

13.01 HRS.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1975-76—Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall now take up further discussion on the demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. Shri Sequeira.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA (Marmagao): The report of the Ministry of External Affairs that had been placed before this House is to my mind a great deception on the House.

13.02 HRS.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

It starts by saying that relations with the Soviet Union, for example, rest on the solid foundation of mutual respect, mutual advantage and non-interference with each other's affairs. Will somebody please enlighten me how the value of the rouble was unilaterally increased with reference to the rupee by 38 per cent since 1971? Where is the mutual respect if devaluations are made on a unilateral basis? We all know that the rouble is a non-convertible currency to start with and that already it is pegged artificially at a high level.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How do you expect the Minister of External Affairs to deal with that question? It relates to the Ministry of Finance.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: I am referring to the statement in the report and discussing a relationship.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): When is the Minister replying to the debate?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not know. We have still almost three hours to go. So, perhaps after two hours, unless you gentlemen insist on more time... (Interruptions).

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: We seem to be deluding ourselves about the status of our relationship with various countries, very often forgetting our self-interest. Nobody in this country will suggest that we should not be

friends with the Soviet Union. We have been good friends, and we should continue to be good friends. Is our friendship so important that we should sacrifice our self-interest? Why are we prepared to divert goods, which we can sell for free foreign exchange to the Soviet Union, in order to pay for this devaluation, which they have done unilaterally?

The same delusion that plagues us with reference to the Soviet seems to plague us with reference to the Americans also. On page 5 of the report, it is said:

"A new beginning was made towards a more mature relationship with the visit of Dr. Henry Kissinger to India in October 1974."

After the end of the year, the Americans resumed arms supplies to Pakistan. This is the sort of delusion that seems to be practised in the corridors of South Block. If this is the basis on which we are conducting our external affairs, are we surprised that we have not been successful in protecting our interests?

Take the Indian Ocean for example. The Prime Minister and her colleagues are raising the spectre of the threat from the sea, and the big noise we hear is about the base the Americans are building at Diego Garcia. Here is a map published by the United Nations. If you look at it, you will see right next to Diego Garcia, the Soviets have got an anchorage. Off Berbera they have another anchorage, and at Berbera they have a base. They have got two mooring buoys south of Madagascar. They have one off Mozambique. They have got another next to Gan.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is a mooring buoy?

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: Mooring buoys are used by military submarines. They are also used by ships at night. It is a military thing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mooring buoy is different from a base.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: The heading of this U.N. map is:

"Main bases, fleet anchorages and mooring buoys of external great powers in the Indian Ocean".

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is trying to restore the balance. But I am only trying to point out that a mooring buoy is something done on the high seas, which is outside and beyond the jurisdiction of any littoral country. Also, it cannot be compared to a base.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: This may be your opinion, but I do not share it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You agree this is on the high seas beyond the jurisdiction of any littoral country?

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: We are not discussing jurisdiction. Our line in this country has been, we want this ocean of which we are a littoral State, to be free of foreign naval military presence. This may not be your line, but this has been the line of the Government of India and I fully agree with it. Yesterday we heard a distinguished member of this House, Prof. Hiren Mukherjee, suggesting as I understood him, that if we see a Russian cruiser, we should view it as a fishing boat, but if we see an American corvette, we should view it as a cruiser!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder!

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: Not if it is blind or half blind. What I am objecting is this half blindness. May be my English is not that good. We should not shut our eyes to the increasing presence of various powers in this ocean. While we continue to preach that we want the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace, I would like the Government to tell us what we are doing in terms of protecting ourselves from all the existing presences.

Yesterday Mr. Dinesh Singh was speaking of a new Asia that has been emerging. But this new Asia has been a long time coming. This has not happened yesterday or day before. I would like the Government to explain why, when in Vietnam the developments that are taking place today are taking place, we do not have even an Ambassador in Hanoi. Is the Minister going to be content with having one in Washington and one in Moscow?

An Hon. Member said yesterday that there was no Asian institution for development. What's fault is this? Being a

country of the size that we are and the position in which we are geographically, was it not our responsibility to spearhead such institutions? Have we done anything about it all these years?

There have been in the recent past two very significant developments. One was the emergence of the oil cartel which brought into focus a problem which all countries including ours have been raising for many years, which is the right of every nation to benefit from its own raw materials. I am very happy that we have backed the OPEC countries in what they are doing in spite of the fact that some of it has economically hit us as well. I think it is in the larger interests that we have gone along with them as we did, but our own interests demand that in other commodities we should enter into similar arrangements and I do not see very much reference to what they are doing in this Report that has been placed before us. I know, for example, that in iron ore the Commerce Minister has already moved and a beginning has been made. I hope it will be successful. More power to the elbow of the Government on that. But what are we doing on tea and other substances in which we are one of the major traders, one of the major exporters?

As a corollary of this development in West Asia, there has been a significant infusion of capital into countries which previously were not surplus. I find that as far as we are concerned, our attitude seems to be that West Asia has capital, we are a country in development, we would like them to invest in here, we would like to have bilateral arrangements with them. But what about the other possibilities, the tremendous manpower that we have in this country, the tremendous expertise that we have in this country which the other countries which are in a position of accepting this investment do not have? What are we doing in terms of creating multi-national institutions in Asia, Africa and in Latin America in collaboration with the OPEC countries in order to utilise the funds that are available with the expertise that we can provide?

One of the most welcome developments that has come about is as a result of the change of regime in Portugal and I am sure that Mr. Chavan will agree with me that a large part

[Shri Erasmo De Sequeira]

of the credit for the speed with which the Portuguese have moved must go the socialist leader in Portugal, Dr Mario Soares. I want to remind the Government, because Government's memory in these matters is rather short, that we have in Goa Daman and Diu a number of people in almost every technocratic branch, starting with teachers right up to engineers and doctors, who speak Portuguese many of whom have got African experience, and whose talents can be used in freed Africa if any request comes from those Governments and who can act as ambassadors of goodwill for India as well. I trust Government will do something in this direction to make use of these people and to protect our interests in those countries.

We often preach that we are pledged to the Afro-Asian bloc which now has been extended to Latin America. Two years ago I had the privilege of being an Observer to the Latin American Parliament session in Guatemala. At this session a resolution was passed which invited us to nominate a delegate to the preparatory Inter-Parliamentary Conference of Africa Asia and Latin America. The ball has been in our court for two years but we have done nothing about it. I am sorry that if we behave like this, those countries are not going to take us seriously. I have received a letter from the Secretary-General of that Parliament that they sent an invitation to the Government to send a delegate to the plenary session of the Latin American Parliament which took place just around the turn of the year and to my knowledge no delegation has been sent by us. Again I think that was a very big faux pas.

It was quite interesting yesterday to hear the former Minister of External Affairs drawing the attention of the present Minister of External Affairs to the emerging Asia and requesting him to forget the emphasis that we have placed on Europe and the more advanced countries, and to look closer to home. Twenty seven years after independence, it only convinces me that we have spent all these years as innocents abroad.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam):
As a student of history, I am always inclined to take a historical view of

things and when one takes the historical view of current international relations, the most fascinating development is the cyclic turn of history. I think history is repeating itself. In the short time available to me, I do not wish to go deep into the pages of history but I would like to highlight one or two aspects.

The western world draws its inspiration for political as well as other matters largely, even today, from the Greece-Roman experience and we know that both Greece and Rome had launched major thrusts towards the East. I do not, however, suggest that Oriental Powers did not have any expansionist ambitions towards the West. We know the course the Hellenic thrust spear-headed by Alexander the Great took and how it ended also. It would be refreshing to us and it is a topical interest today to recall the Alexandrian invasion of the Indus Valley and the battle of Hydaspas. It may be that Alexander had a technical victory over India but the fact remains that immediately after the battle of Hydaspas the Greek or Macedonian soldiers refused to move one inch further although the world conqueror wanted to conquer the entire world. Why? Because the Indian people under Porus showed that no foreign imperial designs would be tolerated in this country, even as the Indian soldiers themselves did not want to carry their own arms beyond their own country. It was a great experience for Alexander.

In the wake of this Alexandrian expansionist motivation Rome also tried to push eastward. A student of the first and second century Rome would recall how the Roman Senate had planned the invasion of Persia perhaps, as a retaliation and how they cultivated Parthia against Persia. But there again the bitter experience of Hydaspas made them confined their attack only to the borders of Persia. It is about this situation perhaps the Prime Minister referred to this morning and the opposition leaders were putting her questions. These Western people did not stop at that, but centuries later, in the sixteenth century, giving up their overland plan of attack, they undertook a maritime conquest. Under the Portuguese they started invasion of the East after crossing the Cape of Good Hope, and came to India, and my own State was the first victim of their

attack. We have pictures in Calicut showing how they came and begged for a few inches of land for trade and later how they colonised and conquered that part of India.

So, taking a cyclic view of history, the whole thing is being repeated now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What about the intervening centuries when the East thrust to the West under the Tartars and the Moors?

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: I know there were the Mongols under Chengis Khan and the Golden Hordes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Moors went up to Spain.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: There were moves, but we are now concerned with the present events and, those intervening periods apart, the expansionist motivation from the West is still visible. Till the sixteen century, they tried to conquer by land. Then they took to the high seas. Then in recent decades, there was some abatement. But now overland and maritime adventurism is now being revived in a subtle form.

Now on our Western land border in Pakistan, we hear sabre-rattling in spite of the Simla. Today, immediately in the wake of the lifting of the arms embargo, we find sabre-rattling in Pakistan synchronising with the setting up of naval bases in the Indian Ocean, by Western Powers. My hon. friend, Shri Sequeria said about mooring buoys being owned by the Soviet Union in the Indian Ocean. In my constituency, there is a major port, Cochin. There are mooring buoys there for the ships to anchor for normal commercial or other purposes. We are concerned with basis for military (naval) purposes. Beyond the territorial waters, ships belonging to any country can have mooring buoys to stop for a while, for fueling purpose, etc.

Coming to Diego Garcia base, Western Powers have not only Diego Garcia but there are 19 other bases from Good Hope to Australia. These are set up primarily by Anglo-American powers. Diego Garcia is not that kind of a mooring buoy. The Soviet Union and other countries may have mooring buoys. But Diego Garcia is specifically meant for military purposes. It is also reported that they are being used to

provide facilities for stocking nuclear war heads. My constituency is hardly 1000 miles away from Diego Garcia base. The ballistic missiles with over 4000 miles range are being kept there. It is a matter of concern to us. Now, dropping the over-land route, that they followed till the sixteenth century, the West have taken to the sea route. Since then, today the use of high seas for controlling Asia is being scientifically and strategically worked out. We cannot ignore this Western logistics. History repeats itself. After political withdrawal from their erstwhile eastern colonies the Western neo-colonialists are creating more exploitative infrastructures behind their diplomatic machinations. The whole historical process is being repeated in a subtler form and they are trying to create a situation of terror and uncertainty for Asia—a situation of destabilisation.

The Diego Garcia naval base and other similar bases in the Gulf region are threat to us. This is the situation which the Prime Minister this morning pointed out. But our Opposition leaders fail to understand their significance. Even the Marxist leaders themselves say that there are about 20 American bases from Cape of Good Hope to Australia. What the Prime Minister said is that recent developments in the international situation are such that our security arrangements will have to be geared to meet these challenges both from land and sea. It is in this connection that she said that the continuance of Emergency is necessary for our national security. Any observer of the international situation would understand this.

Our concern in Asia and, particularly, our concern in developments taking place next-door will have to be related to this historical factor. Everybody knows that there is a renaissance, a revival, in Asia. There is re-assertion of the spirit and will of Asia. What is the significance of the happening in Indo-China? It is something which symbolises the aspirations and demands of the entire people of Asia to re-assert themselves. Germans are supposed to be one of the most advanced Western peoples with high intellectual achievement and military powers. According to me, in this sense, they have a dual personality. Even Germany could not achieve re-unification with all its might and even with the support of the United

[Dr. Henry Austin]

States and others—their erstwhile enemies. What even Germans could not achieve with all its might and support is being achieved by small countries of Indo-China, particularly Cambodia, soon to be followed by South Vietnam. Although more bombs have been dropped in Indo-China than all the bombs that had been dropped by all the powers during the last World War, Indo-China will soon achieve their reunification, undoing the machinations of Western Powers.

Our foreign policy takes into account all the machinations of imperialist powers and their motivations. It is this awareness and understanding of what is happening in Asia that made our leaders, foreign policy makers, to accord due recognition to the Sihanouk regime in Cambodia without undue delay and hesitation. We are also closely watching the developments in South Vietnam and soon a situation will arise when similar action that we have taken in regard to Cambodia will be taken in South Vietnam also.

Let us now see what is happening in West Asia. One is not so naive as to think that import of all kinds of armaments in the Middle East, even in the context of Arab hostilities to the western machinations, has no significance for us. But we cannot shut our eyes to what is happening in Palestine. It is in this context that we have to analyse the situation that is developing in the Middle East. Our policy towards the Arab countries is well known, and although the OPEC countries' raising the oil price is a factor which materially affects our economic development and that of other developing countries, we show sympathy to them because it is a fundamental right of the country to fix the price of their commodities. The Western nations, America, England and others fix their own price for their weapons and other articles; they do not consult the consumer countries. In the same way, the Arab people have the right to fix their own price for oil. Although this affects our own interests, we sympathise with them and we hope to reach mutually acceptable terms by negotiation.

Mr. Erasmo de Sequeira has raised the question of rupee-ruble relationship. As against the Western capitalist

society, there is a certain stability in the economy of the Comecon countries. The economic crisis that is being faced in the Western countries has its repercussions in the Comecon countries. Naturally, our dealings with Comecon countries will have its impact. It is in this context that our Finance Minister has already initiated discussion with the Soviet Finance Minister to find out a solution for this problem. The discussions are going on, and I am sure that the rupee-ruble relationship will be put on a just basis...

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: I have referred to the fact that whatever the Russians have done, they have done unilaterally which, to my mind, is wrong.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: There is no question of anything being done unilaterally...

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: Your own Government have said that it was unilateral.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN: I have talked to the leaders of some of the East European countries. The members of the Comecon had to make adjustments in the wake of the economic crisis in the West. Naturally, its effect was there in their relations with India. As I have said, bilateral negotiations have been initiated and are taking place, and an appropriate decision will be taken after the completion of the negotiations.

I should congratulate the Minister of External Affairs, although strictly it does not come within the purview of the Ministry of External Affairs, on the recent developments in Sikkim. Shakespeare has said: all is well that ends well. It could also be said: all is well that begins well. What has happened in Sikkim yesterday is a demonstration of the faith of the people of Sikkim in the structure of this country, in the political philosophy of this country. Almost whole State, in one voice, has affirmed its faith in our democracy, and it wants to be a constituent unit of this country. China is taking an unfortunate view calculated to vitiate the popular verdict. When Pakistan, unilaterally, without any popular movement, annexed Hunza, China had nothing to say. But we are, in the case of Sikkim, taking decisions only after

consulting the people, after assessing the strength of the people's movement there; we are going by the verdict of the people there as shown in the referendum yesterday.

Much has been said about our relationship with the Soviet Union. I am asking the critics, the detractors of our policy with the Soviet Union, to recall what happened on the eve of the Bangladesh crisis. America had entered into an understanding with China. China was openly backing Pakistan. America had moved its Seventh Fleet to the Bay of Bengal. As against this combination of two Super Powers—if one does not agree with me in calling China a Super Power, one may say, a junior partner of the Super Power—, without a formal defence treaty, with a mere treaty of peace and friendship with the Soviet Union we had been able to checkmate the machinations of both China and the United States to brow-beat India into submission. The Western diplomacy in the post-war years started with the pursuit of a policy of containment and liberation as against the Soviet Union. When they failed, they thought of accommodation with the Soviet Union. Then they tried to brow beat China in the Korean war and wanted to put down China. But when they found that it was not possible, they sought accommodation with China. They can resort to any policy at their own will and pleasure. But what about India? When India develops its own foreign policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence and takes independent decisions, viewing each issue on its own merits, these people are afraid and feel jittery. The crux of our foreign policy is to decide each issue on merits without reference to this country or that country, this bloc or that bloc. India is the second largest country in terms of population and constitutes one-sixth of the world population and no country can be allowed to interfere in its affairs, and our foreign policy serves these aims and objectives.

The foreign policy of a country as everyone knows, is an extension of its domestic policies. As far as our domestic policy requirements are concerned, we want primarily to safeguard our security. In spite of three defensive wars against Pakistan and another against China, our country has come out of the conflicts relatively unhurt.

Our economy, in spite of the international crisis, is also gaining momentum at this hour, after a brief period of stresses and strains.

Our foreign policy's main look-out is to safeguard the country's interests and it has achieved these objectives in spite of very many difficulties both from outside and also from within and; in spite of the fascist movement inside and despite the disorder which some opposition parties are creating everyday, our foreign policy has achieved the desired results.

SHRI NOORUL HUDA (Cachar):
Have one Party rule.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): As one of the participants of the freedom struggle of our country, I do not know whether our Minister of External Affairs had no time to look into the pages of all the papers of to-day wherein has appeared the picture of a man whom we adored as the Frontier Gandhi, a man next to Mahatma Gandhi and who occupied a place of an apostle of non-violence. I do not know whether the niceties of diplomatic relations will rule or over-rule our moral consideration, our sacred commitment and the sacred commitment of the Father of the Nation, to the people of Pakhtoonistan and Baluchistan.

I wanted to remind Mr. Chavan that when Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and Dr. Khan Sahab, the two Brothers, went out of the Working Committee the day when partition was accepted, without uttering a single word, but only with tears in their eyes, then, in the prayer meeting, Mahatma Gandhi pledged on behalf of the whole nation that if the security, honour, dignity, rights and privileges of the people of Pakhtoonistan and Baluchistan who constitute 97% of the Muslim community and who till the last moment were in the mainstream of our national struggle, were ever in danger, India would have the right to go to war with Pakistan. It is on record. You can see. What I say is that on considerations of diplomatic relations or on the basis of an absolutely infructuous attempt which is euphemistically called a glorious achievement like the Simla Pact, we have to keep mum and not a word is uttered although even the Secretary-General of the United Nations could

[Shri Samar Guha]

not refuse to take cognizance of the fact that there is an exodus of Baluchis and Pakhtoons in Pakistan who are entering into Afghanistan I do not know whether we will break this shell of our own of what should I say the so-called diplomatic niceties Or you have any moral concepts left? Nowhere in the world I say such a treachery was committed on our comrades-in-arms who were with us till the last moment of the freedom struggle but not a word is being uttered about them I want to know whether the conscience has been completely frozen I want to know from the Minister of External Affairs who was also one of the participants in the freedom struggle

Much glorification has been made of our Simla Pact I was the lone voice when I said that it was worst than the Tashkent pact I was jeered, and booed and mobbed like anything I do not know what is the tangible achievement The tangible achievement is that even to-day the Prime Minister said that to-day we face a threat to our security

I want to say—war is always a tragedy But half war is a greater tragedy and three wars were imposed on us to be fought with Pakistan and all three wars are half-wars and only begged for greater tragedy for another war Another war is inevitable unless something happens in the international world I say another war with Pakistan is almost inevitable certainly it may come any time We had all the advantages in Kashmir operation in 1948 when suddenly we cried halt I do not want that Pakistan should have been overrun When we could have established peace and stability and communal harmony we halted I do not want to say that we should occupy Pakistan But I want to say about the basic principle of war Unless the backbone of the enemy that attacks you is broken no war can conclude and that would be half-war only because it will create a condition for a greater war and it will become a tragedy Weak-minded foreign policy had only created a situation for another war, another tragedy and greater human sacrifice It is not the Simla way; it has already failed flat You may build a very great monument, well, it will be a martyrs'

monument but not a monument of the future or of any hope.

The time has come for us to adopt a new outlook When I say this, I may be termed Utopian, it may be called an imperialist idea and all that, but if you look at the developments in West Pakistan, when you look at the demands for racial liberation there raised among the Baluchis, Sindhis and Pakhtoonistan people, certainly, you will notice that Pakistan has ceased to exist on the basis of the morality of its origin and the two-nation theory has gone and now the time has come when we have to loudly and strongly say that until and unless there is a confederation of the three States of Pakistan India and Bangladesh there is no future for this subcontinent We should agree to surrender a part a quantum of our sovereignty for common foreign policy and common defence measures Unless we do that there is no future for this subcontinent Pakistan had spent 60% of its national income and we in India are spending around 25 to 30 per cent of our income on defence measures and you may add the expenditure that was spent on three wars Do you think there is any other way except this kind of a confederation to ensure peace and stability in this subcontinent? Our socio-economic development certainly is not possible unless you put a stop to this huge expenditure on defence and unless you do that there is no future for this subcontinent I may be termed as reactionary as expansionist, imperialist and all that But what I say is in the interest of the future of this subcontinent We should slash down this huge expenditure on defence The time has come when we should create conditions for such an evolution of the concept and the realisation of this idea of confederation of these three States in the sub-continent

Much has been said about the galaxies of foreign dignitaries who have come and are coming to our country I do not know what will be the total amount spent for them We are talking loudly about our independent non-aligned foreign policy I wish I could sincerely believe it

I wish, I could sincerely believe it, our government could create that conviction—not among us—by mass media but in the international community

that really we are assiduously following a non-aligned policy. In a magnetic field, when it operates, you find an invisible force operating. But, we feel it by inter-action. Similarly, I think when we say 'no', my friend is saying that certainly we must have good relations with all the States in the world including U.S.S.R. Of course, we should have good relations with Russia because we got all their help at the time of Indo-Pakistan war. There is no reason why we should work, if I may use that expression, within that electromagnetic or diplomatic field of Soviet Russia from which we could not get out of it. Invisibly we are in operation of that orbit and unfortunately, our Government has not gone deep into it. Most of our difficulties and complicities that we are experiencing in the international world are due to this operation of the Indian foreign policy within this electro-magnetic diplomatic field of Soviet Russia.

I would ask the Foreign Minister to go deep into the whole matter. You can convince us—the Opposition. But, how can you convince the international community that we are not very much dependent upon Soviet Russia? How will you succeed to convince the international community that you are really non-aligned. The concept of international diplomacy has undergone a radical change. The communist countries are pursuing the international policy from their ideological standpoints. Whether it is a Communist State or whether it is a Fascist State or whether it is a military State or whether it is a democratic State, we find to-day their cardinal principle in deciding the international policy or foreign policy, in the world, is that the nationalism is in the national interests this a new feature. What I am going to say is this. Unfortunately, we are trying to pursue the concept of ideological diplomacy in the world which, unfortunately, has become another constraint in our foreign policy.

Look at the case of the Middle-East. I have not an iota of any grouse to say that we should have better relations with the Arab countries. But, what are/is policy with Israel? Are we pursuing really a secular policy there? It was not the choice of Israel that they have been put into the present condition. Are we not to take into consideration that the Jews are the communi-

ties which are a very powerful community not only in trade and industry, publicity but also in other spheres? Our policy in regard to Israel should have been a balanced one rather than the concept of giving an ideological support to the Arabs. We have also forgotten that Israel has a socialist—labour—Government. Certainly, she has no right to keep any Arab territories at the same time. We should try to resolve this Arab-Israel Problems somehow. That should be our main consideration. We may try to get dollars from the Arab countries. You know that the oil producing Arab countries are now getting American arms. The American arms to Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and others are being supplied to Pakistan. We are the losers. As such, I would request the hon. Minister to go a little deeper into this. For the last twenty-seven years, this area is just nothing but an extension of ancient India. In the words of Dr Suniti Chhatopadhyaya, the Far-East countries are really nothing but a historical extension of the ancient India. Our Indian culture, behaviour and religion are in vogue in Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia and Cambodia and other Far-Eastern countries. You have neglected them for the last twenty-seven years or so. There has not been a single foreign policy as far as Far-East is concerned. This is one of the greatest lacunae in our foreign policy. So, our trade, our commerce, our foreign relations, social relations, our cultural relations and our educational relations should have been strengthened with those countries, because they are out and out Indian in outlook, values and thoughts. Therefore, I would like to make an earnest request to make a study of the failure of our foreign policy in the Far East. There should be a socio-economic and cultural approach in our foreign policy towards Far East Asia. The expenditure which is made over our foreign embassies in the Far Eastern countries is much less. There are no cultural exchanges between India and the Far Eastern countries. That is one of the very important lacunae.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This greater India philosophy is the most dangerous policy.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, I have used the word ancient India. In Indonesia Garuda is the national symbol.

[Shri Samar Guha]

Sir, I want to conclude by making another request to the Minister. I have tried to draw the attention in regard to the INA Martyrs Monument that was erected by Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose in 1945 and demolished by Lord Mountbatten. Sir, it was not only an INA Martyrs monument but it was a monument symbolic of the whole of Asiatic revolution. Then, Sir, the residential house in Singapore of Netaji and the headquarters of Azad Hind Government should be acquired by the Government. That is a sacred national honour for us. The martyrs memorial which has been demolished should be re-erected.

श्री विश्वनाथ राय (देवरिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, संसार के सब से बड़े लोकतंत्र में इस बात पर विचार करते समय कि उस की विदेश नीति सफल रही है या असफल रही है, यदि हम इस बात पर ध्यान दें कि संसार में उस की बात का, उस की विदेश नीति का प्रभाव कितना पड़ा है, वह कितना लोकप्रिय हुआ है, तो इस विदेश नीति की सफलता और असफलता का अन्दाज होगा। इस दृष्टिकोण से विचार करने पर यदि हम देखें कि भारत की विदेश नीति ऐसी रही है जिस से कुछ बड़े राष्ट्र जिन को हम साम्राज्यवादी कह सकते हैं या पूंजीवादी कह सकते हैं, भले ही नाराज हों, लेकिन जहाँ तक लोकतन्त्रात्मक शक्तियों की बात है, जहाँ तक उन लोगों की बात है जो लोकतंत्र में विश्वास करते हैं और वे पुराने लोकतंत्र की तरह नहीं बल्कि प्रगतिशील लोकतंत्र में विश्वास करते हैं, जिस से जनहित होता है, जोषित और पीड़ित लोगों की जो पीड़ा है शोषण है वह बन्द होता है, उस दृष्टिकोण से भारत बहुत सफल रहा है और उस की सफलता केवल कहने भर की नहीं है बल्कि कार्य रूप में वह दिखाई दी है। भले ही हम आर्थिक दृष्टिकोण से या कौजी दृष्टिकोण से कुछ पीछे हों लेकिन जहाँ तक राजनीतिक महत्व की बात है, राजनीतिक प्रभाव की बात है, हमारा प्रभाव बढ़ा है और हमारी विदेश नीति पूर्णतया सफल रही है और उस का प्रमाण यह है कि हम नूटनियेन रहे हैं। अभी माननीय सक्सेस श्री गुहा जी

ने कहा कि हम लोगों की नूटनियेनता कैसे साबित होती है। इस बात का प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण इन के प्रदेश के बंगल में ही है। इन के बंगल में बंगला देश एक ऐसा नया देश बना जो पाकिस्तान में नहीं गया और किसी घुट में सम्मिलित न हो कर वह भारत से मैत्री चाहता है। इस से बड़ा ऐतिहासिक प्रमाण हमें और कौन सा मिल सकता है, वे इस बात पर विचार करें। और, मुझे यह कहना है कि हमारी ओ नूटनियेनता की नीति है और दूसरों के आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप से दूर रहने की जो नीति है, वह सफल हुई है।

हमारे प्रति दूसरे राष्ट्रों तथा देशों का विश्वास बढ़ा है, हमारी विदेश नीति के प्रति विश्वास बढ़ा है। ऐसे देशों में बंगला देश ही एक देश नहीं है। आप सिक्किम को ले। वहाँ पर परसों वोटिंग हुआ है। वहाँ 97,000 के करीब वोटर हैं। उन में से करीब 59,000 ने वोट इस पक्ष में दिया कि वे भारत का अंग बनाना चाहते हैं उसी तरह से बनाना चाहते हैं जिस तरह से इस देश के प्रान्त हैं। केवल एक डेढ़ हजार ने इसके विरुद्ध वोट दिया है। यह वोटिंग उस प्रस्ताव के आधार पर वहाँ आयोजित किया गया था जो सिक्किम असेम्बली ने पास किया था। वह इस बात का प्रमाण है कि हमारी विदेश नीति कितनी सफल हुई है। सिक्किम चाहता है कि उसके सम्बन्ध भारत के साथ अविच्छिन्न हों, घनिष्ट हों और जैसे भारत के दूसरे प्रदेश हैं वैसे ही वह भी भारत का एक प्रदेश हो।

अन्य देश भी हैं जो हमारा साथ दे रहे हैं। नेपाल की बात को आप लें। सात डेढ़ साल पहले जो बड़ा सा झग उसके मन में पैदा हो गया था वह दूर हो गया है। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में मैं विदेश मंत्रालय से कहूँगा कि कितनी घनिष्टता हमारी नेपाल के साथ होनी चाहिये और कितनी पहलें हुना करनी की, उतनी कम नहीं है, उस में कुछ न कुछ अंतर पड़ा

है। परसों जो बटना बड़ी है उसको आप देखें यह सभाचारपत्रों में निकला है कि भारतीय छात्र और छात्राओं पर जो काठमांडू जा रहे थे आक्रमण हुआ। किसी गलतफहमी के कारण हुआ, भ्रम के कारण हुआ और इन छात्र छात्राओं को वापिस आ जाना पड़ा। जो यह भेदभाव पैदा हुआ है या कुछ भ्रम फैल रहा है इसको दूर करने के लिये जो हमारा वहां दूतावास है वह क्या काम कर रहा है, कौन से पग उठा रहा है, इसको देखने की जरूरत है। जब कभी कोई सन्देह पैदा हो जाए तो उसको तुरन्त दूर करने की कोशिश उसको करनी चाहिये। नेपाल के साथ हमारा सहयोग पहले, की भांति फिर से हो जाना चाहिये। सांस्कृतिक, सामाजिक तथा धार्मिक दृष्टिकोणों से हमारे सम्बन्ध नेपाल के साथ बहुत प्राचीन हैं लेकिन जहां तक राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों की बात है, कुछ सन्देह पैदा हुए हैं जिम को दूर करने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे दूतावास को इस सम्बन्ध में सक्रिय कदम उठाने चाहिये। दो तीन दिन पहले मेरी एक नेपाली नागरिक से बातचीत हुई। वह यहा भारत में है। उसने मुझे बताया कि हमारा दूतावास वहा जागरूक नहीं रहता है, सक्रिय नहीं रहता है, उसका रख सहानुभूतिपूर्ण नहीं रहता है, ऐसा नहीं रहता है जिससे वहां के लोग प्रभावित हों। जो हमारे निकट के देश हैं और जिन के साथ हमारे बहुत पुराने सम्बन्ध हैं, उन सम्बन्धों में अगर कोई भेदभाव पैदा होता है, कोई भ्रम पैदा होते हैं तो उनको तुरन्त दूर करने की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में जो आप अपने घन से नेपाल में कार्य कर रहे हैं, जो विकास के कार्य कर रहे हैं उनकी जानकारी वहां के नागरिकों को मिलती रहनी चाहिये। उस जानकारी को जनता तक पहुंचाने में अगर वहां हमारा दूतावास सक्रिय नहीं होता है तो उसे आप सक्रिय बनाएं ताकि वहां की जनता को मालूम हो कि भारत अपना धन व्यय करके उसकी जनता को उन्नति के पथ पर ले जाने की कोशिश कर रहा है, उसको आगे बढ़ाना चाहता है, उस देश के साथ अपनी नैतिक और दोस्त आधार बना रहा है।

मेरा सुझाव यह जो है कि नेपाल और भारत की सीमा पर जो मुख्य मुख्य स्थान हैं वहां पर सांस्कृतिक केन्द्र खोले जाने चाहिये, ताकि—नेपाली और भारतीय नागरिकों में विचारों का अदान प्रदान हो सके, उस की सहूलियत सुलभ हो सके और दोनों देशों की जनता को लाभ हो सके। इन केन्द्रों पर सांस्कृतिक तथा सामाजिक बातों पर लोग एक साथ मिल सकते हैं, उनको मिलने जुलने के अधिक अवसर उपलब्ध हो सकते हैं और उन के बीच विचारों का आदान प्रदान हो सकता है और किसी प्रकार के भ्रम हो तो उनको दूर किया जा सकता है।

हमारे देश के निकटवर्ती जो अन्य देश भी हैं उनकी सीमाओं पर भी ऐसे ही सांस्कृतिक और सामाजिक केन्द्र होने चाहिये जहां पर बिना पामपोट के प्रतिबन्ध के आसानी से लोग आ जा सकें।

जिन देशों का हमारे प्रति विश्वास बढ़ रहा है उन में न केवल बंगला देश है, सिक्किम है और न केवल नेपाल के भ्रम दूर हो रहे हैं बल्कि अफगानिस्तान का जोकि हम से कुछ दूर भी है, उसका भी हमारे प्रति प्रेम बढ़ रहा है। वहां के लोग और वहा के नेता भारत आए थे और यहा घूम कर गए हैं। यहा आ कर मधुर स्मृतियां ले कर ही वे वापस गए हैं, हमारे प्रति अच्छे विचार प्रकट कर के ही वापस अपने देश गए हैं। उसमें यही सिद्ध होता है कि हमारे देश की विदेश नीति बहुत सफल सिद्ध हुई है। इससे पता चलता है कि निकट के या दूर के, भी जो देश हैं उनके प्रति हमारी कितनी श्रद्धा प्रेम भाव, अच्छी भावनाएं हैं और वे कितना हमारे निकट आए हैं और जो नारा हमने शान्ति और सहयोग का दिया था उसके प्रति उन लोगों का कितना विश्वास बढ़ा है।

न केवल दक्षिण एशिया बल्कि पश्चिम एशियन के जो देश हैं उनकी हमारे प्रति और हमारी उनके प्रति सहानुभूति बढ़ी है। ईराक की बात आप से। अरब देशों की बात आप से। उनके प्रति हमारी जो नीति रही है वह सफल रही है,

[श्री विश्वनाथ राय]

अमरीका और इजराइल के सम्बन्ध बहुत घनिष्ठ थे। अमरीका के विशेष राजदूत के प्रयत्न करने पर भी सामरिक दृष्टिकोण जो इजराइल का रहा है, जो नीति उसकी रही है, उसमें परिवर्तन लाने में वह सफल नहीं हुआ है। किसिजर साहब का प्यार वहाँ पर सफल नहीं हुआ है। इजराइल ने जो अरब देशों के भ्राम अपने कब्जे में कर लिए हैं उनको छोड़ने के लिए या कोई समझौता करने के लिए वह तैयार नहीं है यद्यपि इजिप्ट उसके प्रति कुछ और मधुर हो गया था और साथे बड़ कर वह इजराइल के साथ साथ भी मिलाना चाहता था। कारण यह है कि भारत के बाहर जो पूँजीवादी देशों की नीति है या जो साम्राज्यवादी नीति है आन्तरिक विरोध होने के कारण अपने साथियों में उचित बात मनवाने में भी वे सफल नहीं हो पा रहे हैं। यही कारण है कि अमरीका के विशेष राजदूत का वहाँ पर सफलता प्राप्त नहीं हो सकी है। यू. एम. ए. जो एक सुपर पावर है हिन्द महासागर में अपना प्रभाव जमाने की कोशिश कर रहा है, वहाँ अड़डे स्थापित कर रहा है। इससे भारत को ही खतरा नहीं है बल्कि हिन्द महासागर के आसपास के जितने भी देश हैं चाहे वे एशिया के देश हों, अरब देश हों, ईरान हों उनके लिए भी खतरा बड़ रहा है। यहाँ तक कि सोवियत रूस के लिए भी यह एक खतरे का कारण सिद्ध हो रहा है। यह सही है कि सोवियत रूस एक शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र है, एक सुपर पावर है और सुपर पावर होते हुए भी वह खतरा महसूस करे और इसका विरोध करे तो यह और भी खतरनाक बात हो जाती है। और भी कई देश इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं। ऐसी दशा में भारत का यह नारा कि सामरिक देशों का अड़डा हिन्द महासागर में नहीं होना चाहिये, बिल्कुल सही है। इस बात को उसे अन्य देशों के साथ साथ यू. एन. ओ. में भी उठाना चाहिये ताकि हमारी सुरक्षा के साथ साथ अन्य देशों की सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था भी हो सके।

भारत की विदेश नीति की सफलता इस बात से भी सिद्ध होती है कि हमने और हमारी जनता ने हमेशा लोकतंत्रीय शक्तियों को प्रोत्साहन दिया है, लोकतन्त्र में अपना विश्वास प्रकट किया है। दूसरे देशों के लोग भारत की इस नीति से प्रभावित हुए हैं, लाभान्वित हुए हैं। इसका तात्कालिक प्रमाण यह है कि सिहानूक की गवर्नमेंट को हमने मान्यता प्रदान की है और विश्व के सामने प्रमाणित कर दिया है कि हम प्रगतिशील लोकतन्त्रात्मक शक्तियों का समर्थन करते हैं, उनकी सफलता की आशा ही नहीं करते बल्कि जब परीक्षा की घड़ी आती है तो उस में खरे भी उतरते हैं।

अन्त में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेशों से हमारा जो दूतावास है उनको सक्रिय करने की आवश्यकता है और इसके लिए यह आवश्यक है कि उनका पुनर्गठन किया जाए ताकि वहाँ के नागरिक और भारत के नागरिक जो वहाँ हैं वे जितनी सहानुभूति की आशा उन से रखते हैं वह पूरी हो सके। आज वह पूरी नहीं होती है।

SHRI C H MOHAMED KOYA (Manjori) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir in the matter of foreign affairs, my Party is always supporting the policy of the Government of India. With this basic factor in mind, I would bring certain matters to the attention of the House and the Minister.

In these days of acute unemployment, our educated youngsters want to go out in search of jobs. But when they apply for passports all sorts of handicaps are put before them. The rules are very strict. The common man finds it difficult to get the signature of a Joint Secretary. The Joint Secretaries are reluctant to sign without proper enquiries. The enquiries take a long time. Why not we relax the rule? It takes not months but years to get the passport even after petitions are sent. In the meanwhile, the NOCs lapse and the employers go to other countries for recruitment.

There are complaints of corruption at the lower level in the passport offices. These should be looked into. After inordinate delay and red-tapism, the Kerala Passport Office is to

be opened shortly at Cochin. But this alone will not improve the situation. We have to relax the rules and instruct our passport officers not to delay decision on an application on hair-splitting, narrow, technical grounds.

14.00 hrs.

If the Government cannot give jobs to our educated youngsters, let them at least not adopt a dog-in-the-manger policy in giving them passports. Letters coming from the Arabian Gulf countries to Members of Parliament speak about the comparatively unhelpful attitude of our embassies in those countries. They say that embassies of countries like Iran are so helpful to their citizens in securing jobs whereas our embassies are not helpful. I do not know how far they could help and how true the allegations are. But I hope the hon. Minister will take note of this complaint. There are a number of youngsters who have gone to the Gulf countries without proper travel documents and so they are suffering. The bogus agencies which helped them to go out are extracting a lot of money. Those agencies should be discouraged and punished and our embassies must adopt a generous attitude and passports should be liberally given to those people.

There is need to strengthen our Embassy in Saudi Arabia. Its importance has increased after the oil crisis and we have to cultivate their friendship. Jeddah is as important as Washington or Moscow. I was in Jeddah when our Railway Minister Shri Mishra was killed. Our Embassy there could not give us any authentic information about the matter. I think there is no telex connection with Delhi. Jeddah embassy should be strengthened and a senior ambassador should be sent to Jeddah in view of its importance.

There is need to increase the foreign exchange allotted to Haj pilgrims in view of the high cost of accommodation at Mecca and Medina. The Government must take steps to construct the Keyi Rubat which was demolished for the expansion of the Harem Shereef. The money is lying in the Saudi bank. If the Government takes up the matter with Saudi Arabian Government and constructs the Rubat with that money, it will be a great help to the Kerala Hajis.

The relations with Pakistan should be improved. It will be in the interest

of both countries if friendly relations are maintained. Unfortunately, Pakistan is not following the Simla spirit for reasons best known to its rulers. The two countries cannot afford to be enemies for all times to come. We must take steps to get Pakistan out of the Chinese influence.

I am happy to support the policy of the Government of India with regard to the Palestinian Liberation Organisation. Here I beg to differ with the views expressed by my esteemed friend Shri Samar Guha who wanted a change in our attitude towards Israel. The Palestinian Arabs were sent out of their motherland by Israel, a creation of the imperialist powers and so they are fighting for their liberation under the PLO. The Government of India gave them, wisely, help and recognition. This policy has its impact in the friendly Arab countries and earned their good will and our image is at its height, in spite of the hostile propaganda by Pakistan; the Arabs have got high regard for us.

We should take steps to see that our expenditure in our embassies is reduced, in view of the fact that ours is a poor country. Some of our embassies are spending money lavishly. As a poor country, India cannot afford to spend on such a lavish scale in world capitals. We should concentrate on Arab countries where we have got tremendous goodwill. I hope the hon. Minister will look into the matter.

श्री जशजि बूचर (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वर्ष हम दुनिया की फ्रांजिज्म से मुक्ति और उस पर विजय प्राप्त करने का तीसरा साल मना रहे हैं, लेकिन साम्राज्यवादियों द्वारा हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी में लगाई गई आग आज तक नहीं बुझी है। तीस लाख लोग बंगला देश में साम्राज्यवादी, और विशेषतया अमरीकी, हथियारों से मारे गये। इसी तरह लगभग चालीस लाख व्यक्ति कम्बोडिया और वियतनाम में मारे गये हैं। पता नहीं, वहां कितने बच्चे और बीरतें हलाक हुए हैं। जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, साम्राज्यवादियों द्वारा लगाई गई आग अभी तक नहीं बुझी है। साम्राज्यवाद एक तरह से तो समाप्त हो गया है, लेकिन दूसरी तरह से वह फिर से हावी हो रहा है।

[श्री शशि कृष्ण]

हम साम्राज्यवादियों से लड़े और हम ने अपने देश की आजादी हासिल की। उन्होंने हमारे देश में बहुत से लोगों को फाँसियाँ लगाई; लाखों आदमियों को जेलों में भेजा, हमारे दस्तकारों के अगूठे काट दिये, और वे एक अकालप्रस्त, जर्जरित और दुखी भारत छोड़ कर गये। इस लिए हम साम्राज्यवादियों को कैसे भूल सकते हैं? आज की दुनिया में उन के जुल्म और तरीके बदल गये हैं, लेकिन वे और गहरे हो गये हैं।

दुनिया के जो भी देश अपनी आजादी के लिए साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ लड़ रहे हैं, भारत ने हमेशा उन की मदद की है। यही भारत की विदेश नीति रही है। वियतनाम हो या कम्बोडिया, कोरिया हो या बंगला देश अरब दुनिया हो या अफ्रीका या लेटिन अमेरिका जहाँ भी लोग साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं, भारत ने हमेशा उन को अपना समर्थन दिया है। हम विदेश नीति को महामा गांधी, पंडित नेहरू और आज के हमारे नेताओं का आशीर्वाद प्राप्त है, और हम अपनी इस विदेश नीति पर फख्र है।

जो देश साम्राज्यवादियों से लड़ रहे हैं चाहे वे साम्राज्यवादी देश हों और चाहे तीसरी दुनिया के देश, वे सब हमारे दोस्त हैं। और जो देश साम्राज्यवादियों का समर्थन करते हैं, वे हमारे दोस्त नहीं हैं, इतिहास ने हम को यह बता दिया है। अगर आज हिन्दुस्तान की जनता से राय ली जाये कि हम समाजवादी देशों और तीसरी दुनिया के देशों के साथ दोस्ती रखें या साम्राज्यवादी देशों के साथ, तो हिन्दुस्तान का एक एक बच्चा इस बात के पक्ष में बोट देगा कि हम समाजवादी और तीसरी दुनिया के लोगों के साथ रहेंगे। हमारी विदेश नीति को हमारी चरलू नीति का पूरा पूरा समर्थन प्राप्त है।

मैं मंत्री महोदय को इस बात के लिए कास होर से धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने कम्बोडिया

की सिंहुनुक सरकार को मान्यता दी है। जब से उन्होंने यह भार सम्भाला है, तब से उन्होंने काफ़ी प्रगतिशील कदम उठाये हैं। उन्होंने पी०एल०ओ० और कम्बोडिया की सिंहुनुक सरकार को मान्यता दी है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि बहुत शीघ्र वह पी० आर० जी० को भी मान्यता देगे, क्योंकि पता नहीं, लोन नोल की तरह धियु कब जाने वाले हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके, वह यह कदम उठाये। अगर वह आज ही इस बारे में कुछ कह सके, तो हम उस का स्वागत करेंगे।

मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत एशिया में पहला देश है, जिस ने पी०एल०ओ० को मान्यता दी है। यह एक बहुत बड़ा काम है। पी०एल०ओ० के नेता, यासिर अराफ़त, आज अरब देशों की एकता के एक महान नेता हैं। अरब देशों की आयल पालिसी, और तेल के राष्ट्रीयकरण के पीछे उन की शक्ति है। आज अरबों की एकता, आयल पालिसी और फिलिस्तीन, इन तीन सबालों को कोई अलग-अलग हल नहीं कर सकता है। जब भी कोई हल होगा, तो इन तीनों सबालों का एक-साथ हल होगा। अरब लोग जितने आज एक हैं, उतने पहले कभी नहीं थे। हमें खुशी है कि आज वे अपनी धरती के मालिक हैं और अपने पसीने की कीमत खुद वसूल करते हैं और वे बिदेशियाँ वे बग़ल से छुट गये हैं। एशिया का हर एक देश अपनी आजादी की तरफ़ बढ़े, इस बात की हमें खुशी है।

यासिर अराफ़त ने हिन्दुस्तान आने की इच्छा प्रकट की है। हम ने उन को यहाँ आने की दावत दी है। मैं चाहूँगा कि मंत्री महोदय इस पर कुछ रोशनी डालें कि हम भारत में उन का स्वागत बहुत अच्छे तरीके से करेंगे, क्योंकि वह अरबों के नेता ही नहीं, बल्कि एशिया के एक बहादुर नेता हैं। हो भी सके तो उन में सावगी है, कैस्ट्रो की करेब और लेटिन की जार्नलार्डिंग शक्ति उन में मौजूद है और अरब देशों से जो सेकुलर सोसाइटी का उन का कांसेप्ट है उन ने वह भारत से बहुत मुतासिर है, श्राद्ध तीर

से बंदिब नेहरू और कुब्जा भेजना से। इंदिरा गांधी जी के प्रति उन की बहुत बहुत सद्भावना रहती है। तो हिन्दुस्तान उन का स्वागत करेगा और यह हम चाहते हैं कि एक दिन वह अपने लक्ष्य की प्राप्ति करें।

बड़ा अच्छा हो कि हम इस्लाम की मान्यता भी वापस ले लें। इस्लाम और चिली जैसे देशों का क्या महत्व है जिन को हम से मान्यता दे रखी है क्योंकि जो देश एग्रेसर है और साम्राज्यवादियों के पिछू हैं उन की वह हालत हो रही है। ... (व्यवधान) ... यह ठीक कह रहे हैं। चिली को एक देश ने बहुत मान्यता दे रखी है, वह समझ रहे होंगे, उन को मिलिट्री के हथियार भी दे रहे हैं और उन से ट्रेड भी कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने बलत नहीं समझा, ठीक समझा।

हमारे पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान को अमेरिका से इतने हथियार इन दिनों मिले हैं कि वह हमारे बजट के चौगुने के बराबर हैं। पेशावर में वह एक नया बेस बना रहे हैं। जो पहले हटा लिया था, अब दोबारा बना रहे हैं। मकरान और ग्वादार में उन्होंने एक बेस बनाया है और इस बात की कीमत पर बनाया है कि अमेरिका ने उन को हथियार दिए हैं। उस से हमारा भी खतरा बढ़ा है। और, हम तो बड़े देश हैं, दुनिया में पाँचवीं ताकत हैं, लेकिन कुछ पड़ोसी छोटे देशों को बहुत खतरा बढ़ा है, खास तौर से अफगानिस्तान को। अफगानिस्तान के साथ हमारी हमेशा दोस्ती और हमबर्बी रही है। हम चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान ऐसा रास्ता अख्तियार करे जिस से इस क्षेत्र में तनाव उत्पन्न न हो। लेकिन अभी हम ने देखा कि अब्दुल गफार खा को उन्होंने गिरफ्तार किया है। पहले तो कयूम सहाब के एक मिनिस्टर को मरवाया। उस के बाद बली सहाब को और दूसरों को गिरफ्तार किया। पूरा ज़ुलम का पहाड़ ढाल दिया गया है पूरे बिलोचिस्तान में और पठानों के पूरे क्षेत्र में। हम चाहते हैं कि उस क्षेत्र में शांति हो, बैठ कर बात करें। इस तरह हमारा यह वास्तव आस है।

साथ साथ हमारे पड़ोस में चीन है। वह एक लाख सेना खड़ी किए हुए है। उस के साथ स्यूविलियर बेस उस ने तिब्बत में बनाया है। 1961 में यू एन असेम्बली ने तिब्बत के पक्ष में उस के समर्थन में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया था। उसमें यह कहा था कि तिब्बत को सेल्फ डिटरमिनेशन का अधिकार देना चाहिए। 1965 में भी कुछ हद तक उसी प्रस्ताव को दोहराया। आज तिब्बत के 80 लाख लोगों की जिन्यवी खतरे में है। उन की पूरी नस्ल को खत्म करने की योजना बनाई गई है और हजारों लाखों लोग वहां से उजाड़े गए हैं। तो यह भी हमारी एक जिम्मेदारी होती है कि हम तिब्बत के लोगों की मदद करें। ... (व्यवधान) ... इन की इस से क्यों तकलीफ है मुझे पता नहीं। मुझे बड़ी खुशी होती कि हमारे साथी हुवा साहब जब सिकिम पर और काम्मीर पर चीन का रेडियो हमारे खिलाफ बो ल रहा था तब अपना रोष प्रकट करते। हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलों में चीन जितना दखल देता है उस पर अबर से अपना रोष व्यक्त करने तो मुझे खुशी होती लेकिन बजाय इस के वह जो मजबूत शोक हैं उन का समर्थन भी करने से एतराज करते हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि सेल्फ डिटरमिनेशन का तिब्बत को पूरा अधिकार देना चाहिए।

जहां तक सबील है डीगो गार्सिया का और ओमान में, मसीरा आइलड में जो बेस बनाए हैं और जिस तरह हमारे देश के आसपास बिस्तार बादी और साम्राज्यवादी ने जो खतरे खड़े किए हैं, हम चाहते हैं कि इस क्षेत्र में जो कि शांति का क्षेत्र है उन को कोई खाम नहीं होना चाहिए और उस दिशा में जो भारत सरकार ने कदम उठाए हैं, हिन्द महासागर के आस पास के रहने वाले जो देश हैं उन से जो बातचीत की है वह उचित है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यूनाइटेड नेशंस में जो आज तीसरी दुनिया और समाजवादी दुनिया का बहुमत है उस में भी इस क्षेत्र को शांति का क्षेत्र दोबारा घोषित करने की कोशिश करेंगे। जो एशिया की काकल सेक्वीरिटी है, एशिया के देशों को शिक्षा कर

[श्री शशिबूषण]

अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए तैयार करने का एक ऐतिहासिक भार उन पर आ गया है। मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि उस दिशा में वह कदम बढ़ाएंगे।

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : (राजनयन) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, वैदेशिक नीति और उस का प्रभाव आन्तरिक स्थिति का प्रतिबिम्ब मात्र है। हमारे देश की आन्तरिक स्थिति यदि शांतिपूर्ण है, प्रगतिशील है, आर्थिक दृष्टि से हम सुदृढ़ हैं, एकता भी है तो इस का प्रभाव जगत के देशों पर भी पड़ता है। अपने देश की स्थिति के आईने में अपना चेहरा देखें तो हम शांति के साथ प्रगति करना चाहते हैं तब देश की भीतरी स्थिति में उस समय क्रान्ति का आव्हान किया जा रहता है और आर्मी और पुलिस जो अनुशासन के साथ सेवा के लिए होती है, जिस पर इस सार्वभौम सत्ता की सुरक्षा का दायित्व होता है उन को भड़काया जाता है, तब हमारी स्थिति भी विदेशी या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दुनिया में कैसी होगी इस की कल्पना की जा सकती है।

हमारे देश की वैदेशिक नीति का आधार बहुत पुराना है, सनातन है। महर्षि कौटिल्य 2500 वर्ष पहले कह गए थे कि पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों के साथ संबंध मैत्रीपूर्ण, शालीनतापूर्ण, गरिमापूर्ण और प्रतिष्ठापूर्ण होना चाहिए। लेकिन कबान उन्होंने यह भी कही थी कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और पड़ोसी राष्ट्रों के साथ तीन परिप्रेक्ष्य के संबंध हो सकते हैं—युद्ध, शांति और सख्ति इन से दूर नहीं रह सकते। हमारा संबंध चीन से बढ़ा अच्छा था। इतना ही नहीं हमारे कठ यह नारा लगाते लगाते सूख गए थे—हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई। हम भाई भाई कहते थे और उधर एक बर्बरक हो रहा था। उस बर्बरक का शिकार हमारा देश हुआ। हम ने इसी शांति के लिए देश का बटवारा होने दिया। शाश्वत शांति के लिए हम ने पाकिस्तान बनने दिया और पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा युद्ध हुआ। कई बार शांति की खोज में हम गए, शांति की खोज में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ताश्कंद गए, खैर खैर कर न आ सके। हम ने शांति का

हाथ बढ़ा कर शिमला में संधि की। युद्ध शांति और संधि के परिप्रेक्ष्य में हम पाकिस्तान को सामने रखना चाहते हैं। इस के अतिरिक्त कोई तीसरा राष्ट्र नहीं है जिस के हमारी शांति और मैत्री की संधि न हो। एक तरफ बर्मा है उत्तर में नेपाल और अफगानिस्तान है, ईरान है, इधर थायलैंड और सिंगापुर भी बहुत दूर नहीं हैं, सुदूर पूर्व के देश जापान से लेकर आप कहीं इधर उधर देखें, लका हमारे दक्षिण में है सब के साथ हमारे संबंध बड़े अच्छे हैं। लेकिन इन संबंधों में हम एक सगठन की कल्पना करना चाहते हैं। कल श्री दिनेश सिंह ने कहा था कि एशिया भूखंड में, इस महाद्वीप में अब अमेरिकी की यह जो नीति है हथियार दे कर लड़ाने की, युद्ध में रत रखने की, धरती का पसीने की जगह खून से सींचने की जो उम की नापाक मनोवृत्ति है, उस में वह हम को आलाब रखना चाहते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे युद्ध के बाद किसी राष्ट्र के हथियार खून से ज्यादा से ज्यादा रंगे हुए हैं ता वह अमेरिका के हैं। पच्चीसो बार आश्वासन दिए गए कि ये हथियार जो हम पाकिस्तान को दे रहे हैं भारत के विरुद्ध इस्तेमाल नहीं किए जाएंगे चार्ज किए गए। डा० हेनरी किसिंजर आए और यह कहा कि भारत और पाकिस्तान को हम एक पैगिटो में नहीं रखेंगे। और हमें इस में कई दिलचस्पी नहीं है कि हम पाकिस्तान का शस्त्र सप्लाई करें। लेकिन जब वह न्यूयार्क और वाशिंगटन पहुंचे, उन का दिमाग बदल गया। हम समझते थे कि अब एक नया अध्याय आरम्भ होगा—पाकिस्तान के सन्दर्भ में। डा० किसिंजर ने हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी, राष्ट्रपति जी और विदेश मंत्री जी से मिलने के बाद जो प्रभाव छोड़ा था उस से ऐसा मालूम होता था कि उन का दृष्टिकोण बदल गया है, लेकिन वहाँ पहुंचने के बाद वे बिल्कुल बदल गये। वे इस बात को अच्छी तरह से जानते थे कि जितनी बार एग्जेशन हुआ, पाकिस्तान की तरफ से हुआ, हमने कभी एग्जेशन नहीं किया, क्योंकि हम अपनी पंचशील और सहअस्तित्व की नीति के पुजारी हैं, जिस की आधारशिला पंडित जी ने रखी

जी। दुनिया इस बात को जानती है कि हम यूद्ध से बहुत दूर हैं, हम यूद्ध नहीं चाहते हैं, लेकिन अगर यूद्ध हम पर थोपा गया तो हम उस के भावों से नहीं, पलायनवादी नहीं हैं, यूद्ध थोपा तो हम यूद्ध करेंगे। इस परिप्रेक्ष्य में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ—क्या कारण है कि अमरीका की नीति जो पहले लैंड ब्रेस्ड थी, अब वाटर-ब्रेस्ड हो रही है। हिन्द महासागर में 7 बा फ्लीट घूम रहा है, अड्डे बनाए जा रहे हैं, नुक़िलवर पनडुब्बियों का जाल बिछा कर वे क्या करना चाहते हैं? आज जब कि दुनिया सिंकुड गई है, कुछ ही घंटों में एक स्थान स्थान से दूसरे पर जा सकते हैं, इधर से उधर जा सकते हैं कम्युनिकेशन के साधन बड़े त्वरित हो गये हैं—ऐसी स्थिति में उन की नीयत क्या है, वे क्या करना चाहते हैं?

इण्डो चाइना में जो हो रहा है, सारी सम्यता और इक्लाल की डेरी उन्होंने लगा दी है। आज वहा हज़ियों की डेरी लगी हुई है, कितना खून बहा है, लेकिन इस सब से अमरीका को क्या मिला? आज कम्बोडिया में जो यूद्ध हो रहा है, जो सैनिक वहा पी०आर०जी० की ओर के लड़ रहे हैं—भी शशि भूषण ने ठीक ही कहा है—हमें उन को मान्यता देनी चाहिये। उस राष्ट्र को जो सार्वभौम सत्ता के लिये लड़ता है, हमारा समर्थन उस के साथ है और इस सदन से भी हमारे समर्थन की ध्वनि उस के पास जानी चाहिये।

एक बात आज सिद्ध हो गई है—कोई चाहे कितना हथियार सप्लाई करे, लेकिन जनता के मन में, जनता की घमनिधों में राष्ट्र की स्वतंत्रता के प्रति हमदर्दी और प्यार है तो चाहे कितनी बड़ी शक्ति आ जाय, कभी भी उस घरती को परास्त नहीं कर सकती, पराधीन नहीं कर सकती और वह उदाहरण आज वियतनाम और कम्बोडिया ने उपस्थित कर दिया है। हम चाहते हैं कि एक झण्डे के नीचे सारा इण्डो-चाइना आ जाय और हमें इस काम में अपने मित्र पी०आर०जी० को सार्वभौम देना चाहिये।

जहाँ तक सगठन की बात है—हम एशियाई देशों के नेतृत्व की बात नहीं करते, लेकिन सहव्यस्तित्व और पञ्चशील के अन्तर्गत यदि सारे राष्ट्र सगठित हो जाय तो जो हब-नाबिग इण्डियन ओशन में हो रही है, ज़ुसाका में कॉर्कस हुई जिस में तटस्थ देशों ने निर्णय किया था—, चाहे जितना भी कोई बड़ा राष्ट्र क्यों न हो उस की न आने दिया साथ, यहा शान्ति जोन डिक्लेअर किया जाय।

आज एक कास्पियेसी चल रही है—अरब बरूड में तेल के अन्दर, हम उस का समर्थन नहीं करते हैं, बहुत भाव बढ़ा दिये हैं दाम बढ़ा दिये हैं, हम को भी तकलीफ हो रही है। लेकिन अरब बरूड के 30 बिलियन डालर्स जो उन के यहा हैं, जो सरप्लस हैं बाब उन्ही के यहा डिपॉजिट में हैं, इन्वैस्टमेंट में हैं और उस के एक्च में क्या दे रहे हैं? अमरीकन पालिसी यह है कि उस के बदले में दे रहे हैं—मस्त्र। प्रोबोक कर रहे हैं कि आप बड़े राष्ट्र हैं, खड़े हो जाइये, हथियार हम देते हैं। हम इस सदन के द्वारा बाब इन अरब देशों से अपील करना चाहते हैं—आप की जो व्यापार नीति है या आप का जो समझौता है, उस का पालन करे भाव बढ़ाना हो तो बढ़ावें, उत्पाद कम करना चाहते हैं तो कम करे, लेकिन अमरीका की जालसाजी और वडयन्त में न आय, वे जब आप को हथियार देने की बात कहें तो उसे स्वीकार न करे। क्योंकि जब कभी भी खतरा आवेगा—आज ईजराइल न्यूक्लियर के मामले में थर्ड पावर है, उसके पास इतना भण्डार है कि यदि वह आपरेट करेगा तो एशिया भूखण्ड के लिये खतरा पैदा हो जायेगा। हम चाहते हैं कि अरब देश अपनी सार्वभौम सत्ता के लिये, व्यापार के लिये जो, नीति निर्धारित करना चाहें करे, हमारे उन के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध हैं—ईरान के साथ ईराक के साथ, सऊदी अरब के साथ, क्वैत के, साथ—वे सम्बन्ध अच्छे बने रहें, लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि वे अमरीका की जालसाजी में न आयें।

[श्री राज गहोदर वाघेरी]

बाज सेंसर में क्या हो रहा है—103 देश ऐसे हैं जो आर्थिक दृष्टि से बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं। संयुक्त राष्ट्र के 138 देश में से 103 देश ऐसे हैं जो बूझें हैं, जिन को डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज कहा जाता है, जो आर्थिक दृष्टि से पिछड़े हुए हैं। 100 आदमियों में से बाज 60 आदमी बूझें हैं और इस संख्या में हमारी जनसंख्या भी बूझी है, बाज हमें रोटी की आवश्यकता है, गोला-बारूद की आवश्यकता नहीं है। खेती के उत्पादन की जरूरत है, अनाज की जरूरत है, प्रेम की जरूरत है, हथियारों की जरूरत नहीं है। इस लिये इस सदन के माध्यम से मैं उन उच्च राष्ट्रों से बर्बाद करना चाहता हूँ और खस कर उन राष्ट्रों से कहना चाहता हूँ जो लड़ना चाहते हैं, उन को बर्बाद करना चाहता हूँ—ये अपनी ऐसी नीति का परित्याग करे। हमारे सकल काल में इस हमारी मजद के लिये जाया, उस का हम समर्थन करते हैं, उस की नीति की दुहाई और बसाई देते हैं।

SHRI ANANTRAO PATIL (Khed):

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I know that the time at my disposal is very short and, therefore, I will try to be very brief and will try to avoid repeating the points that have already been made.

The year of 1974 was a year full of trials and economic difficulties for the developing countries due to the world monetary instability and shortages and high prices of fuel, food and fertilisers. The world is going again through a process of certain industrial revolution. Hence, the energy crisis or the oil crisis has acquired the greatest importance as far as the developing countries are concerned. In this context, the Foreign Affairs Ministry has not remained the same as it was four or five years back. How many more responsibilities have been added to it: It has to look to the economic side of the country also. While formulating its foreign policy, the Ministry has to pay attention to the economic, cultural, educational and technological relations with different countries. Hence, in the changing spectrum of the world scene, in the diplomatic activities, the administrative

structure of the Ministry and the foreign service need to be continuously strengthened and adjusted to new priorities.

There are nearly 117 Missions abroad with nearly 2,000 personnel, including the local people. The Ministry has 19 Divisions, with 2,000 officers and staff. But the staffing pattern and the work-method require a change. For example, let us take the expenditure of the Indian Missions abroad. The expenditure on the Indian High Commission in London has got to be curtailed because India is a country today which cannot afford to have such types of luxuries. When I say that the staffing pattern has to be changed, I mean that there should be more India-based staff there in the Missions than the local people, and if we want to have local people, they should be on a contract basis.

We have been paying more attention to our Missions in the Western countries than those in the Asian or African or Latin American countries. In the context of the energy crisis and the need for strengthening India's economic co-operation and commercial relations, our representation in the Gulf region and the Latin American countries has to be strengthened.

Taking into consideration the situation in the world today, our primary responsibility is to develop the areas surrounding us. We have to bear in mind the fact that we are strategically situated in Asia and hence, we have to lay a greater emphasis on Asian affairs. It has become necessary for us to evolve an Asian organisation for mutual development. If we look at the map of Asia, we will find that we are at the centre. About what is happening in West Asia and South-East Asia, we do feel concerned. But there was a time when, if anything happened in West Asia and South-East Asia, India was always in the centre of the picture. But, for some reason or the other, we have moved away from it. We do feel concerned about the happenings in these areas, and the basic problems do attract our attention. The friendship and all round co-operation between India and the United States with the Soviet Union is resting on the solid ground of mutual respect and non-interference. India's nuclear technology was seen in the proper perspective by U.S.S.R. which admitted that

It was a step on the path of economic and technological self-reliance.

India's friendship and co-operation with the East European countries has also received a further fillip with the visits of the Prime Ministers of Bulgaria, Hungary, GDR, Czechoslovakia and others.

With this background if we look at the relations with the United States, unfortunately, such a development has not taken place. There is a need to make an effort to normalise the relations with U.S.A. Dr. Henry Kissinger paid a visit to India in November last and held discussions. These talks did help to remove past misunderstandings and contribute to mature and constructive understanding between the two countries. It was also agreed to set up a Joint Commission which was a great step but the whims of some individuals came in the way and the hopeful trend in Indo-US relationship was thus clouded by the American decision of removal of the embargo on the supply of arms to Pakistan. India's grave concern and serious disappointment at these developments was conveyed to the U.S. Government. Our Minister for External Affairs made a statement on the floor of the House and announced that he would not attend the meeting of the Indo-US. Joint Commission in Washington which was to be held on the 13th-14th March.

The Pentagon has started fortifying their naval bases in the Indian Ocean and make the peaceful zone unsafe. Is the so-called super-power really trying to consolidate the process of detente or enhance the dangers of war? In these circumstances, India has to be play an important role and I hope our foreign policy and our efforts in the direction of world peace are bound to yield great results...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a good point to wind up with.

SHRI ANANTRAO PATIL: I will not elaborate and I will be brief. I will confine myself to our external publicity.

Unfortunately, among our neighbours, Pakistan and China continue to indulge in false and mischievous propaganda against India in different parts of the world. As a journalist, I had a few

opportunities to visit some of the countries and I found there that their publicity and propaganda machinery is much more stronger and efficient than ours and also they spend a lot on that. I know with the financial limitations of our Government, we cannot spend much more money. But, taking into consideration the importance of publicity, public relations and propaganda, we have to see whether at least...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is an ingrained quality in human nature to sympathise with the under-dog, with whom they think is an under-dog, and you cannot do anything about it.

SHRI ANANTRAO PATIL: We must have Information Services at least in four or five important countries which other countries are having, e.g. British Information Service, U.S. Information Service, etc. Unless we have a strong information service, we are not going to meet the challenge posed by China and Pakistan in this respect.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Our difficulty is that we cannot take the pose of an under-dog. We are too big for that.

SHRI NOORUL HUDA: Too arrogant for that.

SHRI SYED AHMAD AGA (Baranulla): It is not Pakistan that counts but what matters is the United States menace which is increasing even to-day. This self-appointed guardian to police the entire world has come out to-day. There is a news item in the papers today and I will just read out one or two lines.

"The Americans cannot afford to go into isolation."

Then it again says:

"we cannot turn our backs on the rest of the world."

It is again said:

"Like it or not, we are a great power."

Then it goes on:

"The President vowed to uphold the United States military strength..."

[Shri Syed Ahmed Aga]

It has come out again to police the entire world. The House of Cards of puppet regimes in Cambodia and in South Vietnam have collapsed. U.S. imperialism is forced to retreat. But it wants to come back in a big way. U.S.A. put up puppets everywhere including Pakistan. Puppets should take a lesson from what happened to Lon Nol and Thieu. It should be a lesson to the puppets that they have to run away weeping. They must know that they cannot exist on borrowed weapons. The United States of America supports the regime in Rhodesia of white people because they get from there chrome and nickel. South Africa has become nuclear. It has joined the nuclear club which is a threat to the Indian ocean area. This area of Asia has got 40% of gold, 60% of uranium, 80% of tin, 90% of rubber, 98% diamond, 57% oil. The U.S.A. obtains 85% of rubber and 70% of tin from this area. Along with Diego Garcia base, the base at Masera which was obtained by U.S. from the Sultan of Oman in return for weapons, to crush the people of Oman. Now the base at Masera, Gowder and Makaran is the channel through which all passes to us. This can be obstructed by the U.S. if they so choose in any emergency.

In an Article, Moosa Moola, Chief Representative of Asian Mission, African National Congress, refers to Simonstown at the extreme end of South Africa. And, if South Africa is going to be made strong, it is going to be a threat again to the countries around the Indian Ocean. It is significant that three vetoes were used by U.S., by U.K. and by France on expulsion of South Africa because they wanted to use South Africa. Kissinger when he came last year gave an assurance that Pakistan will not be given arms and there is no question of parity between India and Pakistan. Now they are arming Pakistan on the plea that they have to maintain a balance between India and Pakistan. Actually, the intention is to de-stabilise normal conditions in the subcontinent and therefore arming of Pakistan. I welcome the detente between the two super-powers. But I do not have any doubts with regard to this that they do not want a nuclear war. Because, that will finish them also in the process.

U.S.A. has 30,000 nuclear weapons which is 3500 times much more stronger

than the bomb which was thrown in Hiroshima. They don't want to be wiped out in a nuclear war. Therefore, their only game is to create this de-stabilisation in the Asian theatre.

I shall go a step further and say that though nuclear war will not be their yet we feel concerned when U.S. is arming Pakistan this time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Aga, you have got just two minutes more. What do you want them to do about it? What should the External Affairs Ministry do in this situation?

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA: I will omit most of the portions of my speech. What I would like to say is this. The Ministry should not only have a dynamic policy but we should also pursue the Asian Collective Security system. We now see the U.S. making its efforts to distillise this sub-continent. Therefore, our policy should be such that we can have stability in this area. We should try to do this progressively. We have recognised Cambodia. We should recognise P.R.G. The U.S.A. is trying to use bases for their own imperialistic purposes. We should not allow this to happen in this part of the country.

I would conclude by saying that we must have a sort of Asian Collective Security system here. I think about a year ago or so, we had attended a meeting at Moscow. About 3,000 delegates attended that meeting there and they resolved that we should have a system of Asian Collective Security in this region. We should try to see in what manner and in what way we should have such a security system which would help us.

SHRI D. P. JADEJA (Jamnagar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. Much has been said about global strategy. Most of the Members have covered almost all the important countries of the world. But, unfortunately, I feel that one important part of the world has not only been neglected by our officers in the North Block but also by Members in this House.

Sir, I would refer you to Chapter VIII of this Report.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is the most difficult little book for me to read! This is a rignmarole of all kinds of things.

SHRI D. P. JADEJA: Since this report has been published from South Block, they always consider South America or Latin America as a part of America. Once they mentioned it as South America, for the second time they mentioned that as Latin America and, for the third time, they have again mentioned that as South America. Whatever the report that was given about 15 years ago, to-day we find the very same thing in this Report. We have had the experiences in the past and let us not forget that as far back as in 1953, India was defeated in the U.N. in a Committee's election by 21 votes whereas 17 votes were from the Latin American countries. It was since then that we have been realising the importance of these Latin American countries. And I am proud to say, to an extent, that we have made some developments in this respect. We have now, out of these 24 or 25 Latin American countries, diplomatic relations with almost all the 20 to 21 countries which is an encouraging sign.

But, Sir, having diplomatic relations alone does not serve the purpose. We should have diplomatic relations along with economic cooperation. We have, in this country, been exporting goods of all sorts which have still not reached the Latin America.

Sir, in this report—I can show the reports for the last five to six years—it is always mentioned that here is a potential market in Latin America. We are prepared to develop our trade relations but it is difficulty in shipping which is coming in our way. This is an excuse which we are giving just to write something in the report. Has not the Shipping Corporation already informed the Ministry of Commerce that if they could give some sort of guarantee that goods would be sent there they are prepared to start an experimental line for at least six months.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): They have already started one.

SHRI D. P. JADEJA: That is only Argentina! I was coming to that. I believe we are even trying to start a line through Hong Kong. We could

even—if we are interested—start operating to South America through Yugoslavia with whom we have good relations. The Yugoslavia lines have lot of contacts with Latin American countries. It is for the Ministry to be more serious in this direction. I am glad that our new Foreign Affairs Minister who has just been there—and he will be again going there—will know for himself the warmth and the friendliness that these people have for all of us. I would congratulate the Ministry for recently recognising El Salvador. These are small countries in Central America looked after from Mexico. When we have an ambassador at Panama why not we have a junior resident ambassador in Guatemala who could look after all these countries in the Central zone. Talking about South America, Brazil covers Bolivia. I would like to know the logic of it. Would it not have been proper to ask our man in Peru to be in charge of Bolivia? These two countries are next to each other and have much in common. These are the small points which I would like to mention just to draw the attention of the Government that it is these small things which matter quite a lot and more attention should be given to them.

I would in short mention about another very important aspect about Latin America and that is our trade relations. I believe STC has office in Buenos Aires which is doing well. But Buenos Aires does not cover the entire Latin American continent. Lima is the headquarters of the Andean Pact. Why can't we upgrade that embassy of ours? Why not put a senior ambassador and make him our economic Commissioner there who can cover the entire Latin American countries because today almost all the Latin American countries are in the Andean Pact except Argentina, Venezuela and Brazil? Would it not be worthwhile to study this point and give importance to our base in Lima which is being neglected to-day?

I would also like to mention one thing which Mr. Sequeira has also mentioned. It was in the year 1971 when for the first time the Latin American Parliament invited an observer from India and we sent one. They appreciated it. We were invited in 1972 and we sent a representative that year also. Sir, we should remember here that the

[Shri D. P. Jadeja]

Latin American Parliament asked only three countries in the world to send observers and we were one of them. Not only that. In other things also, they have mentioned the name of India and they have welcomed the representation of India. What happened now? In 1974, we were invited, I am told, but, we could not send an observer. The point is not only that. The major point is that even in 1973, I had spoken from the same place about the same matter and I had told the Government that since 1972, Government of India were trying to convene a joint conference of democratic countries from Latin America, Africa and Asia; we were given this work. I do not know what happened. Whenever I informally ask the Ministry, I am told, this is something which the Lok Sabha Secretariat has to do. When I ask the Lok Sabha Secretariat, they say that they are going to take it up at some level or the other. But, the result is that we have been given a bad name. It may be the fault of the Lok Sabha Secretariat or the people in the South Block. I am not interested in that. I am only interested to know, who is to be blamed for this and whether we are going to do something to win back the confidence of these Latin American countries who believe in democracy and who look to India as a democratic nation, which could be an example for them to follow :

Saying this, I support the demands.

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH (Parabhan): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs, not merely by way of formality, but, for this reason that for the first time, a distinguished politician and a senior Cabinet Minister has been put in charge of external affairs, who, with his revolutionary background, his socialist ideas and his new approach which he has brought to bear on this subject, has raised certain hopes for Afro-Asian solidarity. The recent conference which the Foreign Minister has been pleased to attend (and the three cardinal principles which he has propounded there), has not only received international recognition, but, has, for the first time, left an indelible mark on Indian participation in this

conference. They have perhaps succeeded in restoring the Bandung spirit of the past.

Sir, the merit of the foreign policy or any other policy is that it can only be emphasised by good propaganda. The best propaganda for any policy is that the policy should be a correct one and for the first time, we have the hope and confidence that the practical pragmatism which the Foreign Minister has brought to bear upon, will yield fruitful results in evolving a conscious policy of Afro-Asian solidarity. Sir, I am not saying this merely for the sake of repetition of words. We are linked with Africa and Asia. Not only our colonial past is similar, not only the present imperialistic exploitation is similar, but, even our feelings far surpass the geophysical boundaries and we feel one with the cause for which this comity of nations is struggling. Sir, this struggle is going to be long and hard and in this struggle, a developing country like India is looked upon by other up-coming Afro-Asian countries as a leading light towards this solidarity. I hope our Foreign Ministry would prove worthy of the same.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, since the days of Jawaharlal Nehru, the foreign policy of India has always assumed an international stature in the down trodden comity of the world. Whenever there has been injustice, in any corner of the world, India's voice has not only been heard with respect but, has always been looked upon as a guiding principle for solution of international ills.

The Kissinger touch which has faded even before it was born is not something which is common with our heritage, which is common with our thinking on foreign affairs. We do not look upon our Foreign Minister to work for wonders, but we certainly look upon him to see to it that solid foundations are laid for international brotherhood, particularly in the Afro-Asian world.

I have something to say about Asian unity. During his last days, Pandit Nehru was toying with the idea of giving birth to a sort of Asian Commonwealth, but that idea could not take shape. Even the limited co-operation in the sphere of an Asian Bank could not go beyond scratching the problem. Therefore, some sort of association with

a socio-political base of the countries of South-East Asia will have to be evolved and India and her Foreign Minister will have to give the lead to these countries in coming together on some sort of association of this kind.

There have been rumblings in the U.K. about British participation in EEC. There may be a referendum in Britain on Mr. Wilson's idea of participating in the EEC. The reservation which the British have on EEC points to the cardinal need of having a similar economic association in the Asian continent. In this regard, I wish our Foreign Minister, who has so much economic background and who is so well aware of imperialistic exploitation, both within and abroad, would see to it that he at least lays the foundation for some such international association in Asia.

I have something to say about India's participation and continuance in the sterling bloc. When India achieved its independence a few years ago, our entire international trade was tied with U.K. and we were naturally in the sterling bloc. Thus we accumulated several thousands of crores of sterling to our credit. Therefore, it was in the fitness of things that India should continue in the sterling bloc. But now that our international trade has assumed a proportion where British commonwealth participation is less than 15-20 per cent, there is no sense in India continuing in the sterling bloc. Even the Arab countries are threat of these petro-dollars and are thinking of evolving their own currency formula for the sale of oil and oil products. So India should seriously think of coming out of the sterling bloc and evolve a sort of currency of its own covering several South-Eastern countries like India, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka which will lead to a solid foundation of trade and aid.

The developing nations of the world not only look to Indian technology and Indian political wisdom but they also look to India as the leader of the downtrodden comity of nations. Therefore, I hope that our foreign policy would be worthy of the same.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Bada-gara): This House for the last couple of years unfortunately, gets fewer and fewer occasions to review that I would

call the dynamic changes that are taking place in the international arena. I would say that this is a very regrettable development because, as far as I can see, this is the only occasion i.e. during the debate on the Demands for Grants of this Ministry over the last several sessions—apart from specific issues which have come up in a call attention motion or otherwise—when we can take a look at the international arena. When I say I regret it, it is because the architect of our foreign policy, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, when he was alive saw to it that this House deliberated for hours not merely on the basis of our foreign policy which was settled even during the days of our freedom struggle, but on the contours of the international situation, and each developing crisis.

15.00 hrs.

One of the co-architects of our foreign policy, Shri Krishna Menon is no more. We miss him very much today and probably we will miss him for many years. I had an opportunity to discuss this matter before his death and he said: "it is unfortunate that this Parliament is not taken into confidence and the Government does not think it proper to come up with proper motions on international questions." Because it is the only House which can deliberate and guide; it should not be a close preserve of the South a Block. Since this is the era of people's diplomacy, at least people's representatives in the Lok Sabha should be taken into confidence not only while formulating policy but also while reviewing the policy.

It is not a cliché to say that the year under review had been a year of considerable significance; in the last couple of years a trend had set in in the international scene which transformed the world from a bi-polar world to a multi-polar world with increasing conflicts of national interests and conflict of regional interests. It is not merely an era of detente and the age of descent of Kissinger; I understand the ascent is over as is very clear from the developments in West Asia and also from what is going on in Viet-nam.

Viet Nam is not an ordinary episode of man's struggle for freedom; it has contributed towards transformation of the world from a bi-polar world into a multi-polar one. By its final onslaught

[Shri K. Unnikrishnan]

on the forces of imperialism, it has shown man's eternal determination in search of basic eternal truths and values. A question was posed before Dr. Ho-Chi-Minh, the founding father of Viet-Nam in its modern sense and he was asked: "if you do not have arms how will you fight?" He replied: "I hope our mountains will fight; our rivers will fight and our valleys and the whole country will rise against aggression." That was the spirit which asserted itself and pulled down the mightiest empire that the world has seen. In this House people will disagree whether it is an empire or not but fact, and the greatest and mightiest empire today is of the United States dollar, the American imperialism facing the final onslaught of the Vietnamese people and their struggle and its fall out in Cambodia would go down in history as a seminal event; that fight will be a significant saga in history.

Mr. Shivajirao Deshmukh pointed out a little while ago that we had a new Foreign Minister who was not only an outstanding statesman but who had also been involved in our liberation as a leader of our national struggle. I would say that he is not merely to be a witness to history; he has also to mould historical forces. I cannot understand how they can refrain from recognising the PRG? Which Government is there in Vietnam? On whose side are you? These are the questions. Freedom loving people would like to ask the Government of India and our great leader, Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her distinguished colleague who is also, as I said, a great nationalist. They have shown wisdom in recognising the Cambodian Government and not only asserted ourselves against the forces of imperialism but are also leading the forces of progress.

This year has also seen many interesting developments in our sub-continent. Unfortunately some of our own friends have talked a lot about developments which should not have been done about Bangladesh. There have been national and international comments about what is going on in Sikkim. The whole question is, how do you view this development? Is it the story of a fight between feudal forces and assertion of the democratic spirit. India did not engineer it. The fact of the matter is,

neither the Himalayas nor the rivers or oceans can prevent the assertion of the human thirst for liberty and the search for a national purpose and democratic values. If democratic values have asserted themselves in Sikkim, Government of India is not to be blamed, nor as the Chinese have in an opportunistic way done, can the people of India or their so-called expansionism be blamed. But if the democratic spirit asserts and says, "We want union with India", undoubtedly I am sure the Government of India and this House will give unstinted support and welcome them to this great family of the Indian Union.

The basic and fundamental point is that we have not transgressed upon anybody's territory nor are we interested in a policy of aggression, as the whole world knows. But still comments would continue to flow—whether from Washington or London is of no consequence—that Shangrila is not being allowed to remain and the Chogyal, an old monument of feudalism in the Indian sub-continent is not there, if not for any other reasons, to amuse the anthropological interests of these people. I hope in a dynamic situation like this, we should have no hesitation in supporting this policy.

There have been very welcome developments in other parts of the world as in Portugal, again as a consequence of this assertion of the spirit in Angola, Mozambique and in Africa. We hope we will have more friendly relations with these countries.

There has been some reference in this House yesterday about the state of Indo-American relations. Somebody—I do not want to name him—talked about the identity of purpose, identity of interests and various other things that are supposed to bind together the Governments—I am not talking about the people—of the United States of America and India. I want friendly relations with every country, and certainly between the peoples of U.S.A. and India. I do not know what this identity of purpose is, whether it has been manifested in Diego Garcia or in the arms supplies to Pakistan. This view certainly does not flow out from our own anti-imperialist struggle or reflects the determination to live a life of honour and carve out for ourselves a place in the comity of nations.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): Sir, I am grateful to the hon. members who have participated in the debate for the last 6 hours. I have listened with great care to most of the speeches. Those which I have not heard, I took care to read very carefully. Some of the members have made very constructive suggestions and I must pay my compliments for the high calibre of the debate. The constructive suggestions that they have made certainly should be borne in mind by the Government and I can assure the Hon. Member, Shri Unnikrishnan who spoke last, that in this era of people's diplomacy as he called it, it is very right and necessary that the foreign policy of a country is reviewed in this forum, people's forum, from time to time. I would like to point out, with your permission, that immediately after I took over I myself had sent a motion for considering the foreign policy of the country so that I would have, to begin with, some mandate, some direction, some instructions, some suggestions from this Hon. House and I might launch on my new duties with a little more support. Unfortunately the House did not find time to consider it. So, as far as the Government is concerned, the Government is always willing to consider the problems of foreign affairs in this House because it not only helps the Government to review its own policies but also gives some new directions in the light of the position in the world today.

In this debate I would like to make a general review of the international scene as we see it today. The international situation is in an important and crucial stage of evolution and many developments that are taking place vitally affect us also. Hon. Members would naturally wish to know how we see the international situation, what are the major features of the trends that affect us, and how it is that we are going to meet this evolving situation by anticipating events, by taking the initiative and also by reacting to events.

As most of the Hon. Members have pointed out, the international scene today has moved quite a bit from what it was two years ago. As we all know, the present era is also called an era of detente. Formerly, there was an atmosphere of confrontation which is being

increasingly replaced by an attitude of co-operation. I am saying that it is a trend, it has not still become a full reality, but certainly it is a trend. The world today is not as it was before, a bi-polar world, but it is a multi polar world and it is in this world that we have to watch the new developments and trends.

As we see it, both Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. which are the two Super Powers are adopting a policy of co-operation and, with all the strains and difficulties in the way, it seems that they are making slow but definite progress in that direction which we welcome. As we see it, they have succeeded to a certain extent because, despite many problems which we see today in West Asia, Cyprus etc., they have succeeded in avoiding any confrontation. Some people say that this *detente* is also another way of managing political crisis. It may be so. That is another way of looking at it, but the point is that certainly a new trend of co-operation instead of confrontation has come to stay and we welcome it, we support it.

There is also another very important factor in the international scene, and that is the relationship of China with these two major Powers. We see that there is slow but definite understanding between China and U.S.A. It may be halting, it may be sometimes ambiguous, but I see a definite trend of understanding between the U.S.A. and China on the one hand. On the other hand the relationship between China and the U.S.S.R. is clouded with suspicion and mistrust. I am merely mentioning certain major facts which ultimately influence the international scene. As to how these events affect us, to that we will come a little later. But let us first of all take into consideration the major situations.

There is also another very positive factor which has come into force in the international scene today, one which was in a very detailed and eloquent manner mentioned yesterday by many Hon. Members. Prof. Mukerjee and our friend Shri Dinesh Singh and many other Members from this side made mention of the new rising tide of people's success in Asia particularly. And this is something which is very significant. I was tempted to see what Panditji thought about these

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

new trends immediately after independence, how he saw it, because there is no doubt that the greatest contribution to the world and to India that was made by Pandit Nehru was that he made a very accurate judgment, a very precise judgment, of the new world that was emerging after the Second World War. That was much more important and it is in that view that he laid down certain basic fundamental policies for the foreign policy of this country, on the basis of which we are evolving our foreign policy. Some people say that it is weak, some people say that it is one-sided, but really speaking they have not tried to understand the real urges and the real inspiration which have been the foundations of this policy. I would like to quote a passage from the speech of Pandit Nehru which he delivered 28 years ago before independence. It was his inaugural speech at the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi held on 23rd March, 1947. And this is the last paragraph which I would like to read.

"All over Asia we are passing through trials and tribulations. In India also you see conflict and trouble. Let us not be disheartened by this. This is inevitable in an age of mighty transition (mark the words "mighty transition") There are often creative impulses and a new vitality in all the peoples in Asia. The masses are awake and they demand their heritage. Strong winds are blowing all over Asia. Let us not be afraid of them, but rather welcome them, for only with their help can we build a new age of our dreams. Let us have faith in these great new forces and the dream which is taking place. Let us, above all, have faith in the human spirit which Asia symbolised for long ages past."

So this was assessment of Pandit Nehru 28 years ago and what has happened in the last 28 years has not only supported this, but it has shown that people in Latin America, Africa and Asia, all people who were under the domination of imperialism were on the march and struggle against these evil forces. We see from year to year that these forces are marching forward from one triumph to another.

We have seen what has happened in Cambodia; what is happening in South Vietnam. We have seen what has happened in South Africa, in the African continent and what has happened in Portugal. These are the new forces, the peoples' forces, in Africa and Asia which, certainly, have made a great impact on the international scene today. This is one of the most important realities. I am mentioning this thing because this is the most important element which will shape the foreign policy or the world trends in the year to come.

Another important thing that has happened is the emergence the third of world. Not merely it has liberated or it has come into its own but it has organised certain institutional forums also to assert itself. One feature of it is the non-aligned movement. The non-aligned movement today is one of the important forces with which the world has to work, recognise and accept as an important fact. We have seen that most of the non-aligned countries are developing countries and most of them belong to the third world. What have we seen in the last year? Both the Special Session and the General Assembly Session of the U.N. demonstrated that this third world and the peoples of the third world are not merely struggling to come into their own but are asserting their rights; they are asserting to achieve justice and equity. They are not merely asking for justice but they are finding out ways and instruments to achieve justice and equity.

These are the basic elements in the international scene today. Of course, there is another reality also which we have to take into account and that is the very acute economic situation that has overtaken the world in the last two or three years, particularly, in the form of inflationary conditions, the prices of certain raw materials and the prices of imports in developing countries and their effect on the economy of those countries. This is also a new reality that we have to take into account.

We have seen in the last year or so, in different international forums, many important matters regarding raw materials, regarding petrol prices, regarding transfer of real resources from developed countries to developing countries, regarding monetary crises and

the solutions for them coming up. There are many aspects of the economic situation which are being discussed.

There was a question of confrontation between the oil consumers and the oil producers. Naturally, we as a developing country and as a non-aligned country took a line that even the oil producing countries have a certain right, as sovereign States, to fix the prices of oil even though it certainly cost us more. Even then, we took a principled position and we supported that. At the same time, we have also pointed out to the world that it has had a rather harmful effect on our economy for which certain solutions must be found. Instead of taking an approach of confrontation, we can certainly take an approach and an attitude of cooperation. It is on those lines that we have worked at different international forums. Even now, in Paris, I think, our representative is meeting in a preparatory meeting for a conference between the consumers and producers and most seriously affected countries. I hope, with this approach of cooperation, it might help us to go ahead.

I mention, in detail, these economic matters because the present economic problems, monetary problems and the economic crisis, all these things, are also factors in the international scene which are going to influence policy-making in the foreign affairs field. You cannot separate economic matters from political matters. We saw what happened in the 1973 war in West Asia. It really created the present acute problems as a result of the political situation there. They are increasingly getting integrated with each other. It is very difficult to separate one from the other. Therefore, this is an important factor on the world scene today that is going to affect the thinking in all the countries, of which both the developed countries and the developing countries have to take note as a part of their policy-making in foreign affairs.

I was talking about non-alignment. In the non-alignment movement also, in order to maintain the solidarity of the non-aligned countries, we will have to find out the areas of cooperation whereby, taking into consideration the complementarity of the economies of these countries, we could build bridges

of cooperation with non-aligned countries, the developing countries, the third world countries. And this solidarity of the non-aligned countries is the greatest guarantee of the progressive forces in the world. This is the major point that I wanted to make about this particular aspect.

Non-alignment, as I have said, is movement. I was asked the other day whether non-alignment was not becoming a mantra, and I pointed out to my interviewer that 'non-alignment is a dynamic, living organism'. Notwithstanding the progress of detente, which all of us welcome and to which we subscribe in our own attitudes, there is need for vigilance and solidarity among the non-aligned countries in guarding against the tendency to carve out spheres of influence or settle matters over the heads of others. The importance of such solidarity was reiterated at the recent Ministerial meeting of the Coordination Bureau of the non-aligned at Havana. The aims and principles of non-alignment continue to have a great validity in order to ensure genuine independence, peace and international security for the majority of the world's population, and India will continue to play its due role in furthering these principles. What has happened in Cyprus underlines the importance of solidarity among the non-aligned. We firmly support the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and non-aligned status of Cyprus. We endorse the various U.N. Resolutions on Cyprus which, while reiterating the above-mentioned principles, call for an end to foreign military presence of interference and for talks between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities in order to achieve a mutually acceptable political and constitutional settlement. For the sake of peace in that region and of the welfare of the people of Cyprus who have already suffered so much, we earnestly hope that all concerned will avoid doing anything that might delay or endanger the prospects of such a settlement. We are glad to note that there is a likelihood of the talks between the two communities being resumed shortly.

I have mentioned the economic and monetary crises. I would like to refer to what Mr. Nalk has said. I would request him to reconsider the proposition that he had made...

AN HON. MEMBER: What did he say?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I do not want to repeat what he had said.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Why not tell him that it is not a *mantra* but a *tantra*?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I am sure he has followed the argument. We have certainly supported the oil-producing countries in this. It is basically a very correct position to take, because this has been the basis of exploitation by the colonialists.

We talk about colonialism. Ultimately what is colonialism? They try to exploit the raw materials of undeveloped countries, and further process them, and it is this processing part that, really speaking, gives the economic strength.

Therefore, the right of a sovereign country to fix the prices of its own raw materials is a very fundamental principle which we must support. But, at the same time, I am quite aware that it has created certain problems which we are, very frankly, discussing with the non-aligned, oil-producing and oil-exporting countries—that it is their duty also to keep the solidarity of the non-aligned world, that they must see that they too try to cooperate with the developing countries in order that these countries are not ultimately affected.

Our basic position in international affairs is—and I should say that that is the major plank of our foreign policy—to build our friendship on very strong foundations as far as our neighbouring countries are concerned. Therefore, you will permit me to go country by country because this is important... (Interruptions). That is the major plank of our policy in the neighbouring countries in which I include the Gulf countries, the South-east Asian countries and also the countries in the North. I know the hon. Member over there has sent me a chit. He wants to ask me a question. But before he asks the question, I will try to answer it and I am sure I will not be able to convince him...

SHRI SHIVAJI RAO S. DESHMUKH: He is not open to conviction.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I will take a little more time, but I think this is an occasion when I have to explain all these matters.

Let us take the case of Pakistan first because it is a neighbour and it is in the minds of many members who have made a mention. I read the speeches and I would like to assure hon. member, Shri Madhav Rao Scindia. He sent me a note yesterday that I should be present when he spoke, I am sorry I had to go away to attend a Cabinet Committee meeting urgently. But I have taken care to read his speech very carefully. About Pakistan he has made criticisms against our foreign policy. As he is a young and new member I do not want to be critical about him. I certainly would like to appreciate his participation in the debate and the contribution he has made. I must tell him that he has not followed the real foreign policy principles behind what happened in the Simla Agreement.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (Guna) I followed it all right. I followed it very well...

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I am giving my assessment to you. You said yesterday whatever you wanted to say.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): The assessment will be reviewed by Sardar Swaran Singh who is already sitting there.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: What happened in 1971 was something bigger than merely Indo-Pakistan relations. The result of the success of 1971 has to be seen in the emergence of a sovereign Bangla Desh, in India's effort to go to the aid of a struggling people who were striving hard to get independence, to go to the aid of people who were being ruthlessly and brutally driven from their homes in their own country. This is the context in which you will have to see what happened later on. What was really being tried through the Simla Agreement was not merely to solve the temporary issues that had given rise to particular problems. Naturally Pakistan along with many other friends of hers have come to recognise Bangla Desh. Then, we had to solve certain humanitarian problems involved in it. We had to solve

the problem of the Pakistani prisoners-of-war. What the Simla Agreement has done is that it has certainly given a frame-work of detente in the sub-continent, if I may use that word. It is something which is a very basic. Ultimately you cannot see a region in isolation if you are talking about world peace and friendly relations and co-existence in the whole world. You cannot think in other terms as far as your own region is concerned. Therefore, this is...

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Still you believe the frame is there. The frame is already cast.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I am coming to that. Certainly you can put your questions after I finish and I will try to answer them.

What is the way one has to look? I know there are certain more troubles in the way. I do not think it is very easy. Some of the things cannot be merely wished away. Wishful thinking is not going to be helpful to anybody. We should better see the significance and the force behind what really speaking took place there. Well, afterwards, Pakistan has taken a zig-zag attitude, to use their own words. I do not want to go over the details of what we did in case of trade, communication agreements, etc. Certainly Pakistan has to accept this position that it has to build up good relations with India, and efforts have been made, but there are certain inherent attitudes in Pakistan which have to be cured by their own efforts. Possibly we will have to help them to cure it, and possibly history will also cure it. The first difficult position that they took was immediately after May 1974 when India exploded a nuclear device. They tried to misinterpret India and carried on propaganda against India all over the world, but, without much impact. A large number of countries have accepted the bonafides of India in its affirmation that this nuclear explosion was made for peaceful purposes. Even U.S.A. accepted this position. So, their attempts did not make much impact on world opinion.

Then, the most important step that we have taken in the last few months to the agreement with Sheikh Abdullah about Kashmir. Shri Bhutto tried to

make capital out of it and started campaigning against that. But I do not think he has made any impact. But he certainly tried to create difficulties in this process of normalisation. We have made it clear to him that this agreement with Sheikh Abdullah is an internal matter of India, Kashmir is an integral part of India and the understanding with Sheikh Abdullah is certainly going to help normalisation of relations with Pakistan. I hope that Shri Bhutto will see the wisdom in this regard and continue this process. We are expecting their Foreign Secretary to come here and discuss further the question of civil aviation, over-flight, etc. and this process will continue.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The earth under the feet is already gone; now you are trying to build up the aerial nexus with Pakistan.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Well, civil aviation also ultimately comes down on the earth! What has happened to you Mr. Samar Guha? You are a great revolutionary; you have become such a pessimist and lost all your idealism. What has happened to you? The main point is this. The old process was going on in a proper way; something happened in between; then our relations with Pakistan were gradually, slowly, may be haltingly, making progress and then at that time this thing happened. And, what a time was chosen by the U.S.A.! The United States of America decided to lift the embargo which in their own wisdom they had placed some ten years before. But this is the time they chose to lift the embargo. It could, really speaking, affect both the processes, normalisation process with Pakistan and normalisation of our relations with U.S.A. also. Somebody said that we must have our bridges of friendship with all the big powers. So, this also came in the way.

It is not again—let me make it clear—a question of merely giving a few weapons here or there which will make a change. What is it that we are objecting to? I would like them to understand our objection. What we are objecting to to-day is the politics behind supplying arms just to create a balance of power. This has been followed by them for the last couple of decades.

[Shri Yashwantrao Chavan]

I think they have now realised it. There seems to be some sort of a curse on American arms that wherever they go, defeat follows them. It looks like that. One sometimes becomes superstitious. I am not a superstitious person. Sometimes this is what it looks like. There is an absolute limitation to what arms can do or what the militarists can do. In both Africa and Asia and possibly, in all parts of the world, nationalism is still an important force to be reckoned with and the awakened masses are also to be reckoned with. Their urges and their aspirations have all to be taken into account. This is one thing which these big countries do not take note of. And that, really speaking, is creating problems for themselves and creating problems for the world.

I think Shri Madhavrao Scindia has criticised America. But, I think, he could not do anything else because now America is supporting Pakistan (Interruptions).

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: What I want to ask you is this. You said that Bangladesh war should be looked at in the context of the emergence of Sovereign Bangladesh. I take it that when war took place, the Government of India had entirely dismissed from their mind the recovery of occupied land in Kashmir. Has the Govt. written of Kashmir? This is my first point. Secondly, I take it that the brave jawans died only for Bangla Desh and not for their country. How can you conduct a war in compartments. Am I to take it that in this war, the jawans fought and died only for Bangladesh and not for our country?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Look, Pakistan made an aggression against us. When was it started? Don't forget the history of Bangladesh. What Bangbandhu was doing was a different thing. But, India entered into war only when there was aggression against India. Do not forget this. You will please re-read the Simla Agreement. You will know that we have not given up this position. Naturally, we have said that these questions will have to be peacefully negotiated to which Mr. Bhutto is a party. (Interruptions). I do not want to enter into a dialogue on this here. Sometimes we can meet and

discuss when we can try to convince you. So, the point I was making was this. As far as Pakistan is concerned, unfortunately, they have taken a wrong position. The reason is the supply of arms to them. That certainly has created certain difficulties. But, still, it is our policy that despite our difficulties, we shall continue to make efforts to normalise our relations with Pakistan because we believe in friendship with Pakistan and our efforts will be deliberately and consciously towards strengthening our relations in that direction.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, I think I have made our own position very clear.

I would like to say that in our policy towards South-East Asia, we have consistently endeavoured to explore the possibilities of mutually beneficial co-operation in the countries in this region. I think we can claim a measure of success in this effort. I would, for instance, refer you to the continental shelf boundary agreement concluded in the year 1974 with Indonesia which is an example of mutually beneficial co-operation in the waters separating the countries in the region. Even with other countries in South-East Asia we have been able to identify and, to some extent, develop co-operation in the areas of mutual interest and we propose to continue our efforts in this direction. Farther afield in the South Pacific, we have been able to evolve a similarity of interests with Australia and New Zealand—an example of this is the valuable change in the Australian attitude on the question of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Our bilateral relations with almost all the countries in Asia have been developing satisfactorily. Of course, the question that was argued yesterday—and it is a very important question—of finding certain forum through which we can develop an Asian identity is a very important point made by all the Members. Some of them showed some ignorance when they said there was no forum where anything could be discussed. It is not so. There are certain institutions in the economic field which are working in the form of ESCAP, Asian Development Bank, etc. But I would like to add that we have been conscious of a certain lack of institutional arrangements for consultations

among Asian countries which could provide an opportunity to ensure that their interests are adequately promoted in various international forums. While we are aware that a variety of political and other reasons somewhat inhibit the creation of a regional consultative organization for Asia, we are nevertheless exploring various avenues to foster a sense of Asian identity. Towards this end Government has been undertaking consultation with several friendly Asian Governments whose response has been generally encouraging. It is hoped that these exchanges can be widened and will eventually lead to the emergence of a greater sense of unity in Asia.

My colleague, the ex-Foreign Minister, Mr. Dinesh Singh, particularly laid emphasis on this aspect and made a mention of the Asian Ministers council. Some meetings took place of this council. The last one was held in 1970. Afterwards it was not possible to hold them but in this matter our judgment is that you cannot force the pace. There are certain regional and internal contradictions which you cannot forcibly solve. This can be done by building bilateral co-operation and when you work out some sort of network of bilateral relations, as I mentioned, a multi-lateral relationship may emerge. We will have to make very cautious though urgent efforts in this direction. Professor Mukherjee and Shri Daschowdhury also made a mention about it.

Recognising that the world grows more interdependent, politically as well as economically, we actively advocate and pursue a policy of international co-operation. This has been the guiding principle of our attitude particularly towards our neighbours. I have already spoken about Pakistan. In recent months, in our relations with some other neighbours, we have been able to resolve some long standing issues which had defied solution for generations. I refer to the Agreements with Sri Lanka on Kachchativu and the future of persons of Indian origin.

I refer also to the agreement with Bangladesh about Indo-Bangladesh land boundary. In our dealings with all neighbours, we have invariably kept in mind the principle of mutual benefit and sovereign equality. Most of our neighbours now have a better understanding and appreciation of our policy

of friendship and co-operation and realise that we have no intention of interfering in their internal affairs or posing any threat to them in any form.

The House is, of course, aware of the recent political and constitutional changes in Bangladesh. So far as we are concerned, they do not signify any change in Bangladesh's policy of friendship and cooperation with India and her non-aligned posture in foreign affairs. On our part, we shall continue to strike for the closest possible co-operation and friendship with that country. It is true that there are some outstanding issues such as the delimitation of maritime boundary and the Farakka barrage. But, we are confident that in the context of the genuine desire for amity and cooperation on both sides, a fair and amicable solution which safeguards the interests of both the countries will be reached.

In regard to Nepal, a country with which we have close and traditional ties of friendship, we are hopeful that a healthy relationship can be built up on the basis of mutual respect and a frank recognition by each country of the other's sensitivities. For our part, we have always done our best to respect Nepalese interests and wishes on a number of issues. We cherish our friendship with Nepal, but this relationship must depend for its growth and sustenance on common observance by both the countries of the elements of reciprocity, mutual benefit, mutual respect and non-intervention in each other's internal affairs. This is as far as Nepal is concerned. Sir, the other areas are the areas of West Asia.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSHI (Calcutta—South): I would like to put a question in regard to Bangladesh. This is for the information of the hon. Minister. You desire that we should not interfere in the domestic politics of Bangladesh and that we should try to strengthen our relationship with that country. But, I would like to know, is it not a fact that for the last two months, some leading newspapers of India have started publishing articles and news items which are meant to deliberately distort facts and which are against the interests of India and Bangladesh, both? Are you aware of this? Something has to be done in this regard.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What can they do about newspapers?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: If you do not want me to reply...

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSHI: There is deliberate distortion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What can you do about newspapers? We have freedom of the Press in this country.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: You have made your point Sir, I had briefly touched upon the dangers of the situation in West Asia. Our attitude to the Arab Israeli problem is well-known. We have consistently supported the principle of denying the aggressor the fruits of his aggression and recognising the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Just peace in West Asia can be secured only on the basis of these principles. The Arab world, by and large, recognises that our support to them over to years has been based on principles and not on expediency. In turn, this has facilitated Indo-Arab cooperation in many fields to our mutual benefit. We have always supported the Palestinian cause and have accepted the Palestinian Liberation Organisation as the legitimate representative of the people of Palestine in their just cause. When the PLO recently asked for permission to open an office in Delhi, we readily agreed to that request. The office has started functioning already.

In this connection, I may also refer to the closer relations that we have been able to develop with the Gulf countries. This is a very important part of our neighbourhood. Several high level visits have been exchanged as a result of which fresh avenues of bilateral co-operation have been identified or developed. Saudi Arabia, under the late King Faisal, has played a dynamic role in West Asia and high tragic death has grieved us deeply. In the past few months, we were able to widen the areas of understanding and co-operation with that country. We look forward to developing this further.

I would like to say a few words about our relations with Iran and Iraq. In the last few years, Iran has shown greater understanding than before on a number of issues of concern to us and has also actively developed contact in the fields

of economic co-operation. Iran has demonstrated its interest in the stability of the region. Its friendly relations with Pakistan need not hinder the further strengthening of our bilateral relations, and it is our hope and desire that Indo-Iranian friendship and co-operation will continue to grow to mutual benefit.

With Iraq, our relations have been traditionally close and friendly. The Prime Minister was accorded a very cordial reception when she visited Iraq in January this year. Iraq was the first country to extend easy payment terms for oil when we were in need. In the circumstances, the news of an accord between Iran and Iraq in March this year over the boundary and other problems has been very welcome, and we hope that both these countries will work together in the interest of the whole region.

I had referred earlier in my speech to the threat of military intervention in this region—I am talking about the west Asia region. Such contingencies will have to be faced by us with the confidence that gun-boat diplomacy is not an effective political instrument. The Suez mis-adventure of 1956 bears testimony to that. At the same time, we have to redouble our efforts to strengthen the solidarity of the entire non-aligned world, so that our unity and determination may serve as a warning to the potential interventionists.

While we shall continue to direct our efforts towards getting the developed world to better appreciate the point of view of the developing countries and towards promoting proposals for international co-operation, the safeguarding of our own security interests would naturally assume paramount importance. In that context, we have to continue to build up and strengthen our relations with these countries which would stand by us.

The only other country, to which I wanted to make a reference and which I have not been able to do, was Afghanistan. As you know, President Daud paid us a visit very recently. There were some good discussions between the President and the Prime Minister. I think I should have made a reference along with Pakistan to Afghanistan that Pakistan's recent attitude of belligerency towards Afghanistan is another

matter which, really speaking, concerns us. Our relations with Pakistan are very closely and friendly and we have...

AN HON. MEMBER: Afghanistan.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Afghanistan I mean—thank you for the correction. Our relations with Afghanistan are very close and friendly and we have the fullest sympathy with Afghanistan in the problems it faces. Of course, with Pakistan also, we want to be friendly...

AN HON. MEMBER: It cannot be a one-way traffic.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: We were making efforts to be friendly. We earnestly hope that a peaceful solution will be found to these problems.

When President Daud recently came here, we both felt that the U.S. decision on arms supplies to Pakistan would encourage the forces of confrontation and tension, retarding the process of normalisation in South Asia.

In this connection, I would like to mention one aspect, to which many members made reference, and that is regarding Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan is a person not belonging to one country or the other. He was a veteran freedom fighter and naturally his arrest has caused concern to us, and I share that concern.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: At least you have mentioned that.

16.00 HRS.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: With regard to China, the fact that I refer to our relations with China in the end does not by any means signify that we attach less importance to that great country. In spite of what China has or has not done we continue to have an open mind on the question of improving our relations with China. We have repeatedly made known our desire and willingness to do so. Unfortunately this thing cannot be a one way affair; there has to be a response from the other side as well. We do not have as yet any concrete evidence of a corresponding desire by China to improve its relations with us. In spite of the recent visit of the table tennis team and the optimistic statement by

the Chinese Vice Premier who passed through Calcutta in February on his way to Kathmandu for the coronation of the king, the Chinese have shown no real change in attitude. On the contrary they have launched a fresh barrage of anti-Indian propaganda on well-worn themes like Kashmir, Pakistan, Sikkim, Nepal, etc.

I find two very interesting criticisms coming from two different Members of the opposition. Shri Mavalankar told us not to insist on rigid reciprocity, if I am quoting him correctly. If in relationships between two countries reciprocity is not to be maintained, what is to be taken care of? If reciprocity is considered rigidity, the only thing is surrender.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): I do not mean surrender at all; I said; let us not be rigid; let us keep an open mind on that point.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Certainly, have an open mind. But this open mind is rather a dangerous thing and I do not know if open-mind is something which could be open at both ends.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That will be an open-ended mind.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: That is one thing. On the other side my hon. friend Scindiaji said: do not go by the ping pong diplomacy... (Interruptions). The word used was—ping pong diplomacy. You said: let it be there; but do not be the ball but be a bat. That is what he said. This word 'ping pong diplomacy' in connection with India has no meaning. It might have had some significance in relation to the United States because they had no other communication with China; they had no diplomatic relations; they had no embassy in Peking nor had China an embassy in Washington in the United States. They had to depend upon some type of diplomacy... (Interruptions).

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCIENDIA: Surely, you have not taken it literally. I do not mean that you go and play ping pong with Mao Tse Tung. That is just an expression.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: In this particular matter, we have to

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

judge the facts. Our basic attitudes are clear. We certainly would like to see what their attitude is going to be and respond to it in the proper manner when we get proper indications. That is what I wanted to say.

In the case of West European countries, I should like to say that our relations with those countries are good. Their economic co-operation is very important for us and I think our relations will continue to develop in the proper way in the years to come. The most important change that has happened in Western Europe is the change in Portugal. After nearly four decades of fascist regime, democracy had asserted itself and it has not only liberated the forces of democracy in Portugal but it has also liberated the forces in Africa, Anglo and Mozambique. There are very important changes taking place not only in the former Portuguese colonies, but some optimistic signs of liberation and progressive forces making further progress are seen in some other countries in South Africa as well as in Zimbabwe and Namibia. In this region, the local statesmen like President Nyerere and President Kaunda are taking a lead in constructive statesmanship.

An hon. member made mention about Latin America. Our relationship with Latin American countries is also recognised to be a very important plank of foreign policy. May be what was true ten years before is not true today. We have got our Embassies there. I had particularly mentioned that this non-aligned meet at Havana had a special significance in the context of Latin American countries. The nonaligned movement is taking firmer roots in Latin America and they are participating in third world problems and identifying themselves with the third world, which is very good. As far as trade is concerned, trade with Latin America is not an easy matter. It is a matter of distance, but even then we have started making progress. A direct shipping service has been started. It goes to Surinam, Guyana, Trinidad & Tobago and other places depending on cargo. There is also possibility of another service to Panama and Pacific ports of Latin America. Certainly these contacts will ultimately help the growth of trade and economic cooperation.

As far as East European countries and Soviet Russia are concerned, our relations are very friendly. Prof. Mukherjee suggested yesterday that by mistake sometimes people try to bracket the two super powers together. I think that is not at least our Government's attitude, because the two super powers cannot be bracketed together. They are not only qualitatively different, but they are different from the point of views of our national interest. This is one fact we have to take note of. Whenever India was in difficulty, Soviet Russia has stood by us. Certainly our relations with Soviet Russia are very friendly and they will grow from strength to strength. Our relations with the East European socialist countries are also very friendly. Only this year we had visits from three Prime Ministers of East European countries and we have found that there is identity of views and similarity of approach in regard to many international matters. I think our trade and economic cooperation is also growing. Our relation with the East European countries and the Soviet world is a very important matter of policy with us and I am sure it will grow from strength to strength.

As far as U.S.A. is concerned, Dr. Kissenger's visit created certain hopes, but the lifting of the embargo created difficulties and I had to postpone my visit to U.S.A. For future, we certainly hope to have good relations with them, but it will depend upon their showing sensitivity to our national concerns.

As far as Cambodia is concerned, we have recognised the Government of Prince Sihanouk. As for the PRG, I would like to assure the House that our sympathies are always with them in this matter. From the very beginning we have stood with the struggle of the Vietnamese people. After the Paris Agreement, we had discussions with the PRG's representatives, and it is with their agreement that we have accepted that their General delegation should be set up in India. Certain letters are expected to be exchanged. Certainly, a new situation is developing. I can only say that we are watching the changing situation. You can rest assured that we will do the right thing at the right time.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: During this session you will get that opportunity.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
You leave that decision to us.

As far as the Commonwealth is concerned, it is a very important forum for exchange of views. It is not a body which takes any policy decisions. It is not expected to do any such thing. But when heads of governments, coming from different regions at different levels of development come together, the exchange of views help each other. This has been my experience. Of course, I have not attended the Prime Ministers' Conference as yet, but I have experience of the conference of the Finance Ministers of the Commonwealth. I must say that it helps us to come into contact with the Caribbean countries, the African countries and the South Asian countries, and this exchange of views certainly helps us to develop a sort of consensus. It is good that some of the developed countries like Britain, Australia and New Zealand are present. Sometimes their availing of the views of the third world help them, though I am not sure how far, in influencing the decision-making in other countries like America.

I think I have practically dealt with all the major problems that were raised.

श्री शशि बूचन (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : चिली की मान्यता वापस ले ली जाय।

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
Of course, there is this tendency on the part of some of these big powers, who are not reconciled to the progressive regimes in developing countries. So, wherever they find a possibility of undoing it, they are taking that opportunity. I am sure this policy has not paid them, has not succeeded in any other part.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSHI: They will try to do it in India.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
Possibly they may wish to try it. But, I do not think the people of India are going to put up with that. They will certainly give a very effective answer to any attempt at subversion in this part of the world. You can rest assured of that.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):
Indian entity is very hot!

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
They would not try it. I have no doubt about it.

Some hon. Members referred to the question of cultural diplomacy. I would like to say that cultural diplomacy is one of the instruments for promoting friendly relations with other countries. Strictly speaking, cultural agreements and cultural exchange programmes are the responsibility of the Department of Culture. However, as one of the implementing agencies, the Indian Council of Cultural Relations, which is under the administrative control of my Ministry, has been carrying out active and increasingly wider programmes of cultural exchanges with other countries, within the constraints imposed by our limited foreign exchange resources.

Now two points remain. One is about our Embassies and Missions, which was a point made by some of the Members, particularly by Shri Mavalankar. I can say from my experience of the last six months, because I have travelled quite a bit in the last six months and I have come into contact with younger officers of the Foreign Service, that most of them are very eager, keen, intelligent and patriotic persons. Shri Mavalankar mentioned his experience sometime in the last decade, was it not? But things have changed. Certainly, there are some limitations on them. One is manpower availability. Some of our missions are small. But I quite agree that there is scope for improvement in the relations with the public. I will again bring to their notice the feeling in the House that they will have to be a little out-going in their relations with the Indians abroad. Indians on visit, and that they should certainly build up India's image in the countries in which they serve.

I trust I have been able to give the House some of the salient features of the present international situation and the manner in which we have tried to make our foreign policy a dynamic and flexible instrument for projecting India's views and safeguarding her interests. The objectives of Indian foreign policy are to promote the cause of peace and international co-operation, as we believe that this would secure the interests not only of India but also of the entire international community.

In the global context, we welcome the world-wide trend towards détente and reduction of tensions. It is in this

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

atmosphere that humanity can achieve social, economic and political progress. It is also in this context that we can take steps in their direction of general and complete disarmament. At the same time, we advocate strongly the sovereign equality of nations and we maintain that all countries, big or small, rich or poor, should have a voice in the working out of their destinies.

India, accordingly, believes that non-alignment plays a crucial role in the furtherance of these objectives. We continue to attach great importance to the unity and solidarity of the non-aligned countries in the interests of themselves, of the developing countries and of the international community as a whole. We remain firmly committed and totally opposed to all forms of colonialism, racism and discrimination in the world, wherever and in whatever form they might occur.

In the global context, we also believe firmly in the increasing inter-dependence of nations, particularly in the task of finding urgent solutions to some of the grave economic problems facing us, including those of inflation, imbalances and inequalities. We believe that there is an increasing awareness everywhere that no country, however great or powerful, can afford to regard a problem anywhere as being of no concern to it.

We have devoted our special attention to amity and cooperation in our region; we have made special efforts and taken various initiatives to strengthen our relations with all countries of the region, particularly our neighbours. It is only through friendship and cooperation, on the basis of sovereign equality and mutual benefit, that we can help each other to build regional peace and stability, and thus contribute to the relaxation of tensions around the world. We have, I think, achieved a substantial measure of success in strengthening our relations with many countries in the region on the basis of these principles. We have settled with them some of the problems which had defied solutions for generations. I need hardly mention that our attitude to Pakistan too is guided by the same devotion to good

neighbourly relations and willingness to settle all problems bilaterally and peacefully.

We attach paramount importance to promoting understanding and developing and strengthening bilateral co-operation in the political as well as economic and cultural fields. As I have said in my speech, the conduct of our foreign policy has been directed at this objective bilaterally, regionally and globally, the objective of building bridges of friendship, cooperation and understanding.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are a number of cut motions...

SHRI NOORUL HUDA rose (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have had enough discussion. If I allow you, I will have to allow others. The debate begins all over again. He had covered a very wide ground.

There are a number of cut motions which the hon. Members, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shri Ram Avtar Shastri and Shri Mavalankar, have moved. Unless any hon. Member wants any particular cut motion to be put separately, I will put them all together to the House.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Cut Motion No. 33 may be put separately.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I put Cut Motion No. 33 moved by Shri Mavalankar to the vote of the House.

The Cut Motion was put and negatived

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I put all the rest of the cut motions to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of

the Order Paper be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st March, 1976, in respect of the head of demand entered in the second column thereof against Demand No. 30 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

[The motion for Demand for Grant, which was adopted by the Lok Sabha, is reproduced below.—Ed]

DEMAND NO. 30—MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 82,72,58,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs 25,25,00,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, in respect of 'Ministry of External Affairs'."

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 18 to 23 relating to the Ministry of Defence for which 6 hours have been allotted. Hon. Members present in the House who desire to move their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions that they would like to move. They will be treated as moved.

DEMAND NO. 18—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,34,12,000 on Revenue Account and not exceeding Rs. 13,31,79,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1976, in respect of 'Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND NO. 19—DEFENCE SERVICES—ARMY

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,50,57,35,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, in respect of 'Defence Services—Army'."

DEMAND NO. 20—DEFENCE SERVICES—NAVY

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,12,16,45,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, in respect of 'Defence Services—Navy'."

DEMAND NO. 21—DEFENCE SERVICES—AIR FORCE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,70,30,62,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, in respect of 'Defence Services—Air Force'."

DEMAND NO. 22—DEFENCE SERVICE—PENSIONS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 94,16,67,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, in respect of 'Defence Services Pensions'."

DEMAND No. 23—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON DEFENCE SERVICES

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 197,88,52,000 on Capital Account be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Defence Services'."

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jainagar): I beg to move—

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to properly educate the officers and ranks about attempts at Military encroachment of India by the US imperialists and dangers arising therefrom (1)].

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to substantially increase the proportion of promoted officers to those of directly recruited (2)].

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need of having common mess for officers and jawans in all the three services (3)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need of providing more facilities to the jawans in the three services for improving their academic and military capabilities. (4)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need of changing the Armed Forces Rules and practices to make them more democratic and less bureaucratic (5)].

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need of educating the officers and jawans on secular democratic and socialistic lines as accepted by our country. (6)].

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need of increasing the emoluments and facilities particularly of jawans and middle rank officers. (7)].

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to train and educate the armed forces against communalism, separatism, casteism and other anti-democratic and disruptive tendencies. (8)]

SHRI S M BANERJEE (Kanpur) I beg to move

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to co-relate the piece work rates for ordnance factory workers. (17)].

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to finalise the pay scales of supervisors and draftsmen in Defence establishments. (18)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to grant bonus to Defence Employees (19)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to revise the wage structure of the defence employees and bring it at par with public undertaking employees. (20)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Non-functioning of the classification tribunal for Defence employees. (21)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Non-inclusion of workers' representatives in Raksha Uttsah Board. (22)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to re-instate victimised Defence workers of West Bengal, Avadi and Kanpur. (23)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for more quarters for civilian employees in Defence establishments. (24)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for further improvement in the service condition of army personnel. (25)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to treat canteen employees of Defence establishments as Government employees. (26)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for full utilisation of production capacity of ordnance factories. (27)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Proposed retrenchment in M.E.S. establishments. (28)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to revise the pay scales of Defence employees and put them at par with public sector employees. (29)]

"That the demand under the Head, 'Ministry of Defence' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to remove discrimination between industrial and non-industrial employees in Defence establishments. (30)]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Demands for Grants and the cut motions are now before the House.

*SHRI JAGADISH BHATTACHARYA (Ghata): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the common man in our country generally knows and ponders over the expenditure that the Government incurs on agriculture, irrigation and on food, education, but they do not have a good idea about the expenditure that the Government incurs on Defence. However, if we go through carefully the Defence expenditure incurred during the last few years then we will find the Government had incurred a sum of Rs. 805.80 crores in 1964-65. From this point the expenditure on Defence rose to Rs. 2,000 crores in 1974-75 and the budget estimate for 1975-76 is of an order of Rs. 2274 crores. From all these it will be clear that during 1974-75 a new record was set up when Rs. 2000 crores were spent for the first time. In an affluent country, increase in military expenditure may not mean much. It may mean curtailment of luxury or comfort of some people. Recently we have found that the British Government have slashed its military expenditure by 300 million pounds and without this, it would not really affect the common man there. Even if this heavy cut was not imposed the people of England would not have starved and succumbed to death. The situation in India is, however, fundamentally different.

16.26 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI in the Chair]

In India, nearly 70% of the population live below poverty line. The necessities of life rather the very existence of a great bulk of our people is at a stake and we have to view our huge defence expenditure in the background of the urgent needs of our people. I would like to quote here from an article appearing in Indian Express dated the 4th March 1975 wherein it has been stated and I quote: "The tragic irony of our situation is that the huge sum being spent on protecting our people against the possibility of foreign attack itself ensures that a significant portion of them will die or be mentally retarded without a bullet being fired. If the millions who see their children going hungry to bed were given the choice between preparing for a possible foreign attack and the certainty of

*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

[Shri Jagadish Bhattacharyya]

their children being crippled for mal-nutrition there is little doubt what they would decide. These are the factors that should be kept in mind by their representatives in Parliament." We cannot possibly ignore the sentiments and logic behind the message of the article writer. You will be surprised to note Sir, that the proposed increase of Rs. 117 crores in the Defence budget for one year is nearly 20 times the entire amount allocated for nutritional feeding for children in the 4th Plan. In other words it can be said that millions of our young children can be fed properly and in a better way if only we can reduce our expenditure on Defence. And I personally feel Sir, that there is a lot of scope in effecting economy in this share. As you know Sir, defence is the biggest single component of our budget proposals and it is but natural that the biggest cut can, if desired, also be made in this sphere only.

Before we suggest a cut in the defence expenditure it would perhaps be necessary to examine the factors which are often referred to as justifications for enhanced defence expenditure. Very often we hear that the country is facing war threats from our neighbours and in this context the names of China and Pakistan are often mentioned. Let us dispassionately see how far these threats really exist today. Our conflict with China in 1962 was only over the possession of the Aksai Chin road which had become clear from the unilateral Chinese withdrawal. Since 1962 till date nothing has happened which may suggest that Peking rulers are interested in invading or grabbing Indian territory. Very recently the Vice-Premier of China was in our country and he had expressed an improvement in India-China relations. A little while ago in this House the Foreign Minister Mr Chavan stated that we hope to improve our relations with China. Therefore, apparently there is no justification of any threat of war in the immediate future from China atleast that is how it appears from the present prevailing situation. Now, let us come to Pakistan. It is said that the military expenses incurred by India is 14 to 15% of the national income while that of Pakistan is 50%. It is also said that India spends 3 to 4% of the G.N.P. on Defence while Pakistan's expenses come to 10% of

their G.N.P. Sir, statistics at times become baffling and they create more confusion than clearing any. Surely we cannot jump to conclusions merely by looking at the percentage of expenditure referred to above because 4% of 1000 is not and cannot be the same as 10% of 100. In other words we have to take into account the total amount of money involved in both the cases and unless these two things are equal a bare comparison will lead us to wrong conclusions.

The Institute of Strategic Studies of Britain in one of their reports have stated as follows: and I quote, "The fire power that India can deploy against Pakistan exceeds Pakistan's without taking into account the ten mountain divisions defending the Himalayas some of which can be used against Pakistan if necessary." I am once again impelled to quote from the same article in Indian Express which wrote 'In 1971 a few divisions meant to defend the North-East Frontier were diverted to the Bangladesh front yet significantly Peking made no attempt to create a military diversion even at that crucial period in Pakistan's history. Viewed against this background there is little military justification for India to have the 3rd largest army in the world. In determining our Defence expenditure we have to realistically assess our requirement and our capacity to pay.

As I have already stated we are trying our best to improve our relations with Pakistan but apart from this Pakistan herself is in troubled waters. She is more than busy with her internal troubles in Baluchistan and NWFP. And in the present circumstances it would be most unwise for Pakistan to think of waging a war against India unless they want to meet a greater disaster at their own cost. We can be legitimately be proud of jawans who have given on many occasions the proof of their superior valour against Pakistan and in future too, to I am sure they will do the same thing if Pakistan indulges in reckless adventurism. Therefore, I feel Sir that even from Pakistan there is not much possibility of imminent war even though at times we hear such cries from across the border.

During the last ten years before U.S. embargo on arms sale was lifted lot

of arms were purchased from open market. According to Far Eastern Economic Review, let me quote, "the total value of Chinese military shipments to Pakistan after 1965 amounted to some £ 312 million and France sold its arms worth another £ 212 millions. In the same period India is reported to have obtained weapons worth £ 1270 million from the Soviet Union and made several purchases in other countries. "Over the last ten years while India was receiving 7.6 billion dollars in foreign aid from the U.S. and from chose to spend 16.4 billion dollars on its military." Mr. Clearance D. Long, a leading Congressman of U.S. who visited India early this year said about the above in his report to the House about the way India utilised foreign assistance for building up defence potential.

And this has not been contradicted by the Government of India so far. A report about the Congressman's report has already been published in the Times of India and till to date it stands uncontradicted. I would now like to suggest a few things which the Government may consider to cut down the expenditure without impairing the defence capability of the country. As at present under the National Cadet Corps programme training is being given to 361163 senior cadets and to 650210 junior cadets. In all we have 10,11373 cadets available with us who are being given training in fire arms and with a proper planning we can give them such training as may be useful for the defence of our country. By utilising the services of NCC cadets we can reduce the strength of the standing army as the services of these cadets can be requisitioned quickly. But unfortunately, the Government does not try to explore these avenues and on the other hand they utilise the army for such purposes for which they are not meant. We have often found that the army is used for suppressing popular democratic movements in our country and this to our mind is highly undesirable. From Government reports we find that army was used in Gujarat for 27 days, in Bihar for 30 days, and in West Bengal for 10 days only in 1974. But strangely enough the report does not say about the use of army during the railway strike of May 1974. It is not the only example how Government reports are written. I will give

another example also. The report circulated to us by the Defence Department tells us about the working of the production units under the Ministry of Defence. The Praga Tools Ltd. and Garden Reach Workshops are running at a loss for the last two years. The report does not make any mention about the losses incurred by these and other Defence production units but they have said in the report that the gains from these units is to the tune of Rs. 5 crores. I would request the hon. Minister to examine why such distorted images are being created and why the complete truth is not revealed in the report I hope he will look into the matter and see that the official reports are not tilted to high light only profits and hide losses. I would also like to say a word about the hire of land and houses by the Defence Department. I feel that some economy in expenditure under this head can also be made. Sometimes it has been found that favours are shown to the interested parties while acquiring their lands and houses. It is very unfortunate Sir, even an organisation like Defence is not free from corruption and there are instances where honest men are harassed for bringing to the notice of higher officers cases of corruption indulged in by senior army officers. I can give one example of it to the Minister. In Sucher in 57 Mountain Divn., Capt. A. K. Chakravarty is being harassed because he has brought to light the illegal catch & sale of fish by the guards.

In fact, two senior officers Col. Grant and Col. Yadav are alleged to be involved in this shady deal and for having brought it to light Captain Chakravarty is being harassed and put to difficulty. The matter I understand is in the court. I am sure this particular case is with the Minister and in case he has not got the details I will be glad to furnish the same to him for consideration. I will only urge upon him that a thorough investigation in this case should be made and the harassment to Capt. Chakravarty must end and punishment should not elude the culprits merely because they are senior officers.

In the end Sir, I would like to say that a well trained classless society bereft of exploitation is the best Defence line for any country and it is the best answer against an enemy having even the best sophisticated

[Shri Jagadish Bhattacharyya]

weapons and unless this Government strives to move in this direction we cannot think of a real good defence of our country. But during all these years, this Government has shown no willingness to move in that direction; rather it is moving in the opposite direction and hence I oppose the demands.

SHRI BRIJ RAJ SINGH-KOTAH (Jhalawar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the demands for grants of the Defence Ministry. I not only support them but I also plead that there is great scope for re-examination and increase in these demands.

It is a matter of great satisfaction that the present Minister for Defence has also, for a long time, held the portfolio of Foreign Affairs. It has been my contention that defence and foreign policies should go hand-in-hand. The foreign policy is like the brains to a muscle, which is the Defence Department. For the last so many years, since 1947, we had four or five wars with our neighbour on the west and everytime we see that it is re-armed by the same persons. Now, once more, the same country has again come in news with the U.S. lifting its arms embargo to Pakistan. When it is confronted, the U.S.A. says that the lifting of the arms embargo is for both the nations on the sub-continent. But, I wish to ask a question. If and when we require certain arms, will they give them to us also? I think this is a question which the External Affairs Ministry will have to answer.

The Defence Department has landed itself into a serious problem owing to the rise in costs of pay, pensions and allowances etc. as also the rise in prices on petroleum oil and lubricants and various other stores. The share of defence expenditure on these items has gone up only at the cost of expenditure on defence equipments, and defence research and development. In other words, I reckon that about 55% or may be about 60% of our defence budget will be eaten up by this rise in costs and prices. This leaves us with approximately 40% of the budget which will go into the part of equipment, defence production, R and D etc. So, this imbalance has got to be rectified. I say this seriously that we have to find ways and means to get the extra funds needed so that our "teeth" do not suffer and we have to find places

where effective cuts have to be made. But, I do not see when and how that can be done. Therefore, this poses a prime question on our nation's security and it has to be viewed and solved as such.

I will briefly touch on the geopolitical situation which should be used to our advantage. We are faced with threats on the North by China and in the West by Pakistan and fresh winds are blowing from the South East. Considering this, it is to our advantage that we make the maximum use of our friendly neighbour in the North namely, the Soviet Union. Recently Marshal Grechko came to India and I should like to learn what came out of the visit because there are great gaps and deficiencies in our Air Force which need to be filled up. Why are we not getting sophisticated equipment which we urgently need, like fighters or long-range aircraft like the Mig 23 or Mig 25 when the Soviets can give the same equipment to countries like Egypt and Syria?

I will now touch on a subject which is most neglected amongst the Defence Department and, that is the Navy. The Navy has been treated so far as a step-child in the Defence set-up. It gets the lowest priority. I think the budget that goes to it comes hardly to 8 to 10 per cent of the total Defence budget. In other countries where they have a Navy worth the name, it gets at least one third of the Defence budget. Today in the changed circumstances that surround us the Navy has assumed a very vital and a crucial role. I am not saying this because I hold any brief from Navy. I feel that in the context of off-shore oil that we are going to develop—which is going to be anything like a thousand crores investment in the Gulf of Cambay—the Navy has a very significant role to play.

I also feel that today out of all the Services, the most technical Service is the Navy. It is a three dimensional Navy. It has an air element, a surface element and a sub-surface element and in all these elements there is the greatest use of computers and highly sophisticated electronics and underwater equipment. The prime role of the Navy is to safeguard our coast which is very long. If you look at it, India today by its own location is in a position to dominate the Indian ocean. But that is a different subject

and I will not dilate on it at present. The Navy needs to be developed and strengthened because of the following reasons:

The Navy at the moment is rather a vintage Navy except for the new programme that we have developed. The ships are rather old and creaky. Firstly, I will touch on the aircraft carrier. The aircraft carrier "VIKRANT" today is a show-piece of the Navy. There is no use of having this flag ship without any teeth in it. The planes that it has are all obsolete and good for nothing. The Vikrant's air complement has to be geared up and even then it will always be a risk in today's sophisticated missile and under-water warfare. If anything happens to such a flagship as the "Vikrant" it will bring down the morale of the country. Therefore, the "Vikrant" needs to be given greater air teeth, if it is going to be of any use.

Now, the long felt need in the Navy has practically come about. From what we have learnt in the papers, we are going to have Long Range Anti-submarine Maritime Reconnaissance planes or bombers or whatever name you call it. But, at the same time, an interesting controversy has been thrown up as to who is going to operate this component. The other day, we read a little about it from the papers. As I said earlier, I do not have any brief either from the Navy or the Air Force. I speak from my personal knowledge and from what I think ought to be our policy and should be done. In most countries, with any Navy to boast about, this part of the arm is controlled by the Navy, whether it be Russia or America or Germany or Italy or Netherlands or Japan or any other country. It is only in the British Commonwealth and in U.K. particularly that the RAF has a coastal command which holds this arm under its purview. It has its own history and the British are great for keeping legacies. That is their legacy. But, we have developed this air arm today not in legacy, but, it has come up out of need step by step. So, Sir, the following reasons are to be advanced if this thing is to remain with the Navy, as I maintain, it should be. This long-range anti-submarine maritime reconnaissance component is really the eyes and ears of the fleet. This is needed with the increasing activity in our Indian Ocean region. The Navy

needs this not only to familiarise itself with this new dimension that they have acquired or the country has acquired, but, they need it to familiarise themselves with the various signatures given by the various under water and surface vessels so that in times of emergency, they can say by these electronic signatures, which is a friend and which is a foe. The Navy has had a deep background into it, because they have been operating this ASW equipment since the last so many years, in smaller single engined planes and in vessels. The Navy is also familiar with such types of aircrafts. They have the necessary base and maintenance facilities. They have the needed expertise and that have the necessary crew that will man these things. But, now the argument that is advanced is that since the Navy does not have the pilots who are experienced to handle multi engined planes, the Air Force should hold this. I do not know how this argument can be presented. Because at some stage, even the Air Force did not have experienced pilots who could handle multi-engined planes and they also went through the same learning experience. So, in a competitive service having the same technological standard, if not more, and I maintain,—because, today the technology in the Navy has become more sophisticated—why not these pilots from the Navy also get the same experience? I do not think there is any reason in this argument. The other thing is that, even if the pilots are from the Air Force, the specialist crew that goes into such planes—this is normally about ten—are going to be always from the Navy. They operate the various electronic devices like the ASW Sonar, the Homing Torpedoes, Computers, Electronics and ECM devices. Even today they are still the Naval crew flying the old planes. What is the big idea if this goes to the Air Force? I do not think there is anything wrong if it is given to the Navy.

Then, I come to this part of the tactical training. The tactical training in this particular branch is a naval thing. The Air Force chaps if they have to operate these planes cannot be expected to know about the capabilities and liabilities of our ships so that they can effectively use this arm. This cannot come from the Air Force. The pilots and the crew have to have some sort of naval background and that is already existing in our naval air arm

[Shri Brij Raj Singh-Kotah]

today. If Navy has it, the air crew can be rotated and they can be used by the Navy in their surface fleet also because the things are quite similar, whereas if they are from the Air Force, those who are doing this job will only be doing this job and they cannot do anything else. As it is today, the Air Force is operating our so-called maritime planes, the "Super-constellations". They have no teeth in them; they can only see, but they cannot destroy. For this set-up today, there is a Joint Command Organisation and it is in all the three Naval Command Headquarters. If the LR ASW/MR Arm goes to the Navy, then this is obliterated, you save on these expensive commands and the Navy fits in quite easily to do this job.

So I suggest that this thing should not be made into a prestige issue by saying that since the Air Force has handled multi-engine and since they have had a longer tradition of this flying, this air arm of the Long Range ASW-Maritime Reconnaissance must go to the Air Force only, basing the stand on the old English traditions of the RAF.

The next thing I will say is about the Mazagaon Docks. I feel that we have done very well there, but we must see what is going to be done after we finish with our "Leander Class" frigate programme. We must be ready to make caruelles, more patrol boats, more missile boats and we must create a position by which our submarines can also be made in the docks or elsewhere and also the existing ones that there are can be refitted, modernised or repaired so that do not have to go all the way to the Russian base in Vladivostok.

The other need today is for missiles. Missiles are going to play an important role in any future operations. Missiles are greatly needed for use for the Navy and for use of the other services also.

As far as the Navy is concerned, I wish that all these points that I have made within the limited time at my disposal, are seriously considered by the Ministry because the Indian Ocean region, as I said, is going to play an increasing role for this country's destiny. With all our sea lanes and the trade, with all the world oil interests

located in the Gulf area and with various bases in this region, the Navy has assumed a very demanding position in our defence strategy and, therefore, I have devoted most of my time to the Navy.

Now I will touch briefly on the Air Force. As you know, the Air Force has got four main jobs to do. One is long-range interdiction, the second is ground support to the armed forces in the field, the third is interception of enemy fighters and the fourth is tactical transport. In the ground support side, we have a very excellent fighter in the "GNAT" now re-christened "Ajit". We need more of these fighters because they are low-costing, highly effective, they have served and demonstrated their use in earlier operations. I feel if we can produce more and more of these fighters, we can achieve quick local superiority in the battlefield, influencing matters without any difficulty. As far as the long-range interdiction part goes, what is called DPSA—deep penetration strike aircraft—this part is absolutely missing. That is why I say that the Air Force has no sturdy wings to soar high. By this I mean that this gap today is vitally needed to be filled in if we are to hit the enemy where it hurts most. Without this, we are risking ourselves because we know what happened last time, we do not want that our aged "Canberras" and the not so successful "Sukhois" the old Lattle horses, that have served as well in earlier operations and can hope to do so in times to come, we need something more efficient and modern.

17.00 hrs.

I do not know what the department of Defence is going to do to fill this void; I do not know whether they are getting Mig 23 or 25. I hear that they are making adaptations to Mig 21M which we have. I believe that if you load a horse too much, then it becomes a donkey! Mig 21M is basically an interceptor and you cannot adapt it and do interdiction with it. Either you get a "Jagaur", the Anglo-French aircraft in the market or you get Mig 23 or 25 or a Mirage F.1 or something which can fill the need. But the need has got to be filled. As far as interceptors go, we have very good ones in the Mig 21. There is a pressing need in the transport fleet because our World War II vintage DC 85 and old C-119s are doing the job so far but it is time we

thought of something more useful and more suitable having STOL i.e. short take-off and landing characteristics. The concept of modern warfare is that one must have a large number of helicopters. They are very useful in arranging the evacuation of casualties, giving medical aid, dropping supplies etc. The concept of helicopter armed brigades or small groups was demonstrated by us very well in Tangail in 1971. But we could have more of this air mobility which is lacking at present.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: For elections also.

SHRI BRIJ RAJ SINGH-KOTAH: That is only one helicopter. We have developed HF 24 MK-II "Marut". The design part is excellent. It is supposed to have Mach 2 potential but we do not know whether it has really achieved that or not? If this aircraft design is actively pursued and developed to the potential that it has, it can form the part of a DPSA fighter bomber which we badly need.

I should like to refer to the lessons of the last conflict in West Asia. Note should be taken of the new family of missiles; there are a host of them and I do not have the time to name them. They had made air cover over the local battle zone quite hazardous unless one has latest electronic counter measures to combat them with. I trust we are going into this aspect and doing all that is needed. We must have a more efficient and integrated air defence system which will be useful in taking quick action and giving faster reaction. A vital gap which we need to fill is missiles; we need missiles if we are to be effective in the future. It was also shown that too much reliance on static surface-to-air missile sites cannot be placed because they can always be hit. We need more sophisticated Early Warning Radar systems which will give quicker response and command decisions.

I shall briefly touch on some points about the Army. We have a very good Army and all the elements in it are very well looked after. But looking to the western theatre, I feel that we have not got much of a superiority vis-a-vis Pakistan. The hon. Member from the Marxist Party was quoting some paper

and said that we had enough superiority on the western theatre and therefore we need not go in for more equipment, etc.

If the lessons of the previous conflicts are to guide us, the wars fought have always been of a short duration and the first person who grabs anything keeps it, and by the time you realise anything else, the cease-fire is enforced. We may be having a slight edge in various components of the army on Division to Division basis, but if we are to go by the lessons that history has taught us, I seriously say that we do not have that superiority vis-a-vis the western theatre as one would feel safe to have. We know we will not be the first to start a war, but if we are aggressed, we must have the necessary complement not only to retaliate swiftly and put the aggressor in his place but take all that has got to be taken in order to achieve our long term ends and do it quickly. That can only be done if we have a 5:1 ratio over that part of the enemy forces opposing us. And we do not have that at the moment.

For the Army, there are certain lessons which we may apply in the western theatre. The Egyptians have shown that water cannons can be used to sweep away earthworks. In the Punjab area, there are going to be a lot of earthworks both on this side and that side. If the use of water cannon can be made, I recommend it.

The next lesson is that more and more anti-tank guided missiles are going to be used in the next warfare. Pakistan already has a lot. I know we have also got some, but these have to be more up-to-date and sophisticated to do the job effectively. We need more tank destroyers and more self-propelled assault guns. We need laser-guided range finders to have effective first shot kills.

As I said, we are doing very well with our defence production. The 105 mm. field gun which we have made is not only a very effective weapon but is also a piece which I am told is quite lucrative on the export market. If we can spare some and find some buyers for it, I do not see why we cannot earn some much-needed vital foreign exchange? We are doing a good job but this need to be done still better.

[Shri Brij Raj Singh-Kotah]

Defence is a subject which cannot be neglected. I do not want my country to keep on facing repeated threats of the same type since 1947 from the same quarter over and over again. I wish not to say more about it. I want that my country grows great and occupies its rightful place in the comity of nations. Let us not keen on shedding the blood of our brave jawans' time and again and then go back to the same stalemate position only to have a fresh position crop up which is essentially the same as it was in 1947.

With those words, I commend this budget for acceptance by the House. I urge that the ratio which is being eaten up by the rise in costs and prices has to be very seriously and urgently considered looked into, so that our effective muscle of defence is not weakened by the administrative and static side of defence.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): Mr. Chairman, I think it is not within my right to comment upon the convenience of our fellow colleagues, hon. Members, but I have to do a bit of explanation. Because, I think defence is a subject which needs a tremendous amount of home work in order to be meaningful.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Why don't you do it tonight and speak tomorrow?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: It means that I have not attended to my home work for the last four years. I am not prepared to admit it or concede it. I am only coming to the specifics.

In the course of the Report it has been mentioned, particularly about the economics of our defence, that the most pertinent factor is that India's defence expenditure has been between three and 4 per cent of the gross national product, and they have compared it with the expenses in other countries. When we compare ourselves with Pakistan, it spends about 50 per cent of its total budgetary expenditure on defence, which roughly accounts for about 10 per cent of her gross national product, while we spend about three to four per cent of our gross national product, which accounts for about 14 to 15 per cent of the total budget outlay of both the Central and State Governments put together.

I was only trying to state when we have a reasonable justification to say that we are the thirty-first country from budgetary angle, as far as the expenditure on defence is concerned, I think the norms which we are picking up would not be very clear indicators; irrespective of the fact of the economic, social and demographic conditions in Pakistan and India being more or less similar, I do feel that for a poor country like ours, with a different socio-political set-up, with a democratic set-up, with social impulses more for the purpose of development and not for the purpose of preparedness on the defence side, to justify this expenditure of even three to four per cent of the gross national product would mean justifying the unjustifiable... (Interruptions). I am trying to say that whenever there is a defence debate, not only the media will be trying to project a situation whereunder the security needs will be given very considerable attention... (Interruptions).

I am just trying to pose the question of the relative priority between guns and butter which was the stock argument before the advent of the Second World War.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): May be guns and grains today rather than butter.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Most apt, I would definitely say between guns and grains in this country of ours.

So, I would most hesitatingly join issue on our defence needs. The present outlay extends beyond the Rs. 2,000 crores limit. We were below that for quite a few years, but we have increased the outlay limit now because of the hike in regard to pay and other things involving additional outlays of a capital nature. In spite of the categorical refusal of the worthy and honourable successor of Sardar Swaran Singhji, Shri Y. B. Chavan, even to admit a case for an Asian Collective Security System to day in the course of his reply I would still urge, though I know that it is at present a sort of cause without many supporters, that in the context of the contemporary history of the world, it does deserve a fresh look. Of course, I have been advised by friends that the Asian Collective Security System, particularly with our northern neighbours, the U.S.S.R., is a

thing which should fall more within the realm of a defence arrangement, I think it is a dual responsibility in which both the Defence and External Affairs Ministries should have a say.

Collective securities have paid dividends in many parts of the world in the course of the last 25 years, particularly in the cockpit of the world. Though we would like to say that Asia has been the scene of fighting, particularly South-east Asia, it has yielded results in the real cockpit of the world, namely Europe, and therefore I would like to say, while supporting the Demands, that a poor country like ours with about Rs. 50,000 crores of gross national product has to make a tremendous amount of sacrifice when it lays out about 14 to 15 per cent of its total budgetary allocation for the purpose of defending and guarding the security of our country.

Militarism has paid dividends in certain periods in the history of the world, but ours is not an army or a defence system with any imperialist design. It has a definite, objective and a definite character, that is to protect the security of our country, to protect the frontiers of our country. It has been made out that we are in a geo-political situation, at the cross-roads of world commerce, at the cross-roads of world population centres, but we cannot deny the fact, even from our common knowledge of elementary geography which we learnt in our schools, that India is one of the most gifted countries as far as natural frontiers are concerned and as far as its security arrangements are concerned. It is a God-made one. This applies not only to the former united India, but even to the present-day India except for the western front with Pakistan. With the Himalayan frontiers in the north and the sea as a frontier for the rest of the country with a coast-line running to about 3,500 miles, we are well protected. So, to make out that our physical environments make it necessary for us to take a very guarded view of our security system would not be justified on the basis of facts.

I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister what the Director of the Institute of Strategic Studies, Dr. Subramaniam, has stated. After 1971, it has been stated—I am trying to make out for the hon. Minister's consideration—that on our western frontiers

there has been a virtual near-parity that has been established, division to division, armour division to armour division, with Pakistan maintaining the superiority of one over the Indian forces and, if that is so, what are the steps that the Defence Ministry is taking particularly in regard to the more vulnerable western frontiers of India.

As far as the Naval requirements are concerned, I completely endorse what has been said by the previous speaker from my party, would it not be a very simple proposition, a rule of the thumb almost, that as against three Naval Commands that you have at present virtually over a coast-line of about 3500 miles, that is a Command at the rate of about 1200 miles—it is a fantastic area, right from Kutch upto Calcutta—to increase it to five? I had requested this to be done. It will have to be done inevitably in the light of the statement made in the House today regarding the possible threat on the coast-line.

I think, it would be appropriate, between Bombay and Cochin, that there should be a Central location and I leave it to the Defence Ministry and their experts in naval logistics to decide. But for the information of the Defence Ministry, I would give an excellent location...

AN HON. MEMBER: Mangalore.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: No.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Nearer his constituency.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: One of the most natural harbours on the west coast which is not much known, which is not much publicised, happens to be a port called as Tadri. It is one of the most natural ones; it compares very much with the cochin harbour as it is existing at present.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does it fall in your constituency?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Is it a sin if it falls in my constituency?

There are other things of a general nature which I would like to know from the hon. Minister. Recently, there has been certain encroachments on the exclusive preserve of the Defence personnel by the politicians, by the people

[Shri B. V. Naik]

who belong to our tribe. It has never happened in the history of India that politicians and political leaders of standing in the country's set-up have given a call to the Army men to follow their voice of conscience if it is necessary and to defy the orders. Unfortunately, from no other sources, either from the spokesmen of the Army or of the Navy or of the Air Force or from the higher quarters we have found any report in regard to this call for revolt. I suppose, our leaders of responsibility and stature know exactly what they are talking about. They are melting the disciplined Army to mutiny, to a revolt...

AN HON. MEMBER: A figment of imagination.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: If his imagination has atrophied, I am not responsible. I read in newspapers and I see that it is being repeatedly said. It is not a figment of imagination. It has come in hold print and cold print also. I hope, the hon. Minister will tell us, in categorical terms, whether this amounts or does not amount to an offence—I do not want in the legal sense—in the military sense, an offence in the constitutional sense.

What are the remedies you are providing? After all, it is our own kith and kin, our own relations, who will be in the various forces. What about the confusion that is caused to them? I think it is necessary to drill our army in a psychological sense that they pay attention to the head of the Indian nation, to the head of this country, which is the President of India, it may be understood by the thinking section, but for the jawans, for the sailors, for the airmen, they must be told in clear-cut and categorical terms as to where they stand. I wish I could make use of harsher words for denouncing the political leadership, at whatever level it is, but, I think, responsible people will be able to understand and get the message therein.

Today in the course of the other debate we were told as to what is the power that has emerged ultimately in Asia. We had a long discussion with the experts from the Institute for Strategic Studies and from the Defence Science Department a month or two

back about the comparative parity of the forces, how many divisions we have, division-to-division with Pakistan on this side; we have been told that there are a lakh and fifty thousand in Tibet; we are face to face on an extremely long northern borders, the inhospitable frontiers; we have got another major power in the world—I do not know whether Super Power would be the correct term—, a major power in the world, China, our advantages and disadvantages and so on.

We have been told in the course of the previous debate that the emergence of a major force in Asia is the emergence of nationalism as a force. We have to accept that. The force of nationalism that was evidenced in Vietnam, the force of nationalism that was evidenced in Cambodia, in the freedom struggles in Africa, show that military might by itself is no answer when the people rise against though they may not be organized—and it is not possible to fight the conventional wars, with fists and lathis and things like those. Under these circumstances, are we trying to learn any lessons from the history of contemporary Asia or are we trying to rest on the laurels which we have won in Bangladesh, which was a prophylactic war, a limited war—as soon as that war was over, we withdrew; that is what is called a prophylactic war, for serving a specific purpose. Are we re-orienting our forces, particularly the armed forces, on the basis of the lessons that have been learnt in Vietnam? There might be differing arguments that the Vietnamese could not have won except with the secret support of Russia and their tanks. But still, as far as we know from common knowledge, they were very ill-equipped, and with all these and their simplicity of organisation, of their army and tactics, the well-equipped, armed-to-the-teeth American forces were dumb-founded. If we can take certain lessons from the history of Vietnam and other similar struggles—I do not mean guerilla war—we should take them. I have virtually made the points and I would like to reiterate what I have stated.

For a country like ours, though we may be large in the scale of population, in the defence scale, as I had once the opportunity to express, a country like U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. are going to spend on a single department

of Defence in the course of one year our entire projected expenditure for the Fifth Five Year Plan for all the five years for all the Ministries put together whereas our plan is only a plan of Rs 56,000 crores and theirs is going to be a plan for one year alone to the tune of Rs. 70,000—75,000 crores. A hundred billion dollars. What does it mean? Therefore, on the basis of reality, man to man, our friend was good enough to say submarines, MIGs and the entire shopping list which we go on, including our indigenous production of Leander type of frigates. But can we really in this equation of power, on the basis of instruments of power, equate them? I think it is one of the fundamental questions which we have to answer from the limited perspective of a sort of a confrontation or a half confrontation with Pakistan I think now that we have seen in the course of the last many years—I am saying with a due sense of responsibility—we have not had any experience of China committing any aggression after 1962—I would like to be corrected if I am wrong—and that too an aggression which was a prophylactic one. Since China has not committed any aggression, I think the suggestion that we should be able to maintain an adequate partly of force at the western end on the borders between Pakistan and India needs immediate consideration.

In the ultimate analysis our country should be able to bear the cost of defence which would be a pittance and which would be a small part for a large nation. With regard to our northern neighbour, we need not be inhibited by considerations of ideology. I need to repeat that point and, therefore, in the ultimate analysis, with due deference and with a sort of poetic justice, our late lamented Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's concept of non-alignment, a great concept, stands out and to make it relevant to the present time, I think the collective security idea has to be given a greater amount of consideration than it has received right from 1969, right from 1971 and right after the 9th August 1971 agreement and treaty of friendship and co-operation with the U.S.S.R. It has to be given a very serious thought and if initiative is not being taken by our big neighbour, U.S.S.R., then, the initiative has got to be taken by us because I think in the scale of values we are the people who are in a greater need.

श्री पद्मावतल बाबुपाल (गंगानगर) : सभापति महोदय, मैं रक्षा मंत्रालय की मांगों का समर्थन करते हुए इस बारे में कुछ सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। मैं ज्यादा नहीं बोलूंगा, क्योंकि मेरी तबियत ठीक नहीं है। लेकिन सौभाग्यवश या दुःखवश मैं सेना में रह चुका हूँ। इस लिए, मुझे तर्जुमा है कि हमारे जवानों को किन मुसीबतों का सामना करना पड़ता है।

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : क्या काम करते थे?

श्री पद्मावतल बाबुपाल : सब काम करते थे। जूता बनाने से लेकर गोली चलाने तक का काम करते थे।

मैं पाकिस्तान के बाडर के साथ, लगे हुए गंगानगर जिले से आता हूँ। मेरा सुझाव है कि दिल्ली से सिरसा होते हुए, गंगानगर तक एक डिफेंस रोड बनाई जाये। इस समय जो रोड बनी हुई है, वह बहुत छोटी है। उस पर ट्रक टैंक और बड़ी गाड़ियां नहीं जा सकती हैं। उस पर कुछ पुल ऐसे हैं, जो ऐसे यातायात से घसक जायेंगे। हमें पाकिस्तान की नीबट पर संदेह होता है। हम ने रक्षा उत्पादन में काफ़ी वृद्धि की है। लेकिन हम यह भी नहीं कह सकते हैं कि हम बहुत शक्तिशाली हो गये हैं। और यह भी नहीं कह सकते कि हम बहुत कमजोर हैं।

इस समय गंगानगर तक बाइपेस [रेल लाइन है। अगर इस लाइन को बीकानेर तक बढ़ा दिया जाये, तो शक्ति में यह बहुत लाभदायक सिद्ध होगी। पिछले युद्ध में जब गडरा रोड पर पाकिस्तान का हमला हुआ, तो हमारी सेना को जम्बाला भाँति से भटिंडा, हनुमानगढ़, सूरतगढ़, बीकानेर और जोधपुर होते हुए बाइपेस आना पड़ा। इस में काफ़ी समय लगता है। इस लिए मैं रिक्वेस्ट करूँगा कि क्या कोई कितना खर्च हो, यह बाइपेस रेलवे लाइन बनाई जाये।

मेरे हवाके में काफ़ी सेनाओं का खर्च है। मुझे लगता है कि देश को रक्षा कर चुकी होती है। लेकिन

[श्री पन्नालाल बांरूपाल]

वे जितनी मेहनत करते हैं, उस मेहनत के मुताबिक ब्रिटिश काल में उन को जो सहुलियतें मिलती थीं, वे आज स्वतंत्र भारत में उन को नहीं मिल रही हैं। नेफा और लडाख में हमारे जो जवान ठहरे हुए हैं, सर्दियों में उन की यह हालत होती है कि सर्दी से ठिठुरते हुए उन की राइफल हाथ से छूट जाती है और वे बर्फ से ढक जाते हैं। लेकिन राजस्थान में हालत इस से विपरीत है। वहां ऐसी लू चलती है, जिस से हाथ झूलस जाता है और राइफल हाथ से गिर जाती है, और आदमी रेत से ढक जाता है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि नेफा और लडाख में रहने वाले जवानों को जो सहुलियतें मिलती हैं, उन की तुलना में राजस्थान में पाकिस्तान की सीमा पर जैसलमेर, जोधपुर और बीकानेर में तैनात जवानों को बहुत कम सहुलियतें मिलती हैं।

जहां तक पानी के टैंकों का प्रश्न है, अब पहले वाली हालत नहीं है। सरकार के पास बहुत टैंक हैं। लेकिन गर्मी में उन में पानी बहुत गर्म हो जाता है। इस लिए मेरा सुझाव है कि जहां जहां हमारी सेनाएं रहती हैं, वहां ग्रैंड वाटर टैंक बनाये जायें, ताकि पानी ठंडा रहे।

मेरा एक मौलिक सुझाव है कि बीकानेर से श्रीकोलायत तक जो रेलवे लाइन है, अगर उस को तीस चालीस मील आगे फलौदी तक मिला दिया जाये, तो सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से वह बहुत लाभदायक होगी।

मैं ज्यादा नहीं बोलूंगा, क्योंकि डाक्टरों ने मना किया हुआ है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि सरकार जवानों का ख्याल रखे। बाढ़ हो या भूकम्प हो, हमारे जवान उस समय सहायता-कार्य करते हैं। कोई भी ऐसा काम नहीं है, जो हमारे जवान न करते हों। सैनिक, किसान और खेतिहर मजदूर और कारखानों में काम करने वाले मजदूर देश की बुनियाद हैं। बाकी के लोग तो मौज करने वाले हैं। इस लिए सरकार को इन तीन वर्गों का विशेष ध्यान रखना चाहिए।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I heard with rapt attention the speech, —the very good speech—of my hon. friend Shri Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, who knows the subject well. There was some sort of effort made in his speech and I could feel that he was trying to explain that we are having a slight edge over Pakistan. He was talking of the western sector. What happened in 1971 was this. With all the sophisticated weapons which they got from the U.S.A.,—whether they were Patton tanks or whether they were the Sabre-jets or other types of sophisticated weapons,—why could not Pakistan possibly use them correctly?

What was the call given at that time by late lamented Pandit Nehru—self-sufficiency in defence.

I think that in 1953 or in 1956, when Shri Menon was a Defence Minister for some time, he gave a call to maximise the production. Since then the Defence Establishments started producing sophisticated defence equipments. In 1962, the late Shri Krishna Menon was criticised. But, later on, it was found that it was he who laid the foundation for self-sufficiency in defence production in our country. And today it is a fact that we have reached a stage of self-sufficiency in the matter of conventional weapons whereas Pakistan purchases every item of defence needs from various countries. Our army, navy or air force never depended on anybody's help. They depended on our production alone in our country. Practically, it was our tanks and our Gnat produced in our country which became a terror to Pakistan army. That was how the production in this country had increased. Therefore I congratulate those workers—they may not be in the forefront but they are in the rear—in the ordnance factories and the Research and Development who were doing their best to see that self-sufficiency was reached in the matter of defence production and we do not remain dependent on any other country. So, naturally, the feelings of discord should not be created and defence budget should not be increased still further. But, by that, let us not create a war psychosis in this country. We know that Mr. Bhutto may say whatever he likes to say. But, he knows in his own mind, that we are strong enough to face Pakistan.

Now, I am happy that he has realised this. He will also realise it very seriously that we have the support of the U.S.S.R. and so, even by supplying of arms by U.S.A., we shall be able to face Pakistan. Sir, U.S.A. could send the scientists to the moon; they could land in moon but not in Vietnam. Whether it is in Vietnam or in North Korea and wherever the U.S. intervention was there, ultimately they met their Waterloo at their hands. And this is what is going to happen in this country once they try to enter the Bay of Bengal. They will meet the same fate in the hands of our armed forces and navy. We are proud of them. I am happy that the Defence Minister while inaugurating a convention of All India Defence Employees' Federation recently in Bangalore gave a call not only to the armed forces but to the civilian employees also who are second to none for maximising the defence production.

Here I would only confine myself to the cut motions which I have moved. More important points will be dealt with by my friend and leader of my group, Shri Indrajit Gupta. But, I have some thing to submit before the hon. Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh and Shri Mirdha and Shri Pattanayek. We are talking about the defence production having gone up in the defence factories except at Ambajhari and Tiruchirapalli. And practically, production in every unit has gone up and it is still going up and up.

I have no doubt in my mind about this. But, what is going to happen to coordinate the various units of the defence production. For the *Raksha Uthpadan* Board, we have been pleading in this House that the workers should be associated with it not because I want to go there on behalf of the Federation. There are workers who are efficient and who can possibly head this *Raksha Uthpadan* Board and who can give suggestions as to how production could be improved. So, as a matter of experiment, I would only request the hon. Minister to have on it one of the representatives of the Federation.

I assure you we will nominate only the best worker and not a politician. We will nominate a person who is capable and knows his job. I hope, the hon. Minister, will kindly consider the suggestion of mine.

Then I come to the question of various demands of the defence employees. I do not say the demands are not conceded. The piece workers of the Ordnance factories who are the backbone of the Ordnance factories work practically ten hours a day without any rest. In their case the recommendation of the Pay Commission about co-relation of piece work has not been approved or okayed by the Finance Ministry for the last 23 months. I would request the hon. Minister to take up the matter with the Finance Minister and see that piece workers do not suffer. Then there are supervisors, draftsmen, etc. against whom injustice has been done by the Pay Commission. There are so many such categories. The Defence Ministry is one with the stand of the Federation in all these matters and I would request the hon. Minister to take it up.

Now, I come to classification tribunal for the Defence employees. I am happy that for the first time this particular demand has been accepted by the Defence Ministry. I must congratulate them for it but what has happened has not functioned. Suddenly, when the Defence Ministry accepted our suggestion the Department of Personnel came out with another suggestion that this might have repercussion on Railway and P. & T. employees and, as such, it should be considered in totality. My point is why should the Department of Personnel come in between. I would request the hon. Minister to see to it that this classification tribunal works.

Now, I will touch a few points in connection with improvement in service conditions. The Defence units are production units. Nobody can deny that it is an industry. When we talk of Defence we talk of Defence Industry but in the matter of payment of bonus it is a departmental undertaking. HAL employees who manufacture aircrafts get bonus because it is a public undertaking but the worker at Avadi tank factory is not given any bonus because it is a departmental undertaking. I would request the hon. Minister to convince me of the logic behind it. Are not both the same? Sir, time has come when as an incentive to the workers bonus should be paid.

Then, Sir, will the hon. Minister assure about the re-introduction of permanent negotiating machinery? This was given to us and was working very efficiently. In 1960 strike which was declared illegal this permanent

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

negotiating machinery was withdrawn from the Railways, P. & T. and Defence. After the strike when recognition was restored everyone got it back but not the Defence employees.

I would request him, in the larger interests of good industrial relations and if you do not want confrontation—I do not want any confrontation even for a moment and I want good and smooth relations—let the PNM be established again and I can assure you that we shall create conditions by which things are settled by peaceful negotiations.

Sir, I will take another three minutes. Sir, I would like to mention about the revision of pay scales. There are certain glaring injustices. I do not want to dwell on it at length. But, I would request the hon. Minister to kindly consider whether it is justified to have higher scales of pay for the same posts in the Railways, in the Posts and Telegraphs and not in Defence. I do not know, why the members of the Pay Commission recommended it. That is why, I say that this should go to the classification tribunal and the matter settled.

Then, Sir, the discrimination between the industrial and non-industrial workers should be removed. Sir, there was the unanimous recommendation of the Shankar Committee that there should be no discrimination between industrial and non-industrial workers. The industrial workers are as effective, as efficient and as respected as the men of letters in the country. There should be no difference between a man of craft and a man of letters. I would request him that apart from removing social discriminations, we should also remove other discriminations which exist today.

Sir, I would like to mention one or two other points and I will conclude. Sir, the hon. Minister inaugurated our Federation Session in Bangalore and we requested him to reconsider the cases of victimisation, whether it was in West Bengal or in Avadi or in Kanpur or in Jabalpur or in other places. I would request him to appoint a senior officer of the Defence Ministry not exactly connected with the Ordnance factories there and this will prove that only those workers who have been engaged in genuine trade union activities have been victimised. We are not pleading for any workers who might have been

dismissed for moral turpitude, for theft or for security reasons. But, workers who have been engaged in genuine trade union activities have been discharged. The time has come when we have to start on a new slate. I would request Shri Mirdha and Shri Swaran Singh to sit together with the representatives of the Federation and decide these cases so that these workers may be able to put in their best and step up production.

Now, I would like to mention about the awful conditions of Defence employees in ordnance factories and other places in the matter of quarters. The MES employees construct quarters for the whole Army, but, they have no quarters. They have no quarters. This is a peculiar thing. This is a paradox. I would request the hon. Minister that these workers should also be given quarters. The contract system should be abolished. They should be given contracts to construct their own quarters.

Last but not the least, I would request Shri Mirdha to give me some reply in regard to the canteen employees. Both the Federations, ours and the INTUC have pleaded unitedly that the canteen employees should be regarded as central government employees. This has not been done.

With these words, I would request the hon. Minister to reply to the points raised by me. I can assure him, on behalf of our Federation, that whenever there is trouble, whenever there is any shadow of external aggression, we shall forget our demands, and we shall do our best; we shall rise like one man and we shall share the burden of this country. Sir, in 1962, 1965 and in 1971, we stood by the country and we would like to assure that when we fight, we fight not for offending anybody but in self-defence.

श्री विश्वनाथ राव (देवरिया) : माननीय सभापति जी दो विश्व युद्धों में यह सिद्ध हो चुका है कि भारतीय सैनिक चाहे वह अफसर हो या जवान वीरता के दृष्टिकोण से पहली पंक्ति में जाता है। वही परम्परा आज भी कायम है, बल्कि उस से भी अधिक उन के अन्दर जोश, वीरता और संयम है, साथ ही साथ जो शान्तिपूर्ण, क्रान्ति की पंक्ति

है, वह राष्ट्रीयता भी उन के अन्दर कूट कूट कर भरी हुई है। हमारे देश पर पश्चिमी सीमा की तरफ से तीन बार आक्रमण हुआ, उस में भी वह परम्परा कायम रही और कायम ही नहीं रही, बल्कि वह एक रिकार्ड है, प्रमाण है। 1970-71 में जब देश के पूर्वी भाग की सीमा पर लाड़ाई हो रही थी, बहुत कम समय में इतने अधिक सैनिकों को कैद करने का श्रेय भी भारतीय सेना को ही है, भारतीय सैनिकों ो ही है।

इस दृष्टिकोण से विचार करने पर आज हम विश्व में सब से आगे हैं। लेकिन जहां तक हमारी सैन्य सामग्री का सवाल है, हम अभी भी अमरीका और सोवियत यूनियन के मुकाबले पीछे हैं। हो सकता है कि घन की कमी की वजह से ऐसा है, लेकिन जहां तक हमारे वैज्ञानिकों का सम्बन्ध है, उन्होंने बहुत से साहसिक कार्य किये हैं, उन्होंने टैंक बनाये, हवाई जहाज बनाये और अनेको ऐसे अस्त्र निकाले हैं जिन का मुकाबला अमरीका के हथियारों से हुआ है। और हो सकता है कि ऐसा मुकाबला आगे भी हो। यह ठीक है कि हम बीर हैं, हमारे पास साधन भी हैं, लेकिन जितनी हमारी आवश्यकता है, घन की कमी की वजह से हम उस की पूर्ति नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। इस लिए मेरा कहना है कि इस मंत्रालय को जितने घन की आवश्यकता है, वह इसे अवश्य मिलना चाहिये, आज इस की जितनी डिमाण्ड है, वह कम है। आज हमारी सीमाओं पर जो संकट है, चाहे वह पश्चिमी तरफ से हो या उत्तरी तरफ से हो, या अमरीका से हथियार आने के कारण हो, इन बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए यदि इस मंत्रालय के लिये हम पर्याप्त साधन उपलब्ध कर दें तो इस से देश की सुरक्षा अधिक मजबूत होगी। इस लिये मैं ऐसा अनुभव करता हूं कि इस की डिमाण्ड में वृद्धि होनी चाहिये, इस वक्त इस मंत्रालय की जितनी मांग है, उस के अतिरिक्त भी यदि आवश्यकता पड़े तो हमें देना चाहिये, जबकि वर्ष के बीच में भी यदि

संसद को अधिक धन देने के लिये कहा जाय तो उन की डिमाण्ड अवश्य स्वीकृत होनी चाहिये।

आज जो भी अमेरिकन हथियार सीधे पाकिस्तान को जा रहे हैं या किसी दूसरे देश के द्वारा जा रहे हैं, बल्कि यह भी सम्भावना है कि बियतनाम में जो अमरीकन सैनिक शक्ति की पराजय हुई है, वहां का बचा हुआ सामान भी यहां आनेवाला है। हमें हाल में ऐसे संकेत मिले हैं कि वहां जो सैनिक युद्ध सामग्री है उस को अमरीका पाकिस्तान को या अन्य देशों को जिनको बे महायता देना चाहते हैं, वहां से हटा कर देने जा रहे हैं, ताकि वे उन को अमरीका ले जाने के खर्च से बचा सकें। इस खतरे को देखते हुए भी हमारे यहां इस मंत्रालय की धनराशि को बढ़ाया जाना चाहिये।

यह सही है कि अब हमारे यहां काफ़ी अच्छा प्रोडक्शन हो रहा है, विशेषकर चीन के आक्रमण के बाद हमारे उत्पादन में कई-सी-गुना वृद्धि हुई है। लेकिन इतना सब होने के बावजूद भी हमारी सीमायें उतनी सुरक्षित नहीं हैं जितनी होनी चाहिये। मैं खास कर उत्तरी सीमा की तरफ अपने रक्षा मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकषित करना चाहता हूं। चाइना की सड़क काठमाण्डू तक पहुँच चुकी है, दूसरी तरफ हम लोगों ने भी सड़क बना दी है। अगर कोई संकट उत्पन्न हुआ तो चाइना नैपाल के रास्ते से बहुत जल्द हमारी सीमाओं तक आ सकता है और एक तरह से तो वह हमारी उत्तरी सीमा के पास ही है। इस लिये मेरा कहना है कि सीमा के आसपास जो रक्षा के साधन हैं, वे बढ़ने चाहियें। साथ ही हमारी उत्तरी सीमा के पास गोहाटी से लेकर अमृतसर तक आक्रमण की रक्षा के लिये साधन होने चाहिये। मैं अपने ही जिले की बात करता हूं—आज से सात-आठ साल पहले वहां पर एक एरोड्रोम बनाने का निर्णय हुआ था और वहां पर उस के लिये जमीन भी किसानों से ले ली गई थी। लेकिन पता नहीं क्या कारण है.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow."

18.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, April 17, 1975/Chaitra 27, 1897 (Saka).