें लग जायें और वे दौलत के जरिये से हमारी पोलिटिकल

पार्टीज के ऊपर असर रख कर सारे हिन्दुस्तान को फिर से एक नौ आवादी बना दें, तो यह कहां तक उचित है, इसको ध्याप सोच सकते हैं। यह जो दोनों का सोचने का तरीका है यह गलत तरीका है। जब भी कोई नीति तय की जाती है तो कुछ माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि यह अंधी पालिसी है, यह कानी पालिसी है यह लंगड़ी पालिसी है। जो माननीय सदस्य इस तरह की बातें कहते हैं मैं कहुंगा कि उनकी आंखों के शीशे पर रंग चढ़ा हुआ है। उनको चाहिये कि राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से वे पालिसीज जो हमारी हैं उन पर विचार करेंगे। जिन माननीय सदस्यों की आंख पर एक देश की तरफ का शीशा लगा हुआ है उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ का जो दूसरा शीशा है उसके ऊपर पानी फेर रखा है, इस वास्ते उन को एक ही तरफ से दिखाई देता है और दूसरी तरफ से दिखाई भी नहीं देता और वे देखना भी नहीं चाहते। वे चाहते यहीं हैं कि उनको रूस और चीन या फिर अमरीका और इंग्लैंड की बातें ही नजर आयें।

मैं समझता हूं कि किसी भी देश को अपनी विदेश नीति बनाते वक्त जहां अपने देश के हालात का ध्यान रखना पड़ता है वहां अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय हालात का भी ध्यान रखना पड़ता है। हिन्दुस्तान विकास के पथ पर आगे बढ़ रहा है। हमारे देश की सरहदों पर एक ओर चीन है तो दूसरी ओर पाकिस्तान है। एक लैफिटस्ट है और दूसरा राइटिस्ट। ये दोनों ही हमारे लिए एक समस्या हैं। हमारी विदेश नीति जो है इसको बनाते वक्त चीन और पाकिस्तान ये दो सब से बड़े फैक्टर हैं। इन का हमें ध्यान रखना पड़ता है। अगर हम अमरीका के साथ मिलते हैं, अगर उसकी गुटबन्दी में हम शामिल हो जाते हैं तो चीन जिस के साथ रूस भी है और सारे कम्युनिष्ट देश भी हैं वे सब के सब, यह सारा का सारा ब्लाक हमारे खिलाफ हो जाता है। फिर पाकिस्तान भी है। उसके साथ भी झगड़ा है। हम तो झगड़ा करना नहीं चाहते हैं लेकिन उसने झगड़ा पैदा कर रखा है। पाकि-

स्तान को अगर एक टुकड़ा भी हिन्दुस्तान का दिया जाता है तो हम में से कोई भी इसको बरदास्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। एक इंच इलाका भी अपने देश का हम पाकिस्तान को नहीं दे सकते हैं। जिन सरहदों पर हमारे फौजी जवानों ने अपनी जानें गंवाई, पैटन टैंकों को अपने शरीर के जरिये से रोका, गोली चलने नहीं दी, हमारे बहादुरों ने अपनी जान पर खेल कर सीमाओं की रक्षा की, बरकी पर कब्जा किया, उनके साथ हम धोखा नहीं कर सकते हैं। हम अपने इलाके को पाकिस्तान को दे कर समझौता करना नहीं चाहते हैं। हम पाकिस्तान के साथ न अमरीका के दबाव में आकर और न इंग्लैंड के दबाव में आ कर और न ही किसी और देश के दबाव में आ कर समझौता करने को तैयार हैं।

हमारी नीति साफ है। न हम लैफ्ट हैं और न राइट। जो इस सदन के अन्दर राइट या लैफ्ट का नारा लगाते हैं वे हमारे देश का भला चाहने वालें नहीं हैं। जो इस तरह का नारा लगाते हैं उनका केवल एक ही इंटरेस्ट है। वह यह है कि विदेशों से पैसा उनको मिले और वे हिन्दुस्तान की बागडोर अपने हाथ में लेकर राज्य करें। राज्य क्षक्ति को हथियाने के लिए वे विदेश नीति को इस प्रकार से ढालने का नारा देते हैं।

भारत की विदेश नीति भारत के हालात के मुताबिक चलती है। जब कभी उस में लचक पैदा करने की जरूरत होती है तब उस में लचक पैदा की जाती है। जो यह कहते हैं कि भारत की विदेश नीति कोई नीति नहीं है उनको मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब भी अरब कंट्रीज में हालात खराब हुए, जब भी योरोपियन कंट्रीज के अन्दर हालात खराब हुए, वियतनाम का मसला आया भारत ने हमेशा शान्ति कायम रखने में एक अहम रोल भ्रदा किया।

इन क्षब्दों के साथ जो प्रस्ताव पेश किया गया है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ और विदेश नीति की सराहना करता हूँ।

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch-Behar) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Sir, we have been told by the hon. Prime Minister, while initiating the debate on this motion, that foreign policy of our country is guided by our national interest. We have been further told that we were never neutral in matters of justice and freedom.

Looking to this aspect, I would like to mention what is our policy towards Pakistan. As a matter of fact, we have no policy towards Pakistan. While Pakistan has exhibited a very hostile attitude towards us, while Pakistan has started infiltration into our territory and has started training and giving arms to Naga and Mizo hostiles, we have a very soft corner towards Pakistan.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister to reply, categorically, certain basic questions. What is our stand about Pakistan? What is the stand of our Government towards Pakistan? We have seen that in a number of cases, our territories have been forcibly occupied by Pakistan. But we have not done anything so far. While Pakistan is training and aiding, directly, Naga and Mizo hostiles, we are doing nothing. I would like to ask : Can we not create a similar situation in East Pakistan? Cannot our Government do something so that this sort of subversive activities of Pakistan are stopped? But we have no answer to that.

Two years back, there was an upsurge in East Pakistan for national autonomy, provincial autonomy, and we did not give any help at the time of that national movement to attain their freedom, to have their sense of justice and their democratic right. This is our neutrality and sense of justice and freedom. While it is a fact that we have helped, in many countries of the world, many national movements, democratic movements, say, in Algeria, Indonesia, Spain and many other countries—even now, we are helping the African National Conference—we are so silent on the national movement in East Pakistan. This is a policy of appeasement that we are following. We say, it is neutrality;

[Shri G. K. Daschowdhury]

we say, it is non-alignment. We say something more; we use many other words. But all these policies are a failure and abortive.

What about our position of Indian enclaves? Thousands and thousands of Indian citizens are living in Indian enclaves. Only the other day, the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs Mr. B. R. Bhagat said about pitiable conditions of the Indian enclaves and he expressed his helplessness. He said, he could not do anything to protect the rights and the interests of Indian citizens in Indian enclaves. What a wonderful statement he made the other day on the floor of the House! With your permission, Sir, I would like to quote from *Patriot* of 5th December, 1967, as to what he said on the floor of the House:

"So far as the Indian enclaves in Pakistan are concerned, a overwhelming majority will have to come over to India."

We have our moral duties and obligations to protect our citizens there. But the Minister of External Affairs seems to be absolutely helpless. What has been suggested is that an overwhelming majority of our population will have to come to the mainland, that is, India. Side by side, if we look into what is Pakistan's policy regarding Pakistani enclaves surrounded by Indian territory? A brochure has been published by the Pakistan Foreign Office and has been distributed to all the MPs, wherein it has stated about the most insecure position of Pakistanis in the Dahagram enclave; it has stated that the Pakistanis there are feeling most insecure and all that. This is what the report says. But whenever thousands and thousands of Indians in the Indian enclaves in Pakistan are murdered, slendered and their houses are burnt, our External Affairs Ministry keeps mum; they never say anything for the protection of their rights. What is our policy and what is the policy of Pakistan? Time has come to change our foreign policy now, lest we should simply be helpless spectators of millions murdered in Pakistan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I should like to warn this Government and the hon.

Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs who said the other day that an overwhelming majority of the Indian population would have to come over to India. May I ask the hon. Minister to give a categorical reply that when all those Indians in the Indian enclaves there, who are rendered homeless, come back, they would be made a new class of refugees and Government would take the full responsibility to rehabilitate them?

We have also seen the barren and abortive foreign policy of our country in other respects. As far as I can remember, many years back, Pandit Nehru gave an assurance; by saying that the Chittagong Hill district is a predominantly non-Muslim area and has mistakably gone to Pakistan and that he would take up the matter with the appropriate authorities through the international agencies and forums. I should also like to mention that about 6 to 8 police stations or *Thanas* of the Sylhet district, which have gone to East Pakistan after a Referendum in 1947, are predominantly non-Muslim areas, but because of certain doubtful interpretation of the Radcliffe Award, these areas alongwith many other areas have gone to East Pakistan. They should have come to the Indian Union. But we have not seen any attempt on the part of the External Affairs Ministry to raise those issues through international agencies and forums and to get those Indian territories annexed to the Indian Union. We have not done anything in this regard, which is practically a large territory. May I say one thing here, Sir? If Pakistan can raise the issue of Rann of Kutch through the International forum even after 18 years of the Partition, can we not raise these issues? These are both legally and politically our territories but our foreign policy is imbecile in the matter. Sir, you will find that Pakistan, even at the slightest pretext, raises such issues through international agencies. The other day we saw some reports that Pakistan was threatening to raise the Farakka Dam issue through an international agency unless our Government conceded to certain demands made by them. This is a disastrous foreign policy that we

are pursuing! We always try to appease them and in this policy of appeasement we are always the losers. It is regrettable that we very often forget that, by the policy of appeasement, we simply allow our aggressors to whet their knives at our cost and to use the same against us. Further we simply allow our aggressors to commit more and more aggression on our side.

Before Partition and after Partition it was said that the affairs of the minorities in Pakistan would be looked into. But we are not looking into those affairs. Those Hindu minorities in Pakistan are being murdered, butchered and plundered every day and many awful things have been happening; but we are keeping mum about this matter. Sir, is it not our duty to realise the fullest compensation of the properties and assets and interests left over by the Indian nationals in Pakistan. We have seen the same case here. In the case of West Pakistan displaced persons fullest compensation has been given to them, but, in the case of East Pakistan displaced persons this privilege has been denied. Sir, the Nehru-Liaquat pact has not been honoured by Pakistan and our Government also must disown it and should try to realise the fullest compensation from the Government of Pakistan and those monies should be paid to these displaced persons.

One thing more, Sir, I would like to mention in regard to our foreign policy. Many speakers have said so many things and I have weighed them very carefully. What is actually our foreign policy today? We have decided that we should have big missions in many countries. Sir, this one thing that I have come across—this is what has been published in the *Blitz* of the 6th December, 1967,—with your permission, Sir, read it out to the House:

"India's Ambassador to Washington, Mr. B. K. Nehru, who represents the present Government of India, has been using in his public speeches expressions like 'India-occupied Kashmir' and 'Pakistan-occupied Kashmir' or 'India-held Kashmir and Pakistan-held portions of Kashmir'."

This is very strange, Sir. Is our Ambassador there to make Pakistani propaganda? Is it not a fact that Kashmir's accession to India is both politically, constitutionally, and legally, a finality? If that be so, why is our Ambassador saying 'India-held Kashmir' and 'Pakistan-held Kashmir'. Will the External Affairs Ministry perform more "Bhudan Yajnas" by giving away Kashmir to Pakistan, like many other territories in Eastern India?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now please conclude.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY: Am I to sit down? I do not know if that is the policy that big people would get more time than what we are not getting.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You should conclude now.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY: Then, I sit down, Sir.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: *rose*.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): He has not finished at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is no good. Purposely I called him. He sits at the back and there is no policy as such. He is a young man. I gave him 14 minutes. Now that is not fair. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI J. M. BISWAS (Bankaura): Can't you give him two minutes more?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I never said 'Please sit down'. I said, 'You please conclude', but he said 'I will sit down.'

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (बाङ्गुर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल की रात इस बरस की सब से लम्बी रात थी। कल से बड़े दिन शुरू हो रहे हैं। उनको क्रिसमिस कहा जाता है। पोप ने इस क्रिसमिस को समर्पित किया है विश्व-शान्ति के लिए। लेकिन हमें बड़ा दुख है इस बात का कि पोप ने इस वर्ष के जिस क्रिसमिस को विश्व-शान्ति के लिए समर्पित किया है, उस क्रिसमिस में वियतनाम में एक बहुत ही नृशंस और पाषाण-विक्रम चल रहा है और दुनियां की

[श्री अमृत नाहाटा]

एक सब से बड़ी ताकत—अमरीकी साम्राज्यवाद—वहाँ की निरीह और स्वतंत्रता-प्रिय जनता को मौत के घाट उतारने पर आमादा है।

आज दुनियाँ की सारी स्वतंत्रता-प्रिय जनता वियतनाम की बहादुर जनता के प्रति नतमस्तक है, उसको अपनी श्रद्धा और अभिनन्दन देती है। अपने देश की आजादी के लिए वियतनाम का एक-एक नागरिक, बच्चा, औरत और जवान, बन्दूक ले कर खेतों में भी काम करता है और आक्रमणकारियों का मुकाबला भी करता है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि वियतनाम युद्ध के सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार की नीति बिल्कुल सही है। सब से पहली बात यह है कि अमरीका की बमबारी बिना-शर्त बन्द की जानी चाहिए और उसके बाद जेनेवा सम्मेलन के आधार पर बातचीत की जानी चाहिए। जिस बातचीत में एन० एल० एफ० के मेम्बरों को भी शामिल किया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करूँगा भारत सरकार से कि सही नीति प्रतिपादित करना काफी नहीं है। पोप पहलकदमी कर रहे हैं, यू० थांट पहलकदमी कर रहे हैं। सारी दुनिया आज भारतवर्ष की तरफ देख रही है कि आजादी का एक अलमबरदार था जो मुल्क वह आज वियतनाम के सवाल पर सही नीति प्रतिपादित करने के बाद भी चुप क्यों है ? भारत सरकार को चाहिए कि अपनी नीति को सही माने में अमल में लाने के लिए पहलकदमी करे और दुनिया में आवाज उठाए। मुझे अफसोस है आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने आज एक बहुत ही खतरनाक सिद्धांत यहाँ प्रतिपादित किया। उन्होंने कहा कि वियतनाम में अमेरिका के लोग मर रहे हैं या वियतनाम के लोग मर रहे हैं हमें इससे क्या ? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दक्षिणी अफ्रीका में काले लोगों पर जुल्म हो रहा है और गौरे लोग जुल्म कर रहे हैं हमें इससे क्या मतलब ?

स्पेन पर हिटलर ने हमला किया था और हमें क्या मतलब था कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू वहाँ जाते और स्पेन के साथ हमदर्दी जाहिर करते ? हमें क्या मतलब था कि चीन में कोटनीस को भेजते जो वहाँ शहीद हो गए वहाँ की आजादी के लिए ? दुनियाँ में कहीं भी किसी मुल्क पर जुल्म होगा, आक्रमण होगा, अगर किसी मुल्क की आजादी कुचली जायगी तो यह गांधी और जवाहर का देश अपनी आवाज बुलंद करेगा। हम चुप नहीं रह सकते। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ, ऊपर बादल गरज रहे थे और नीचे कमजोर दिल वाले नाथ पै उन गरजते हुए बादलों के साथ होड़ कर रहे थे लेकिन उनके मुँह से एक शब्द नहीं निकला वियतनाम की लड़ाई और उनकी हमदर्दी के बारे में...

श्री नाथ पे : आप शायद यहाँ नहीं थे। जब यह बमबारी शुरू हुई तो पहली मर्तबा हम ही ने भारत सरकार को कहा था कि इसका विरोध पूरे राष्ट्र की तरफ से होना चाहिए। एक बात को हजार दफा हम दोहराना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन जब यह बमबारी हुई तो उसके विरुद्ध हमने आप से पहले आवाज उठायी थी।

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : मैं इतिहास में नहीं जाना चाहता। मोहनजोदड़ो युग की बात हमें नहीं मालूम। मैं आज की बात करना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दूसरी बात मैं जो करना चाहता हूँ वह है जर्मनी के बारे में। भारत सरकार की नीति हमेशा यह रही है, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने यह कहा था कि दो जर्मनी वास्तविकताएँ हैं। एक जर्मनी से यानी पश्चिमी जर्मनी से हमारे कूटनीतिक संबंध स्थापित हैं, उस पश्चिमी जर्मनी से कि जिसके राष्ट्रपति ने कोयले की खानों में हवाई जहाज बनाने के कारखाने बना कर और सारे वार प्रिजनर्स से उसमें काम कराया और लाखों लोग वापस वहाँ से नहीं आये, उस पश्चिमी जर्मनी से जिसके चांसलर गोयवल्स के असिस्टेंट थे जिनका सिद्धांत था कि सौ दफा झूठ दोहरावो

तो वह सच हो जाता है, जो कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को हम हथियार दे रहे हैं, हम क्या करें? उनका 30 प्रतिशत विदेशी व्यापार आज हमारे पड़ोसी दुश्मन चीन के साथ हो रहा है। कहते हैं हम क्या करें? उनका हवाई जहाज गिलगिट के ऊपर से उड़ता है, कहते हैं हम क्या करें? और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उन नक्शों में काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र बताया गया है। यहां प्रश्न उठाया गया। हमारी प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने कहा कि यह तो पुराने नक्शे हैं। मैं यह नक्शे साथ लाया हूँ, उनके फोटो हैं, यह एक एटलस है, हरम एटलस जो म्यूनिख में, फ्रैंकफर्ट में, बर्लिन में और हैम्बर्ग में छपा है और इसमें काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र बताया गया है। यह नक्शा 1963 का है, यह पुराना है। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मार्च 1967 का, यानी करीब 4 महीने पुराना यह नक्शा छपा है और वरसीज जर्नल वेस्ट जर्मनी में जिसमें काश्मीर स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र बताया गया है। यह अक्टूबर 1967 का डेढ़ महीने पहले का नक्शा छपा है इन्डो एशिया मैगजीन में जिसके अन्दर काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र बताया गया है। यह सारे सेमी गवर्नमेंट पब्लिकेशंस हैं, एटलस हैं जो वहाँ के स्कूलों में पढ़ाए जाते हैं जिसमें काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र बताया गया है। उस वेस्ट जर्मनी के साथ तो हमारे डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशंस हैं। लेकिन जी० डी० आर० जर्मन डेमोक्रेटिक रिपब्लिक जिसका व्यापार हमारे साथ निरन्तर बढ़ रहा है, जो हमारे प्रति मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध रखता है, जो काश्मीर के प्रश्न पर हमारा समर्थन करता है, उसके साथ हम डिप्लोमैटिक रिलेशंस नहीं स्थापित करते यह बह कर कि वह राष्ट्रसंघ का सदस्य नहीं है। राष्ट्रसंघ का सदस्य चीन भी नहीं है। यह कसौटी नहीं हो सकती किसी राष्ट्र के साथ कूटनीतिक संबंध स्थापित करने या न करने के लिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, तीसरी बात जो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि आज जो वियतनाम में युद्ध हो रहा है उसके पीछे एक और बड़ी बात है। आज अमेरिका में

और रूस में हर रोज नये नये हथियार तैयार होते जा रहे हैं और पुराने हथियार आवसोलीट होते जा रहे हैं, पुराने पड़ते जा रहे हैं। अमेरिका में जगह नहीं है पुराने हथियारों को रखने के लिए। इसलिए कम से कम उनके गोडाउन्स का किराया भी बचाना चाहे तो वह चाहते हैं कि दूसरे देशों में वह हथियार इस्तेमाल किए जायें। इन देशों की, खास कर के अमेरिका की अर्थ-व्यवस्था मौत और युद्ध पर आधारित है। जब तक इस देश में निरस्त्रीकरण नहीं होगा, तब तक यह युद्ध चलते रहेंगे। भारतवर्ष ने आज तक हमेशा निरस्त्रीकरण के लिए पहलकदमी की है। आज मुझे अफसोस है कि दुनिया में हमारे देश का जो बिम्ब स्थापित होता जा रहा है वह धीरे-धीरे कमजोर होता जा रहा है इसलिए कि वह पहलकदमी हमारे हाथों से निकल रही है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा एक बार फिर हम निरस्त्रीकरण के लिए आवाज उठाएं और उसके लिए पूरी कोशिश करें। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं श्री नाथ पं की उस मांग का बिल्कुल समर्थन करता हूँ कि एक तरफ जहां हम निरस्त्रीकरण के लिए पहलकदमी करें दूसरी ओर हमें यह भी स्पष्ट कर देना चाहिए रूस और अमेरिका को कि हम एटामिक हथियार बनाएं, न बनाएं, सदियों तक न बनाएं, लेकिन वह हमारी मर्जी की बात है। उनके कहने से हम हस्ताक्षर करके हाथ कटा कर उनको नहीं देंगे। उस सन्धि पर हमें हस्ताक्षर करके नहीं देना चाहिए।

एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। जनसंघ की ओर से इस बार नहीं, पिछली बार मधोक ने और सौधी ने एक बात कही थी और वह खां अब्दुल गफ्फार खां के बारे में है। दो साल पहले हम लोग काबुल गए थे और श्री अब्दुल गफ्फार खां से मिले थे। हम लोग जितने थे, सब से वह गले लग कर मिले। हम में से एक एक के साथ वह गले मिले और उनको देख कर हमें आंसू वह आये। आज हम चाहते हैं कि श्री अब्दुल गफ्फार खां की भारत सरकार हर तरह से मदद करे। स्वास्थ्य ठीक करने के लिए।

【श्री अमृत नाहाटा】

नहीं बल्कि राजनैतिक कारणों से उन्हें भारतवर्ष बुलाया जाना चाहिए और उनकी मांग का समर्थन करना चाहिए। इसलिए नहीं कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ इरीटेशन क्रियेट करना चाहते हैं। जनसंघ का एंटीट्यूड सिर्फ इतना है कि दलाई लामा को मान्यता दो, अब्दुल गफ्फार खां को बुलाओ, दरअसल यह टिट फार टैट की जो नीति है मैं उसका समर्थन नहीं करता, इरीटेशन क्रियेट करने की नीति का मैं समर्थन नहीं करता। लेकिन मेरिट पर देखा जाय, आन मेरिट्स हमारा यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि हम उनकी मदद करें। आज कहते हैं अब्दुल गफ्फार खां कि उनको भेड़ियों के हाथों में सौंप दिया गया है। आज महात्मा गांधी के वचन हमें याद करने होंगे और श्री अब्दुल गफ्फार खां के आन्दोलन का समर्थन करना होगा।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, अभी कुछ दिन पहले मुझे शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय में जाने का अवसर मिला। यह बात उस समय की है कि जब हमारे पहले प्रधानमंत्री श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू का निघन हुए केवल एक ही वर्ष व्यतीत हुआ था। शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय के अधिकांशकारियों ने श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के साथ पत्र-व्यवहार के चित्र बना कर दीवारों पर लगाए थे। एक पत्र उनका विशेष रूप से जो मुझे याद है आज तक। जिसकी चर्चा मैंने केवल इस सदन में नहीं, बल्कि वर्तमान प्रधानमंत्री की उपस्थिति में उस दिन भी की थी, जब श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू का जन्म दिन केन्द्रीय कक्ष में मनाया जा रहा था। उस पत्र में लिखा था— 23 दिसम्बर को जब शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय का दीक्षांत समारोह था, उस समय एक दिन शनिवार को लोक सभा का अधिवेशन बड़ गया। श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने शांति निकेतन विश्वविद्यालय के अधिकारियों को लिखा क्योंकि लोक सभा का अधिवेशन एक दिन बड़ गया है इसलिए मैं 23 तारीख को नहीं आ सकूंगा। आप अपना कार्यक्रम कुछ

पीछे हटाएं। मैं यह बात विशेष रूप से इसलिए कहना चाहता हूँ कि पहले प्रधानमंत्री संसद को प्रमुखता देते थे अपेक्षाकृत और कार्यक्रमों के। लेकिन उन्हीं की पुत्री जो उनके उत्तराधिकारी के रूप में उस स्थान पर बैठी हुई हैं, उन्होंने आज विदेश मंत्रालय जैसी एक गंभीर बहस की अपेक्षा कर के उसी कार्यक्रम में सम्मिलित होना स्वीकार किया जहाँ उनके पिता जी ने इस आधार पर वहाँ जाने से इन्कार किया था। यह संसद की अबहेलना ही नहीं अपितु, उस परम्परा की अबहेलना भी है जो परम्परा और मार्ग उनके पिता जी ने प्रशस्त किया था।

उपाध्यक्ष जी विदेश नीति की सबसे बड़ी दुर्बलता इससे अधिक क्या होगी कि आज इतने दिनों के बाद भी सरकार का डाबांडोल मन श्री चागला के विदेश मंत्री पद से त्यागपत्र देने के बाद यह निर्णय नहीं कर पाया कि उस पद पर किस व्यक्ति को बिठाना है? मैं ने पहले संकेत के रूप में एक बार यहां कहा भी था कि प्रधानमंत्री के मन में जो विदेश मंत्री हैं परिस्थिति उनके अनुकूल नहीं जा रही है। लेकिन जो विदेश मंत्री होना चाहिए वह प्रधानमंत्री के मन का नहीं है। इस प्रकार की अनिश्चित परिस्थिति क्या हमारी विदेश नीति को आगे चल कर और दुर्बल नहीं बनाएगी? रक्षा नीति और कूट नीति यह दो इस प्रकार की नीतियां होती हैं जिनसे किसी देश का स्वाभिमान सुरक्षित रहता है। लेकिन इनकी अपेक्षा से भारत सरकार को आज कदम कदम पर दूसरे देशों में और अपने घर में भी अपमानित होना पड़ रहा है।

सबसे बड़ी चीज यह है कि हमारे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध किस प्रकार के होने चाहियें। मैं भारत सरकार को इस बुद्धिमत्ता के लिये तो साधुवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि नेपाल में राजदूत के लिये उन्होंने श्री राज बहादुर की नियुक्ति की। सगता है सरकार अब धीरे-धीरे व्यावहारिक दृष्टिकोण पर आ रही है कि भारत को अपने पड़ोसी देशों

में किस प्रकार के जिम्मेदार और गम्भीर व्यक्तियों को राजदूत के रूप में भेजना चाहिये। एक छोटे-से नेपाल के साथ हुई भूल का अब तक कितना महंगा मूल्य देना पड़ा है मैं उस के विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन इस प्रकार की भूलें हम अन्य पड़ोसी देशों के साथ न दोहराये। पड़ोसी देशों में राजदूतों की नियुक्ति करते समय हमें दूरदर्शिता का परिचय देना चाहिये, जैसा कि नेपाल के मामले में किया है।

अभी कुछ दिन पूर्व मुझे भारत के पड़ोसी देश अफगानिस्तान में जाने का अवसर मिला था। उस समय वहां पर हमारे जो राजदूत थे, उन की क्रियाशीलता या अक्रियाशीलता की मैं चर्चा यहां नहीं कर रहा हूं। लेकिन विदेश में जो हमारे राजदूत बन कर जाते हैं, केवल वे ही हमारे राजनीतिक प्रतिनिधि नहीं होते हैं। जो भारतीय वहां पर रहते हैं, वे भी हमारे राजनीतिक प्रतिनिधि का काम करते हैं। उन के साथ हमारे राजदूतों के सम्बन्ध बहुत घनिष्ठ होने चाहियें। देखा जाय तो वे ही हमारे स्थायी राजदूत हैं, जो वहां पर भारत के हितों को संरक्षण देते हैं। लेकिन उन के साथ हमारे राजदूतावासों का सम्पर्क न होना यह हमारी विदेश नीति की बहुत बड़ी दुर्बलता है। मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहता हूं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब देश स्वतन्त्र हुआ था और ईरान में हमारा सब से पहला राजदूतावास स्थापित हुआ था। उस समय ईरान में जितने भारतीय रहते थे, उन्होंने भारत सरकार को पत्र लिखा और उस पत्र में यह लिखा कि आप अपने राजदूतावास के लिये कोई भवन किराये पर न लें, भारत सरकार यहां पर अपना भवन बनाये। उसका भारत से एक नया पैसा मंगाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हम भारतीय यहां पर सारा पैसा देंगे, जिससे भारतीय दूतावास का भवन तैयार हो सके। बीस साल बाद बिना सूद के हमारा पैसा हम को वापस कर दिया जाये। तेहरान में राजदूतावास बनाने के लिये वहां के भारतीयों ने इस प्रकार का

प्रस्ताव किया, लेकिन आज तक इस सरकार ने वहां के भारतीयों के उस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं किया। जितनी धनराशि में उस समय राजदूतावास का भवन तैयार हो सकता था, अब तक उस से 15 गुना किराये की शकल में यह सरकार दे चुकी है। दूसरे देशों में जो भारतीय रहते हैं, उन के साथ विदेश मंत्रालय का या हमारे राजदूतों का सम्पर्क न होना, यह हमारी विदेश नीति की कितनी बड़ी दुर्बलता है।

इसी प्रकार में प्रवासी भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं। दो देश इस प्रकार के हैं जिनमें भारतीयों की संख्या अधिकांश मात्रा में है—मोरिशस और फिजी। फिजी के कुछ लोगों ने जिस समय श्री नेहरू प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री थे, एक पत्र लिखा। प्रवासी भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार जितना 1947 से पहले, उनके हितों का संरक्षण करती थी, उस के बाद भारत सरकार की नीति वह नहीं रही। उन्होंने लिखा था कि हम दिल्ली में उनके प्रवासी भारतीय भवन अपने खर्च पर बनाना चाहते हैं। भारत सरकार हम को केवल भूमि दे दे। इससे केन्द्रीय सरकार और प्रवासी भारतीयों के बीच की शृंखला मजबूत हो जाय और उस में किसी प्रकार की दुर्बलता न आने पाये। श्री नेहरू ने देहरादून के सर्किट हाउस से अपनी मृत्यु के दो दिन पूर्व उन के पत्र का उत्तर दिया कि मुझे वह प्रस्ताव स्वीकार है, लेकिन आज तक भारत सरकार उस प्रस्ताव को कार्यान्वित नहीं कर सकी—क्या यह हमारी विदेश नीति है ?

इसके अतिरिक्त जब इन देशों से उच्च अधिकारी आते हैं तो उन्हें यथोचित आदर मिले। अभी कुछ दिन हुए मोरिशस के प्रधान मंत्री श्री रामगुलाम भारत आये। उनको उनके अनुरूप सम्मान न देना, क्योंकि वह भारतीय वंशज हैं, मैं इसको उचित नहीं समझता। अगर किसी अन्य देश का राष्ट्रपति आता है तो हमारे राष्ट्रपति उसका स्वागत करने के लिये

[श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री]

जाते हैं। अगर किसी देश का प्रधान मंत्री आना है तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री उसको सम्मान देने के लिये जाते हैं। लेकिन इनके सम्मान के लिये उप-प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरारजी भाई गये। मैं इसको भी बुरा नहीं समझता। लेकिन मैं यह अनुभव करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री को वहाँ जाना चाहिये था। ये छोटी-छोटी बातें हैं, लेकिन दूसरे देशों में इनका बहुत बड़ा अर्थ लिया जाता है।

मैं एक बात अफगानिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में और कहना चाहता हूँ। कुछ दिन पहले हमारे उपराष्ट्रपति, जो इस समय राष्ट्रपति हैं, काबुल शहर में एक बाल रोग चिकित्सालय की नींव डाल कर आये थे। उनका कहना था कि भारत सरकार अपनी ओर से उन प्रकार का चिकित्सालय वहाँ बनायेगी। अब पाकिस्तानों वहाँ पर क्या काम करते हैं? धीरे धीरे वहाँ के नागरिकों के मनों को भारत के प्रति विषाक्त करने के लिये इस प्रकार का वातावरण बना रहे हैं कि देखो यह तो पत्थर ज्यों का त्यों पत्थर हो पड़ा है। लेकिन हमने जो सहयोग आपको दिया है, वह पूरा कर दिया है। इस लिये मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि या तो भारत सरकार इस प्रकार के निर्णय न ले। यदि लेता है तो शीघ्र उसको कार्यान्वित करे ताकि दूसरे देशों में उन बातों को लेकर हमारे विपरीत वातावरण तैयार न किया जा सके।

इसी प्रकार जैसा नहटा जी ने कहा—खान बादशाह के मन में इस बात को लेकर इतना कष्ट है कि अफगानिस्तान की गवर्नमेंट तो खान बादशाह को पूरा समर्थन देता है लेकिन भारत सरकार से उनको वह समर्थन नहीं मिला, जिसकी वह अपेक्षा आरम्भ से रखते थे। खान बादशाह भारत से समर्थन लेना चाहते हैं। भारतीय स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम में उनका बहुत बड़ा योगदान रहा है। जब पठानों को मुक्ति आन्दोलन का हमने आश्वासन उन्हें दिया था, तो हमें अपने उस आश्वासन को पूरा करना चाहिये। यह राजनीतिक दृष्टि से भी उपयुक्त

है और कूटनीतिक दृष्टि से भी उपयुक्त है, और नैतिक दृष्टि से भी यह बात उपयुक्त है। इस पर हमें गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये।

एक प्रश्न यह है—पश्चिमी एशिया का। पश्चिमी एशिया के सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार की जो नीति है, मैं उस के विस्तार में तो नहीं जाऊंगा, लेकिन जहाँ तक इजराइल का सम्बन्ध है मेरी अपनी कुछ मान्यता है—अभी श्रीलंका जैसे छोटे देश को ईजिप्ट ने पत्र लिखा कि आपके हमारे साथ भी राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध हैं और इजराइल के साथ भी राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध हैं। उस छोटे-से देश ने जिसकी आबादी भारत से बहुत कम है, उत्तर दिया—आपको हमारे घरेलू मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। आपके साथ हमारी मित्रता है, इस का अर्थ यह नहीं है कि हम दूसरों के साथ मित्रता करें तो आपसे पूछ कर करें। यही बात मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ। हम को चाहिये था कि आज जितने भी देश अस्तित्व में हैं उनके साथ समान राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें। हमारी तटस्थ नीति की मांग भी यही है, लेकिन यदि किसी कारणवश आप अथवा अपनी दुर्बल नीति के कारण, जो दुर्भाग्य से अब तक चलती चली जा रही है, इजरायल को राजनीतिक मान्यता देने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, तो कम से कम इस प्रकार के प्रगतिशील देशों के साथ शैक्षणिक सम्बन्ध ही स्थापित करें और सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें। पीछे राजस्थान सरकार ने इजरायल को लिखा था कि हमें अपनी मरुभूमि को शस्य-श्यामला बनाने के लिये आपके विशेषज्ञों की जरूरत है। उन्होंने उत्तर दिया कि हम विशेषज्ञ देने को तैयार हैं लेकिन जब राजस्थान सरकार ने केन्द्रीय सरकार से पूछा तो उन्होंने उस को स्वीकार नहीं किया, उस का विरोध किया। दूसरा देश अपने विशेषज्ञों को आपके घर भेजे, आपकी भूमि को हरा-भरा करने को तैयार है और आप उस के प्रस्ताव को ठुकराते हैं, यह कौनसी ब्यावहारिक नीति है ?

में अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए—दो बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ। एक बात—यह कि काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मंत्री ने यह कहा कि हम किसी के दबाव में आ कर काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में निर्णय नहीं ले रहे हैं लेकिन शेख अब्दुल्ला और मिर्जा अफजल बेग—इन का जो नया षड्यन्त्र प्रारम्भ होने जा रहा है इससे मैं सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी को सावधान कर देना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि वह रक्षा मंत्री के पद पर हैं और शायद आज वह विदेश मंत्री की ओर से भी इस विवाद का उत्तर देने जा रहे हैं। सरकार थोड़ा सावधान होकर चले, कई भूलें होने पर भी आपका व्यवहार उस के सुधार के अनुरूप नहीं हो रहा है। अन्तिम बात जिन देशों में भी में गया और वहाँ पर भारतीय दूतावासों को देखा सो दुख हुआ। और कुछ करो या न करो, कम से कम “भारतीय दूतावास” तो हिन्दी में लिखवाओ। जिन देशों में अंग्रेजी नहीं चलती है, वहाँ भी आपने अंग्रेजी भाषा में ‘भारतीय दूतावास’ लिखवाया हुआ है—इससे हम को कितना अपमानित होना पड़ता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह विदेश मंत्रालय को निर्देश दें कि हर जगह “भारतीय दूतावास” भारतीय भाषा में लिखा जाये जिससे कि कुछ स्वाभिमान जगे।

SHRI SEQUEIRA (Marmagoa): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in today's world, one of three attributes seems to be necessary for a country to be a world power: economic might, military might or habitual belligerence. I submit that we in our country have none of these three. What then is our place in the world? We are a country which in terms of history is recently independent. We are a developing nation; we share with our friends in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America all the aspirations of nations; with a wide disparity of income among the people, we are making an effort to efface this difference. I submit that the object of our foreign policy in the councils of the world should be to take a place with them as equals and to play a major role in all common policies

that aid the process of development. Where and how is world wealth being created today? The majority of world trade is within the club of developed nations. The second largest quantum is the trade between developed nations and the developing nations. It is almost equal, but what does it consist of? The developing nations send to the developed nations raw materials and get in return finished products. The processing is being done in the developed nations. The jobs are being created, factories are being built and technology is being developed in those areas which need all these things less than we do. We must be able to arrest and reverse this process. There is not enough trade between the developing nations. We are having the UNCTAD conference and I am sure in this conference we shall try and project the view that we wish a greater amount of trade amongst ourselves, and there should be a flow of technology from developed nations to the developing nations, rather than merely finished products.

But is such a conference enough? This is the reversal of a process that has been there for centuries since colonial days. If we are to make this reversal of the process a success, it is necessary that we in India be in constant touch with all the developing nations and place before them our views and play a major role in the shaping and presentation of these views to the developed nations. Take Germany. Our trade with Germany is an adverse trade. Recently I read in the papers that we have come to an agreement with them and we are going to examine how we can close the gap. But a mere agreement to set up a committee is not enough. Besides our diplomatic initiative by our embassy there, it is necessary that we should have constantly delegations of all manner of people from this country who know something about exports, politicians who are able to influence the policies there, to go there and present the view that a safe world is only a contented world, that today we can achieve a contented world if all the countries get together and do something about it together. When we say a safe world is a contented

[Shri Sequeira]

world, let us not forget that in Bhutan, Sikkim and Nepal, it is our duty to contribute to the contentment of these neighbours who are economically not as strong as we are.

The projection of views in the world means ability to speak in languages other than our own, languages native to the country in which we are speaking. We in this country were fortunate enough to inherit three live teaching institutions of 3 live languages—English, French and Portuguese—English in most of the country, French in Pondicherry and Portuguese in Goa. But what have we done? With the short-sighted policy that whatever was colonial was bad, we are destroying the institutions that we have. This is another process we should reverse. We should maintain these institutions and strengthen them, so that our people can learn those languages and imbibe that culture to be able to go abroad and project our own very much Indian views.

The Prime Minister said yesterday that we do not miss many opportunities. I would give an example of one opportunity that we have not only lost, but which we had and which we have now almost lost.

You are aware, Sir, that when Goa was liberated this country earned the gratitude of almost all the freedom movements in Africa. These days we were very much in touch with them. What has happened to this advantage today? Are we in touch with these movements? Do we know what is happening to them. Having cleared foreign presence in this country, let us not forget there are still people in the world, many millions of them with an urge to be free and that we should be in constant touch with them. Wherever we are in a position to help them we should help and wherever we are not in a position to help them we should be able to recommend to our friends in the world that help should be given to them.

Non-alignment is perhaps not as important today when the super powers themselves are aligned. But the one

thing that I would like to submit in conclusion is that this country now should be fully aligned. It should align itself with the voices of those millions in the world who want peace, prosperity and progress. It should identify itself with the area in which it lives, it should find its own place and not seek to exceed it, it should define the area in which it can have influence, it should decide the priorities which it is going to apply to its policies and it should put all its efforts within these limited areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Minister—

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secunderabad) : Sir, allow me to put one question.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All right. He may put his question.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA : Sir, even though it was the chance of the Congress to speak you gave it to the Opposition. I want to protest about this differentiation being made in time allotment between the first among equals and the last among equals.

My question is this. Is the Minister aware that at a public meeting in Delhi a resolution was passed in favour of giving every assistance, diplomatic and otherwise, to Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan? This was sent to the Prime Minister, the Minister of External Affairs and others. I would like to know what action Government has taken on that. In this connection I would like to inform the Minister that this decision about partition and referendum was taken behind the back of both Mahatma Gandhi and Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan. On 26th September, 1947, Gandhiji said that if there was no other way of securing justice from Pakistan India should have to go to war against it. He said that war was not a joke, no one wanted war but he can never advise anyone to put up with injustice. On 17th November, 1947, Gandhiji informed Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan—that is after freedom—to come to India so that he could lead non-

cooperation movement from here, he said: "with me or otherwise". What that "otherwise" can be I do not know. He went so far to say, when he was asked: "You are a believer in ahimsa?", "I am a believer of ahimsa but my Government is not". That was the pledge of the Father of the Nation, which is dear not only to the Congress Party but the whole country, specially to Congress. May I know what steps Government of India has decided to take in giving help to Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and his Pakhtoon Movement? If it is considered to be interference in the affairs of another country, I would like to know how you can allow interference in our country when Mizos and Nagas are being trained and armed by Pakistan and when every effort is made to attack India? I would like to have a definite answer. I am very sorry the Prime Minister is not here, but they had advance notice of the resolution of the public meeting.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Swaran Singh.

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore): Sir, are you not going to give me an opportunity?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your party spokesman has taken perhaps more than his time. I do not want to say how much time he has taken.

15 hrs.

SHRI S. KUNDU: Sir, I have given notice of amendments.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Usually, those who give notice of amendments are given opportunities. But it is not possible now.

SHRI S. KUNDU: I hope he will remember me when the amendments are taken up.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is not my intention to go into any great detail about the various points that have been urged. The Prime Minister in her two speeches yesterday had given the broad outlines and guidelines of our foreign policy on

essential matters, and in her intervention towards the end of the debate yesterday she tried to answer many of the points that had been raised yesterday. I would, therefore, like to confine myself to some of the points that have been raised in the debate today. I am very happy to find that even today, within a short period, as many as 9 hon. Members have participated in the debate, and they have raised many important issues, many important problems have been touched upon and their views have been put forward.

I would, first of all, like to touch upon some of the points raised by my esteemed colleague and friend, Shri Nath Pai. I fully agree with him on three points that he mentioned towards the end of his speech. These three points are: (1) our attitude on nuclear non-proliferation treaty, (2) use of foreign money inside our country for political purposes and (3) the political stability and economic difficulties of the country do present a picture abroad which is not to the liking of anyone of us and, therefore, the real strength of the country lies in having stability here and in improving our economic conditions.

I would only like to remind him, as he has in fact himself stated, that on non-proliferation treaty our position has been very fully clarified, not only in the various international gatherings including the United Nations, but also in our discussions with the representatives of the governments concerned. I need hardly re-state that Soviet Union, United States, France and United Kingdom, all these countries are fully aware of our attitude towards the non-proliferation treaty. We have said it very clearly, and I would like to make a very brief reference only to a part of our statement, the Government of India statement in the United Nations on this issue:

"A rational approach to the solution of this problem"

—that is, nuclear disarmament and disarmament generally—

"requires that all international instruments which seek to regulate and control nuclear weapons must assure

[Shri Swaran Singh]

that the possessors of those weapons must be denied that licence to continue increasing the instruments of their threat. Nuclear disarmament cannot be achieved by the preservation of exclusive rights, privileges and options as such to be retained by certain armed and powerful countries while measures are to be taken to limit the actions of the threatened and unarmed countries. It is for this reason that India has consistently emphasized that any international instrument which seeks to deal with this problem which would be acceptable and which would endure must ensure that both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon powers accept obligations not to proliferate. It must be recognised that these mutual obligations are complimentary and are two facets of the same problem."

We had occasion to point out to the international community that whereas we are very vitally interested in preventing horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons we are equally interested in preventing vertical proliferation. If, on the one hand, the nuclear arsenal of the Big Powers continues to increase and they continue to add to their nuclear holdings by stepping up the production of nuclear weapons . . . (*Interruption*)

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : What is vertical and horizontal proliferation ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am glad, Raja Sahib is showing some interest in this. I tried to explain the second sentence. Horizontal proliferation is that more countries start manufacturing nuclear weapons and vertical proliferation is that the same countries go on adding to their nuclear arsenal.

Whereas the nuclear powers are trying to keep the option to them of vertical proliferation, that is, increasing their own nuclear holdings, they are preventing the other countries from developing nuclear weapons. We have always urged in the international community that this state of affairs is, to say the least, not fair and that this thinking must be reversed. In view of this clear policy.

there is no scope for any criticism of Government policy in this respect.

With regard to the percolation of foreign money to influence one way or the other political events in this country, it is something which cannot be too strongly condemned. I felt surprised when Shri Nath Pai regarded the statement of my colleague, the Home Minister, somewhat lightly. We do not treat this matter in that spirit. We attach the highest importance to keeping our independence and our line and course of action being absolutely free from any foreign influence, whether it is money or any other influence. I cannot state the Government's stand in this respect more clearly.

There are several other points raised by Shri Nath Pai and I would like to refer to one or two of them. I think that his criticism of State visits was not quite fair. If the total outcome of a State visit is only the issuing of a joint communique, which Shri Nath Pai dismissed as a very ordinary routine affair and which could perhaps be handled by an expert or a trained stenographer, then perhaps his criticism may have some force. But it cannot be unknown to him—I am sure, it is not unknown to this hon. House and to the country—that the visits of Indian leaders abroad as also the visits of foreign dignitaries to this country are useful and very important for a variety of reasons, the most important being that here is an opportunity to exchange views at the highest level on very important issues. I would like to remind the hon. House of what the Prime Minister said yesterday, namely, that all these talks and discussions which take place at diplomatic level cannot be divulged. The communique is only on those points upon which some public attitude has to be taken, either of some agreement or of some difference of opinion. That is the normal accepted pattern all over the world. There are many other matters which are discussed in the course of these visits and which are of the highest importance because this gives an opportunity to put across our viewpoint in front of the visiting foreign dignitary

and also to put across our viewpoint when our Prime Minister, Foreign Minister or other ministers visit other countries.

SHRI S. KUNDU : The hon. Minister will remember that what Shri Nath Pai meant was that even when we go for food agreement we take such a huge contingent of officers that it appears that we have gone to give food and not to bring food.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like to say very clearly on this issue that it is again an unfair assessment, namely, that any visit abroad by Indian ministers is only to beg for foreign aid or to ask for food. We experienced unprecedented difficulties in the matter of food and even now we are facing some economic difficulties. We welcome help from whatever quarter it comes. But it will be absolutely wrong for anybody to imagine as if all our foreign policy and all our postures are, in any way, revolving around this basic or central thing, namely, food or economic aid. If it comes, we welcome that and we are in need of it for our economic development, particularly, in the basic sectors of our economy. I would like to reiterate our debt of gratitude that we owe to many industrialised and developed countries, like U.S.A., U.K., France, West Germany, Soviet Union and several others who have helped us in giving economic aid in vital sectors of our economy. But let us not be misunderstood on this issue. Our postures, our attitudes, in the international field on basic political and burning issues have never been influenced by anything extraneous and will never be so influenced in future. There is no use trying to project that our postures and our attitudes are, in any way, circumscribed or influenced by these matters.

It should not be forgotten that the aid-giving also, in a large majority of cases, is the result of an assessment of the national interest, even of the aid giving countries. In this context, our young colleague from Goa made some admirable suggestions in the economic

field. It is not as if it is only by way of charity that the developed countries are extending aid for the economic development of the under-developed countries. It is rectification of an act of injustice in the economic field spread over centuries together and that, to a small measure, is now being straightened and it is as much in their interest as it is in the interest of the developing countries. Poverty is indivisible and, if peace and progress has to be maintained, the widening gulf between the rich and the poor countries has to be bridged and it is as much in the interest of the developing countries for a variety of reasons, not only moral but the questions of peace and war, the question of maintenance of economy at a particular level, all these factors, are important and it is on an overall assessment of these factors that the aid-giving countries have come forward to help the under-developed countries. In fact, they are not doing enough in this respect and it has been our endeavour to highlight this in the United Nations and in the Economic and Social Councils, and also a great deal of concentrated effort will have to be put in by us at the time of the UNCTAD Conference. These are important economic issues that face the world. Our own attitude on these issues is well known. I would like to state again, clearly, that our political postures and our attitudes have never been deflected by the fact that we are receiving economic aid or food aid from any country.

Another matter that was mentioned was our state of relationship with the United States of America and the Soviet Union. More than one hon. Member has referred to it. It is important because these two countries are powerful countries, economically and politically, and they hold a great deal of concentrated power in their hands. Our relations, both with the Soviet Union and with the United States of America, are friendly and there is appreciation of our view point even when there is some difference of opinion on important international issues between us and any of these countries. It is true that the international scene is changing. If there

[Shri Swaran Singh]

is less of tension now or less of the atmosphere of cold war, we should be happy rather than that we should feel perturbed over it. We have, after all, been working in the international forums and amongst the international communities for lowering tensions between the power blocs, between the defence blocs, as they were described. And if a new situation is developing where these tensions are being lowered, I do not see why there should be any feeling of consternation; on the other hand, there should be happiness over that. We, by the size of our country, by our geo-political situation, by the pursuit of correct policies, internally and externally, will continue to have a position of importance in all these changing situations which might be witnessed by us . . .

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi): Are you happy about the Soviet and American military aid to Pakistan?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I think, this was a question which could admit of only one reply. How can India be happy if Pakistan receives military aid from Soviet Union or from United States or, in fact, from many other countries? This was a question which was hardly of any importance, and I would also like to say that, according to the information in our possession Soviet Union has not given any aid so far to Pakistan; it has not even sold anything of a military character or any military hardware to Pakistan.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: Helicopters.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Helicopter has been discussed more than once. Helicopter is on OGL and any country can purchase it. You can purchase it. Anybody else can purchase it. In this connection I would like to say this, which is quite interesting. I did not want to say that, but because he picked up this 'Helicopter', I would say this. I have not seen Mr. Masani very often mentioning the heavy military and which was given to Pakistan by way of gift; I have not seen him condemning strongly the military armament and military equipment that have been gifted

by the United States of America to Pakistan. But the helicopter, which is on OGL as I said earlier, is always put forward as if they want to put the Government on the defensive in our relationship with the Soviet Union. I cannot approve of this attitude from one side or the other, trying to highlight only those points which might be in consonance with the pet theories which they want to propound, and they forget altogether the other spectrum of either help or association that might be existing between us and those countries. This is a lop-sided presentation and we should resist the temptation of indulging in this.

On South-East Asia more than one hon. Member has laid stress—several members from both the sides of the House. We in Government attach the highest importance to development of close and friendliest of relations with all the countries of South-East Asia. I am glad that Mr. Nath Pai has in a belated manner mentioned with approval the work done by Mr. Chagla. Mr. Nath Pai was prominent with his brick-bats when Mr. Chagla held the fort, but I am glad that, at any rate, when he is no longer there, he is giving bouquets . . .

SHRI NATH PAI: Bouquets!

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am very happy about it because all of us valued very greatly the contribution that Mr. Chagla had made in regard to our foreign policy.

SHRI NATH PAI: Is that why he was removed? You said, you valued his contribution so much.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would not like him to take any credit that his brick-bats can remove a Minister. It has not come to that bad.

South-East Asia is a region in which several countries are included and our relations with almost all of them are quite friendly and we have taken a decision that we should give even greater importance to our relations with the countries in South-East Asia. We intend to improve our relations, economic rela-

tions, cultural relations and political relations with this region and we want to strengthen them so that this region which is in our neighbourhood prospers and all the progressive forces and forces of unity, independence and sovereignty there are strengthened, because the real strength of South East Asia lies in strengthening the forces of independence as a result of which all these countries feel that they have a pride in their own culture, in their own existence and in their own independent line of action.

The strength of this region does not lie, as some countries at one time thought, in having some sort of defence pacts and the like, but really it lies in developing the independence, the strength and the honour and dignity of these countries. It is in this spirit that we view the problems of South-east Asia.

I need hardly bring back to the minds of hon. Members the situation that exists in South-East Asia today. Indonesia has passed through a very difficult period. There is a new government there. They are doing their best not only to improve their relations with other countries in South-east Asia but also are grappling hard in the matter of improving their internal economy. The best of our wishes go to them for the success of the task upon which they have embarked. It is a colossal task, and we have assured our friends in Indonesia that we are prepared to participate in that venture of theirs upon which they have embarked for strengthening their economy and for improving the conditions in their country. Our relations with that country are today very much different from what they were before the present regime came into power, although even at that time we were careful always to keep the real objective before us namely that Indonesia is a large country in the South-east Asian region, and the people of Indonesia and India have common bonds of history and of culture, and they being neighbours, there should be abiding friendship between the people of Indonesia and the people of India.

Burma is also experiencing at the present moment many economic difficulties. Also, there are tensions that Burma is now experiencing from certain quarters. We value very greatly the independence and friendship of a neighbouring country Burma. There have been several exchanges of visits between the heads of governments of the two countries, and it has always been a great pleasure to welcome the chairman Mr. Ne Win in our country, and the Government and the people of Burma also have been greatly pleased by the visits of the heads of our Government to Burma. Our relations are very close, very cordial, and we are working in mutual interest and in a spirit of mutual help.

As the Prime Minister has mentioned, the Governor-General of Ceylon paid us a visit. Our Prime Minister went to Ceylon and paid a visit to that country. These are very important links and we should greatly value them.

Coming to the other countries in South-east, Asia, for instance, countries like Thailand, Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia etc. we have got very excellent economic and cultural relations. Also, there is constant exchange of views on important issues. Then, our relations with Australia and New Zealand are also good. The visit of our Deputy Prime Minister to Japan was also very successful. All these things show that we attach the highest importance to our relationship with our neighbouring countries in the South-east Asian region.

In the West Asian region also, our position today is such that we can say with a great deal of confidence that our relations with all the Arab countries are excellent. There are as many as 10 Arab countries in the North of African and the west of Asia and our relations with them are excellent. Our trade relations, political relations, cultural relations etc. are in a very excellent form, and there is a great deal of appreciation of the just stand that India took in the Arab-Israel conflict when we saw the situation in the correct perspective and raised our voice in unmistakable terms

[Shri Swaran Singh]

in favour of justice and against aggression and thus kept the banner aloft . . .

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : . . . of national humiliation.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : . . . of national honour. If some people think that to connive at a country grabbing the fruits of aggression would redound to the honour of the country, then I submit that they have still to know the meaning of the word 'honour'. Perhaps, my hon. friend has forgotten all that he has learnt in the foreign service.

AN HON. MEMBER : He has no sense of shame.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Here is a case where even today we have got areas in Arab countries under Israel possession, areas which are admittedly in Arab countries. Even the friends of Shri M. L. Sondhi admit that they are Arab countries, as for example, Sinai

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : I have Arab friends also, in Saudi Arabia, for instance.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I thought that he had written them off. Otherwise he could not have used that expression.

I would like to say that here is the case where even now Israel is in occupation of territories which are admittedly Arab territories, and some of their leaders in a flamboyant manner say that they are not going to vacate those territories. Can there be a more flagrant case of aggression, in fact, not only aggression, but gloating over aggression. And here are our friends like Shri M. L. Sondhi who say that to raise our voice in favour of vacating the aggression and depriving the Israelis of their going ahead with the enjoyment of the fruits of aggression is a matter of national humiliation; it is amazing that he should use such a word as humiliation. It is humiliating to think in those terms.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : I Challenge him to fight an election on this issue anywhere, in Jullundur, for instance. There are countries that think that our country has been purchased by the Arab countries.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am very glad that Shri M. L. Sondhi who also comes from Jullundur which is his home town reminds me of fighting an election in Jullundur. I have fought six elections in Jullundur, and the only election that Shri M. L. Sondhi has fought is in Delhi. Therefore, I think he does not know Jullundur. Of course, we are proud of him because he was a bright student of Khalsa College there but he has now fallen in bad company and so he has been progressively forgetting the good things that we had taught him. But I think he had retired himself a little because I was going to give him a compliment for the speech that he delivered yesterday.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : Shri Swaran Singh has been a Minister for nearly thirty years, whereas Shri M. L. Sondhi is not even thirty years old.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I wish to compliment Shri M. L. Sondhi because he had tried to salvage some of the positions which the Jan Sangh had progressively lost by adopting a very reactionary policy in the international sphere. Yesterday he did make an attempt, though it was a feeble attempt; I could see, the stresses and strains on him from Shri Bal Raj Madhok on the one side, from Shri Shrichand Goel on the other and from Shri A. B. Vajpayee on the third side. So, he did try to do some rope-dancing and some tight rope-dancing at that.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : I thank him for taking so much interest in the Jan Sangh. If he continues that effort, I shall be delighted because he might possibly be able to bring a certain measure of realism in the otherwise highly retrograde and highly reactionary policies of the Jan Sangh. This is just by the way and I am sorry for this interlude.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : He is creating groupism in the Jan Sangh.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The groups are already there . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : Groupism is the monopoly of the Congress alone.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : . . . and I cannot forget to take notice of them. If he does not want me to take notice of them, I would not because the hon. Member will find out for himself what their position is.

Sir, coming back to the Arab-Israel position, the Government of India's representative in the Security Council did a great deal in bringing realism to the whole situation. I am very happy to recall it, because I was at one stage despondent as to whether the Security Council would be able to arrive at an consensus about a resolution, but, ultimately I am happy that a near-unanimous resolution was adopted by the Security Council which has laid down certain fundamental principles which should be the basis for bringing permanent and lasting peace in West Asia and we should bless the efforts of the United Nations representative who is at the present moment engaged in very serious and delicate talks with Israel on the one side and the Arab countries on the other. And let us hope that his efforts will result in restoring normalcy in this region.

I would like to make one position quite clear. We have always been in favour of safeguarding the sovereignty and integrity of all countries in that region and in this is included Israel. It is wrong to suggest that we have adopted policies which are in any way anti-Israel, in fact anti any country. We are interested in preserving the sovereignty and integrity of every country in this region and we are also interested in the use of the international water-ways.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Do you remember Tibet ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, we are also interested in presenting the

right of navigation in the international water-ways for all shipping. Sir, this is a vital route for our economy and we are very much interested in re-opening the Suez Canal.

SHRI NATH PAI : For Israel also?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I want Mr. Nath Pai to study that clause in the resolution to which we are a party in which we have said

SHRI NATH PAI : Whose resolution is it ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This was a joint resolution moved by many countries.

SHRI NATH PAI : That is our point. Who moved it ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I think, the British representative.

SHRI NATH PAI : It was not India's resolution. India's resolution could not have come because of your partisan attitude. Anyway, there is a resolution, I agree.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : You cannot take credit for that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I was trying to inform the House about the developments there. I am not taking any credit for this that we did it.

SHRI NATH PAI : You were.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I take the credit that we toed a line and we actually pursued a policy which ultimately resulted in creation of a consensus.

Somehow or other, there are certain friends in our country who would like to give all the credit when it is a British resolution or a Soviet Union resolution or a United States resolution, but they would never like to consider our own contribution which would help them. I will be content with differing with them.

Mr. Masani's face absolutely became bright when I recalled that it was the British representative, Lord Caradon's resolution which was approved.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMIKANTTAM-MA (Khammam) : We are only sorry for you.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I can say, I wish them well. I hope that the pressure of public opinion and the opinions expressed strongly in this House will continue to instil in their minds a greater regard and love for the representatives of their own country and they would not always be looking round to representatives of other countries.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Public opinion is not with you on West Asia. You are hopelessly isolated.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We know the public opinion on West Asia.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Not quite.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We know India is essentially secular and we have always opposed forces of aggression and have always been in favour of restoration of areas which might be in the possession of an aggressor. This is the public opinion and merely because there are some friends like Mr. Masani with powerful lobbies and merely because....

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : Please remember Tibet.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : From the desert you go the plateau. I will come to the plateau also. Rest assured I will not leave that.

It is wrong to say, and it is an injustice to the Indian people, wedded as they are to secularism and to the support of progressive forces, that they are in this respect with Israel and not with the Arabs.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : They are neutral, they are objective.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : That is the greatest disservice that is being done, because the good that the Government wants to achieve is sought to be belittled and clouded by expressions of opinion of this nature which I strongly repudiate. Otherwise, so far as the West Asian situation is concerned.....

SHRI NATH PAI : You were diverted by Mr. Masani. You were making a very important statement which was a new line of thinking for us. Would you kindly tell us more about it. You said this Government stands by the right of all nations to use international waterways. Do we understand that even Israel is included when you say all nations?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The words of the resolution are quite clear.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI : Why not give a direct answer?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I know how to give a direct answer, and also to give an indirect answer.

SHRI NATH PAI : You specialise in it, that is our worry.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I had something to do with the formulation and evaluation of some of these principles which are incorporated in the Security Council resolution, and there is now a concensus that the international waterways should be open for innocent navigation, for normal trade, to all countries. It is quite another consideration, to which I did not want to refer at this stage, because I do not want to prejudice the ultimate success of the negotiations that might be undertaken by the U.N. representative, namely what other conditions could be superimposed which could be based either on national security or defence or other matters, they are matters of detail. So, I would not like at this stage to say anything more on that. The words of the resolution and the principle that is incorporated in one of the clause is quite clear, and I would suggest that that may be studied carefully. I am not saying anything new. All these points, sovereignty and integrity of all States, the use of international waterways, restoration to position before the aggression took place, these are all incorporated in the resolution which has been approved even by those countries for whom Mr. Masani has a better word than India. All these countries have approved that resolution.

I would like now to say a few words about the policy on Tibet. It happened to be here when Mr. Sondhi was making his speech, and I was very much intrigued to notice that he thought that I was anti-Tibet, a little more anti-Tibet, and that perhaps Mr. Chagla was a little more pro-Tibet. It is amazing that the assessment should be based on these considerations. Mr. Sondhi or his other colleagues in the Jana Sangh may be anti-many countries, because unfortunately some of their programmes are negative. And here was a young friend from East Pakistan who was describing our policy towards Pakistan....

B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : I am not from East Pakistan, I am from West Bengal.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It was a slip of the tongue, it will not be there on the record, I will correct it (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER : Colossal ignorance.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : There are many friends who came from West Pakistan and they are now in West Bengal. Anyhow, this was a slip of the tongue on my part, and I am very grateful to Mr. Gupta to remind the House of it and ridicule it, because that is the level to which he goes.

Mr. Sondhi and several other friends, I will not name them, are somehow or other in the grip of a phobia of anti-something. Either their approach is anti-China or anti-Tibet or pro-Tibet or anti-Pakistan or pro-Pakistan. That is not the attitude of the Government of India. None of us is either pro-Tibet or anti-Tibet. We see the situation in its proper perspective. Here is a country which is our neighbour. And people talk lightly about the treaties entered into and the declarations entered into and suddenly, if it is inconvenient to them, they say, "you scrap this; you cancel this; you repudiate this treaty." It was my friend from Cooch-Bihar who said that the Nehru-Liaquat Pact should be scrapped

It was said that the Tashkent Declaration is quite useless, "You forget about it."

AN HON. MEMBER : It is correct.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If such a thing is correct, then it is a highly irresponsible thing and no government can be credible if they are going to scrap the treaties entered into, merely because it is inconvenient or it is uncomfortable. (*Interruption*). That is a spirit which we should eschew. I say in all seriousness, not as a point of argument.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : You are evading Tibet.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am coming to that. Because there is a treaty, because you are erroneously adopting a policy, we should forget the terms of the treaty ! Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I say this in all seriousness. This is a light-hearted manner which is shown when they say that the agreements that we entered into with other countries, whether it is the Nehru-Liaquat Pact or our agreement on borders or the Tashkent Declaration.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Or the Privy purse ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Internal matters, we shall discuss when we discuss the internal matters.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is a breach of privilege.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Internal economic matters and our attitude towards them are separate matters. What is Mr. Masani's argument ? Does he mean that I should dishonour all the agreements we entered into with others outside, and honour only all the agreements entered into inside?

SHRI M. R. MASANI : All.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am not going to do it. Inside the country, this Parliament is sovereign, and any economic issue is a matter which can be finally and firmly and unalterably decided by Parliament, if Parliament, in its wisdom, one day decides to do away

[Shri Swaran Singh]

with private property, or nationalise banks or remove the privy purse, it is the prerogative of Parliament. There is no question of agreement or non-agreement in these matters, because the Constitution is supreme and Parliament is supreme. You can take any decision you like. But I would like to remind the hon. House that this Parliament has to honour the international agreements. I would beg of the hon. Members, even those who disagree with the Government, not to lightly challenge the concluded treaties and agreements, and they should not urge that these should be got over.

SHRI NATH PAI : I agree.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : You agree, but there are several others who do not. That is my difficulty. I have to see in many directions. If you are the only man whom I have to satisfy then I will finish the thing in a short while. But there is a wide spectrum and some one wants to pull in one direction and some others in the other direction.

SHRI NATH PAI : You are looking for loopholes in order to evade the issue. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Minister is saying that the treaties that India has entered into with other countries should not be disregarded. I agree. We subscribe to it. But let him answer this question : was there a stipulation on the part of India in the treaty we entered into with China in 1954 to see that the personality, the entity and the freedom of the people of Tibet is destroyed? I would like to know the clause in which we have agreed to that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This is not a new point. This has been discussed several times.

SHRI NATH PAI : Is it?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Yes. I can quote chapter and verse when this point was gone into in the course of the debates. I myself have handled it more than once here. Our treaty with China on Tibet is quite clear : we have

accepted certain Chinese position in relation to Tibet.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Shame.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He is shouting, "shame." What I am saying is—

SHRI RANJIT SINGH (Khalilabad) : *Sabash*.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Even if it is *sabash*, I will be sorry. Even if the *sabash* is from Mr. Sondhi or Mr. Masani, I will be sorry because it means that I have done something which is incorrect.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : Sir, you are getting allergic to me. Mr. Ranjit Singh said *sabash*.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am in a rather difficult position to choose between the two. I have been in charge of External Affairs and Mr. Sondhi has been in the foreign service. Now I am Defence Minister and Mr. Ranjit Singh has been in the Army. I have to keep a balance between the two.

Coming to the treaty with China on Tibet, we had taken a certain attitude with regard to Tibet after taking into consideration everything — historical background, documents, etc., and even the McMahon line on the eastern side of our border; there were talks with Tibetans. I do not want to go into all these details. All those matters are known to the House. If there has been a conflict later on, to get away from that treaty is a suggestion which is most fantastic. Even if any particular clause of that treaty has not been actually adopted by any country, whether that entitles us to smash that treaty, to obliterate it . . . (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There should be no more interruptions.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I want to make it clear that notwithstanding all these pressures that are mounted from time to time our policy on Tibet continues to be what it was. We cannot recognise Dalai Lama as the head of an emigre government, because

there is no such government. This matter has been clarified more than once.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : The public opinion in the Congress Party is in favour of Tibet. You are against Tibet. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You were not a member then; this issue was discussed threadbare since 1958.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : The Chair is not expected to reply, Sir. It is for the minister to reply.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Again and again I requested Mr. Sondhi not to interrupt. You will have to resume your seat.

श्री कंवरलाल गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आप बोलने दीजिये। मुझे आप से शिकायत है। यह आप का काम है कि वह मिनिस्टर का काम है? आपको मेरी बात सुननी पड़ेगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Mr. Swaran Singh has a vendetta against Tibet. He is anti-Tibet. The Dalai Lama is not safe as long as Mr. Swaran Singh is there. The Dalai Lama is a prisoner in India. Mr. Chagla was pro-Tibet . . . (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This matter was discussed umpteen times. Mr. Gupta, please resume your seat. Nothing will go on record now. (*Interruptions*).**

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is better to know our mind and to know our policy clearly. Any amount of confusion or any amount of lack of appreciation is not good. There can be a difference of opinion, but there should be no misapprehension about a particular policy that we pursue. We have our differences with China. China is in illegal occupation of our territory. They are mounting pressures on us in a variety of

ways. Collusion between China and Pakistan is there. All these factors are known to us and to the country. But let our judgment, let our attitude not be clouded on issues about which there is no scope for confusion. If we get confused on every issue, then we are not serving the country, we are not serving the national interest.

Take this question of recognition of Formosa. The Prime Minister explained this matter. It is surprising that it was again raised here. The essential point there is that the Government in Formosa claims that they are the rightful and the only Government of the whole of China including the vast mainland of China. It will be fantastic if we are to accept that claim. It is on account of this fact that they are in the United Nations, in fact they are represented in the Security Council, that they make this claim. But will it be realistic for us. And, on this most sensitive issue that affects us daily—I think it will do some good to my friends from Jan Sangh if they know this—the border question, the position of the Formosan Government is precisely the same as that of the Peking Government.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : Not, it is not true.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Not at all, it is false.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Shri Gupta is not yet a representative of the Formosan Government. He is an hon. Member of this House.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Are you their representative?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have talked with their Foreign Minister as Foreign Minister and I know their views. I say this in all solemnity that the only difference they make is this. It is in their published books.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : No. That is not correct.

**Not recorded

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is amazing that friends from the Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh are trying to defend the Formosan attitude on this issue. The important question for us to remember is, irrespective of their stand, I repeat, that their stand on this Sino-Indian border dispute is the same. The Formosan view is the same. They also claim the same area which the Peking Government is claiming. At any rate, here is a Government which claims to say that their writ runs over the whole of China. Whether we are at peace or in conflict or exchange of arms—it is with the Chinese army—how can we ignore hard reality of fact, hard reality of geography, hard reality of positions at the border. It is amazing that those people who ask us to recognise Formosa as the legitimate Government of the whole of China . . .

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Only for Formosa.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : That they do not say, that they are only in Formosa. Shri Gupta does not know the Formosan mind on this issue. I am very sorry. I cannot go to their help.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : I know your mind.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) : Recognise the Government of Formosa and the Chinese army may withdraw from our border. That possibility is there. Why don't you try that?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I will commend the observation of an important Member of the Opposition to another Member of the Opposition. That is all that I can say. I will be glad if both of them were to combine, and whether it is Formosa or . . .

SHRI NATH PAI : We can pay you in the same coin. You recommend your view, to the Deputy Leader of the Congress Party, on Tibet as the view of the Defence Minister of Government.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am very glad that Shri Nath Pai is in a somewhat lighter mood now, because he had become very tense at one stage. I want to say this in clear terms that our position with regard to Formosa and our position on Tibet remains the same, because raising these issues does not help us. In fact, it embarrasses us in the international community. A great deal of harm is done by doing that. The opposition has not clearly understood all these issues.

There were several other unimportant matters, unimportant in the sense that they were not policy matters, and it is not my intention to go into any great detail about them. But I would like to say one or two things about Pakistan.

I was greatly disturbed when I found the hon. Member from Cooch Behar saying that there was unrest in East Pakistan and that was the time when India should have helped the process of insurgency, or whatever it was, in East Pakistan. I would appeal to this hon. House to view this thing in its proper perspective, and it will be a very dangerous principle for us to adopt that we should interfere in the internal affairs of another country. We tell others "what business has Pakistan to give arms to Mizos or Nagas?". Every day we take it up with the Government of Pakistan and we say that it is a very wrong policy that they are pursuing. When we claim that this is a wrong policy, can you suggest that we have to pursue a similar wrong policy when it deals with Pakistan territory? It will be very wrong for us to view this matter in that perspective. Pakistan is our neighbour. We do have an unfortunate state of relationship with Pakistan. Yet, as our Prime Minister has stated more than once, it is the desire of the Government of India, and I hope also of the people of India, that the two countries should live in peace, in friendship as good neighbours.

AN HON. MEMBER : Not at any cost.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : That is the desirable objective to have. To get

irritated over things that we do not like and to suggest doing in another country something which we do not like to be done in our country by another country, it is not a great virtue; in fact, it is a wrong approach. We should not give up our basic policy and principles in this respect. We have to pursue our basic policy, because that is the only correct policy in international affairs, not to interfere in the internal affairs of another country. We should not interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. Their relations with East Pakistan is a matter entirely for them to decide. What measure of autonomy East Pakistan or West Pakistan gets, it is entirely a matter for them to decide just as in relation to Nagaland, Maharashtra, Punjab or Haryana, whatever re-organisation we make is entirely for us, for this Parliament, to decide. How will we react if there is any interference in our affairs by a foreign power? So, what we expect others to do unto us, we should do to others. So, there cannot be any justification for suggesting that we should interfere in these matters. In fact, these are the voices which are exploited against India; these are the voices which are used against India. India is always projected in this light, that India has not reconciled herself to the fact of partition and it still continues to have some sort of lurking desire in its mind to undo this partition. So, this is a wrong policy, a bad policy from our national point of view. It comes in the way of development of good-neighbourliness between India and Pakistan. We should not do that.

A great deal has been said about enclaves. I want to make the position quite clear. We entered into a solemn agreement with Pakistan to exchange the enclaves. We stand by that agreement and we will honour that agreement, whatever happens. In fact, the Parliament amended this Constitution and has ratified the agreement on enclaves. It is unfortunate that the matter has been prolonged. Some litigation is still going on, unfortunately, in the High Court of Calcutta. After this sovereign Parliament, as the amender of

the Constitution, has ratified that agreement, it does not lie in the mouth of any hon. Member, however irritated he might be, to suggest that we should do away with all those agreements and that we should look at the whole thing *de novo*.

16 Hrs.

It is a very, very dangerous approach and I would beg of hon. Members not to slip into this temptation with a view to scoring the deal in a limited manner. You will be harming the interests of the country in the long run . . . (Interruption). In these international affairs if we give up sanity, if we give up the sanctity of agreements and if we are carried away by the moment, ultimately we have to pay a bigger price.

In this short time, Sir, I have tried to cover most of the points. I oppose all the substitute motions that have been moved except the one moved by my hon. friend, Shri Chintamani Panigrahi.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to substitute motion No. 13 which he approves of. It says :—

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves the same.”

Is he asking the House to approve of the international situation, involving the occupation of Indian territory by China and Pakistan and of Arab territory by Israel? Are you approving of the international situation also?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I think, Shri Masani has been carried away by dialectics. The international situation has been discussed. There is no clause artifying any particular attitude of the Government of India. This is the normal form in which approval is given to the policy of the Government of India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There is something which I would call vagueness in it. Will you correct it?

SHRI P. K. DEO : How can it be corrected at this stage ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We approve the policy. That is the main question. He will take the leave of the House to amend it.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : When the time comes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Yes This is not the normal formula; there is a slight need for amendment. We will do it with the approval of the House.

Now, there are substitute motions by Saravashri Sequeira, Masani, Goel, Bharati, Kundu, Shastri and Shiva Chandra Jha. Shall I put all of them together to the vote of the House ?

SHRI M. R. MASANI : No, Sir. We are pressing our substitute motions Nos. 2 and 4 to a vote.

SHRI S. KUNDU : I am also pressing my substitute motion, No. 10, to a vote.

SHRI SHRI CHAND GOEL (Chandigarh) : We want our substitute motion to be put separately.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : It is the same as No. 2.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is more or less covered by Shri Masani's. Only the wording is slightly different.

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA : (Madhubani) : I want my substitute motion to be put separately.

SHRI B. K. DAS CHOWDHURY : My substitute motion, No. 1, should also be put separately.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, I will first put the disapproval motions to the vote of the House. The first one is by Shri Masani.

The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, disapproves of the policies pursued by the Government in recent months." (2)

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 33]

[16.10 Hrs.

AYES

Amat, Shri D.
 Amersey, Shri M.
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
 Behera, Shri Baidhar
 Bharat Singh, Shri
 Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
 Dandeker, Shri N.
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
 Deb, Shri D. N.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri P. K.
 Dhrangadhra, Shri Sriraj Meghrajji
 Goel, Shri Shri Chand
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
 Guha, Shri Samar
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Kachwai, Shri Hukum Chand
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal

Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kundu, Shri S.
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Y. S.
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Mahato, Shri Bhajahari
 Maiti, Shri S. N.
 Majhi, Shri M.
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Misra, Shri Srinibas
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.
 Mohan Swarup, Shri
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Naik, Shri R. V.
 Onkar Singh, Shri
 Parmar, Shri D. R.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Ranjit Singh, Shri

Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sen, Shri Deven
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir

Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Thakur, Shri P. R.

NOES

Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Baswant, Shri
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Bholu Nath, Shri
 Brahma, Shri Rupnath
 Buta Singh, Shri
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati
 Gowda, Shri M. H.*
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hari Krishna, Shri
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri

Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S. C.
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kamble, Shri
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kavade, Shri B. R.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Khan, Shri M. A.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kotoki Shri Liladhar
 Krishnan Shri G. Y.
 Kureel Shri B. N.
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Malimariyappa, Shri
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao
 Manikya Bahadur, Shri
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Mehta, Shri Asoka
 Mehta, Shri P. M.
 Melkote, Dr.
 Menon, Shri Govinda
 Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Smt.
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
 Mohsin, Shri
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani

*Wrongly voted for 'NOES'

Pant, Shri K. C.
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri
 Patil, Shri Anantrao
 Patil, Shri C. A.
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Ram Kishan, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Saigal, Shri A. S.
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara
 Sarma, Shri A. T.

Savitri Shayam, Shrimati
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Sayyad Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayana
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethuramae, Shri N.
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Sharma, Shri M. R.
 Shastri, Shri B. N.
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Sheth, Shri T. M.
 Shinkree, Shri
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Sursingh, Shri
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Uikay, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The *result of the Division is :

Ayes	51
Noes	.. 149

The motion was negated

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, I put Amendments Nos. 7 and 8 together to the vote of the House.

The substitute motions Nos. 7 & 8 were put and negated.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will now put Mr. Kundu's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 10.

SHRI S. KUNDU : Please read it out, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the Government has failed to—

- (a) project the right image of India abroad by not pursuing a correct non-aligned policy in the international sphere;
- (b) evolve a correct policy towards the Afro-Asian countries." (10)

The motion was negated

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will now put Mr. Shiv Kumar Shastri's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 11.

*The following Members also recorded their votes :—

Ayes—Sarvashri Nath Pai, Arjan Singh Bhadoria, M. H. Gowda, S. S. Kothari and Bansh Narain Singh.
 Noes—Shrimati Ganga Devi.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री (बाघपत्त) :
इसे पढ़ दिया जाय ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, disapproves of the foreign policy of the Government because the Government has failed to protect the interests of India in the West Asia and the South-East Asia."(11)

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will now put Mr. Shiva Chandra Jha's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 12,

The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the Government of India has failed to—

- (a) give up its pusillanimous policy in voicing for the cause of democracy and socialism, wherever they are endangered; and
- (b) speak for the revival of the democratic Government in Nepal and the release of Shri B. P. Koirala." (12).

Division No. 34]

[16. 19 Hrs.

AYES

Amat, Shri D.
Amersy, Shri M.
Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
Bansh Narain Singh, Shri
Behera, Shri Baidhar
Bharat Singh, Shri
Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I will put Mr. B. K. Daschowdhury's amendment to the vote of the House, Amendment No. 1. This is a long one. The hon. Member himself may read it out.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : It is not necessary to read it out. You may put it to the vote of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I now put Amendment No. 1 to the vote of the House.

The substitute motion No. 1 was put and negatived

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will now put Amendment No. 4—Mr. Masani's Amendment—to the vote of the House.

The question is :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the view that the recent agreement between the Press Information Bureau of the Indian Government and the Soviet news and feature agency *Novosti* should be revoked and a thorough enquiry made into the circumstances leading to the signing of this agreement." (4)

The Lok Sabha divided :

Dandeker, Shri N.
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
Deo, Shri P. K.
Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
Goel, Shri Shri Chand
Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
Gowda, Shri M. H.

Guha, Shri Samar
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Imam, Shri J. M.
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Y. S.
 Maiti, Shri S. N.
 Majhi, Shri M.
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Meghrajji, Shri
 Misra, Shri Srinibas
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Naik, Shri R. V.

Onkar Singh, Shri
 Parmar, Shri D. R.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Ramani, Shri K.
 Ranjit Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sequeira, Shri
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Thakur, Shri P. R.
 Viswanathan, Shri G.

NOES

Adichan, Shri P. C.
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan
 Barua, Shri R.
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Baswant, Shri
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bhattacharya, Shri C. K.
 Bhola Nath, Shri
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Brahma, Shri Rupnath
 Buta Singh, Shri
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
 Diesh Singh, Shri
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Govit, Shri Tukaram
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti

Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hari Krishna, Shri
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulsidas
 Jagiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S. C.
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kamble, Shri
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kavade, Shri B. R.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali
 Khan, Shri M. A.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Malimariyappa, Shri
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao
 Manikya Bahadur, Shri
 Marandi, Shri
 Masuria Din, Shri

Mehta, Shri Asoka	Roy, Shrimati Uma
Mehta, Shri P. M.	Saha, Dr. S. K.
Melkote, Dr.	Saigal, Shri A. S.
Menon, Shri Govinda	Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
Minimata, Shrimati Agam Dass Guru	Sanghi, Shri N. K.
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali	Sanjit Rupji, Shri
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Mishra, Shri G. S.	Sapre, Shrimati Tara
Mohsin, Shri	Sarma, Shri A. T.
Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati	Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri	Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Murthi, Shri B. S.	Sayyad Ali, Shri
Nageshwar, Shri	Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
Naghoor, Shri M. N.	Sen, Shri P. G.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan	Sethuramae, Shri N.
Narayanan, Shri	Shambhu Nath, Shri
Oraon, Shri Kartik	Sharma, Shri M. R.
Padmavati Devi, Shrimati	Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
Pandey, Shri K. N.	Shastri, Shri B. N.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo	Shastri, Shri R.
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath	Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani	Sheo Narain, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.	Sher Singh, Shri
Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai	Sheth, Shri T. M.
Partap Singh, Shri	Shinkre, Shri
Parthasarathy, Shri	Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
Patil, Shri A. V.	Siddeshwar Prasad, Shri
Pital, Shri C. A.	Singh, Shri D. N.
Patil, Shri N. R.	Singh, Shri D. V.
Patil, Shri S. B.	Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
Patil, Shri S. D.	Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
Patil, Shri T. A.	Sursingh, Shri
Pramanik, Shri J. N.	Swaran Singh, Shri
Radhabai, Shrimati B	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Raj Deo Singh, Shri	Uikey, Shri M. G.
Ram Kishan, Shri	Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.	Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Ram Swarup, Shri	Verma, Shri Balgovind
Randhir Singh, Shri	Verma, Shri Prem Chand
Reddi, Shri G. S.	Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Reddy, Shri P. Antony	Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila	Yadab, Shri N. P.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The result* of the Division is : Ayes : 48; Noes : 160.

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put Mr. Sequirra's substitute motion No. 9.

The substitute motion No. 9 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now substitute motion No. 13 of Mr. Chintamani Panigrahi. There is an amendment to it.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Sir, there is always a procedure to give amendments.

*The following Members also recorded their votes : —

Ayes—Sarvashri Nath Pai, Kiruttinan, S. S. Kothari, and D. N. Deb.

Noes—Shri Ramshekhar Prasad Singh.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It was given already.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Sir, can an amendment be given to another amendment, and if so, under what rule ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If a certain amendment is not clear, then with the permission of the House a verbal change can be made to provide a clearer enunciation. Beyond that there is nothing in this.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : My amendment is that in the substitute motion No. 13, at the end, for the word 'same' substitute 'policy of the Government of India.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am explaining what it is. To make it clearer, he has proposed an amendment to substitute 'same' by 'policy of the Government of India'. I will now put Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's amendment to vote.

The question is :

"That in substitute motion No. 13, at the end, for the word 'same', substitute 'policy of the Government of India'."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS 'Aye'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Those against will please say 'No'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : 'No'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The 'Ayes' have it, the 'Ayes' have it; the amendment to the substitute motion is adopted.

I shall now put substitute motion No. 13, as amended, to the vote of the House.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Sir, we are unable to understand what you have been talking to Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The first question was that there was a verbal amendment for which the approval of the House was taken. That is all. But by mistake somebody shouted 'No'. That is all. Beyond that nothing.

SHRI M. R. MASANI : It was not a mistake.

SHRI N. DANDEKER : We deliberately said 'No'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I shall put the substitute motion moved by Shri Panigrahi with this verbal amendment...

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : For the word 'same', the words 'policy of the Government of India' are to be put in.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am putting the substantive motion as now verbally amended to the vote of the House.

SHRI NATH PAI : If the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs wants to talk to you, even he must stand. What is this dialogue between the two of you? This is very disorderly.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the policy of the Government of India".

(13 as amended)

The Lok Sabha divided :

DIVISION No. 35]

[16.27 Hrs.

AYES

- Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Shashibhushan
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Baswant, Shri
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Bholu Nath, Shri
 Brahma, Shri Rupnath
 Buta Singh, Shri
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati
 Gupta, Shri Lakhna Lal
 Hari Krishna, Shri
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulsidas
 Jagiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S. C.
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kamble, Shri
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Karni Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kavade, Shri B. R.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Khan, Shri M. A.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Malimariyappa, Shri
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao
 Marandi, Shri
 Masuria Din, Shri
 Mehta, Shri Asoka
 Mehta, Shri P. M.
 Melkote, Dr.
 Menon, Shri Govinda
 Minimata, Shrimati Agam Das Guru
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mohsin, Shri
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Nageshwar, Shri
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri
 Patil, Shri A. V.
 Patil, Shri C. A.
 Patil, Shri Deorao
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.

Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Rajani Gandha, Kumari
 Rajasekharan, Shri
 Ram Kishan, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Saigal, Shri A. S.
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sanjit Rupji, Shri
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara
 Sarma, Shri A. T.
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Sayyad Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayana
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethuramae, Shri N.
 Shah, Shri Manabendra

Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri M. R.
 Shastri, Shri B. N.
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Sheth, Shri T. M.
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Sursingh, Shri
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Uikey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.

NOES

Adichan, Shri P. C.
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amersey, Shri M.
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
 Bansh Narain Singh, Shri
 Behera, Shri Baidhar
 Bharat Singh, Shri
 Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Brij Raj Singh—Kotah, Shri
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Dandeker, Shri N.
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri P. K.
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Dhirendranath, Shri
 Goel, Shri Shri Chand
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
 Guha, Shri Samar
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Jha, Shri S. C.
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali

Kirutinan, Shri
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Y. S.
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Maiti, Shri S. N.
 Majhi, Shri M.
 Manikya Bahadur, Shri*
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Meghrajji, Shri
 Misra, Shri Srinibas
 Mohamed Imam, Shri
 Mohan Swarup, Shri
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Naidu, Shri Ramabadra
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Naik, Shri R. V.
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan
 Nath Pai, Shri
 Onkar Singh, Shri
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
 Parmar, Shri D. R.
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Ranjit Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Ray, Shri Rabi

*Wrongly voted for 'NOES'.

Samanta, Shri S. C.
Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
Sequeira, Shri
Sharda Nand, Shri
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Shastri, Shri R.
Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh

Shivappa, Shri N.
Singh, Shri J. B.
Sivasankaran, Shri
Sondhi, Shri M. L.
Thakur, Shri Gunanand
Thakur, Shri P. R.
Umanath, Shri
Viswanathan, Shri G.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The result of the Division is : Ayes 156; Noes 69.

The motion was adopted

16.26 hrs.

HARYANA STATE LEGISLATURE (DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY) : On
behalf of Shri Y. B. Chavan, I beg to
move :

"That the Bill to confer on the President the powers of the Legislature of the State of Haryana to make laws, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration".

श्री प० सा० रामस्वामल (गंगानगर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, में हिन्दी भाषी हूँ लेकिन
मुझे यह अंग्रेजी की डायरी दी गई है . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We have taken a different decision. He might take up the matter with the Minister concerned, not at this juncture.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : On the 31st of last month, the President issued a Proclamation in relation to the State of Haryana under art. 356 of the Constitution dissolving the Assembly of the State. The two Houses of Parliament approved the Proclamation. Under the Proclamation, Parliament is vested

with the powers of the legislature of the State of Haryana. Now, Parliament has to enact certain laws in regard to the State. This has become very much necessary now as some of the ordinances issued by the Governor are pending and enactments have to be made by Parliament. This has to be done within 6 weeks of the summoning of Parliament.

The ordinances in question are very important. They go to augment the resources of the State. Let me mention some of them : The Haryana Land Revenue (Additional Surcharge) Ordinance, 1967, which was published in the Gazette of India dated 15 July 1967 is expected to bring in 50 per cent more income from land revenue; similarly the Punjab Urban Immovable Tax (Haryana Amendment) Ordinance, 1967 and the Indian Stamp (Haryana Amendment) Ordinance, 1967 and several other ordinances will bring in substantial additional revenue to the State Government.

Sub-Clause (a) of cl. 1 of art. 357 confers on the President the powers of the Legislature of the State of Haryana to enact laws under the authority of Parliament. This is not the first time that such enactments have had to be brought before this House. This was done in the past when Proclamations were issued with regard to the Punjab in 1951 and 1956, PEPSU in 1953, Andhra Pradesh in 1956, Travancore-Cochin in 1956, Kerala in 1959, 1964 and 1965 and Orissa in 1961.

*The following Members also recorded their votes :—

Ayes—Sarvashri Manikya Bahadur and Bimalkanti Ghosh.

Noes—Sarvashri M. H. Gowda, C. K. Chakrapani and S. S. Kothari