

[Shri Mohd. Shafi Qureshi]
been killed and 35 injured as a result of this accident.

Immediately on receipt of the information of the accident, Medical Relief Vans from Guntaki and Bangalore along with the doctors were rushed to the site of the accident.

The General Manager, Southern Railway, accompanied by the Heads of Departments has also proceeded by air to the site of the accident.

Minister of Railways, Shri Hanumanthaiya, who was at Bangalore, has personally visited the site of the accident.

Ex-gratia payment is being arranged to the next of kin of those who died and to the injured persons.

The injured passengers have been admitted in the hospitals at Anantapur and Hindupur and are being looked after.

The cause of the accident is under investigation.

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-NINTH AMENDMENT) BILL*

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE : I introduce the Bill.

12 23 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1972-73—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, we resume discussion on the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA (Baramulla) : May I make a submission, Sir? There are many speakers who have not been able to participate in the discussion on the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. If we could only forgo the lunch hour, three or four of us could be accommodated.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad) : Does he want to forgo the lunch or the lunch-hour?

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA : Lunch-hour.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajnandgaon) : If Mr. Agha is given the opportunity, the matter will be over.

MR. SPEAKER : In spite of that, your name is not here in the list. So, now we carry on and we will stick to the schedule.

We have already extended the House for half an hour and still you are asking for dispensing with the lunch-hour. We must stick to the time already announced unless there are very exceptional circumstances and we have a consensus.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : The Congress party can accommodate Mr. Agha.

MR. SPEAKER : I was thinking in that manner, but when I saw the list, Mr. Agha's name is not there.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) : The number of speakers from the Opposition and the Congress are equal in this debate and the time taken is also equal although we are entitled two thirds of the time. Our Members feel disappointed because they do not get the due share of the time. They require two-thirds of the total time fixed for a particular Demand.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Sant Bux Singh.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH (Fatehpur) : I start to speak to-day with being in disagreement with a person for whom I have tremendous respect and affection. That is, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee.

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, section 2, dated 25.4.72.

†Moved with the recommendation of the President.

Prof. Hiren Mukerjee yesterday questioned the fact that the expenditure on the 'Indian Council for Cultural Relations' has gone up a little. It is surprising that one of the most cultured Members of this House should have raised an objection of this kind. If one looks at the expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs, it amounts to Rs. 5273 lakhs of which a paltry sum of Rs. 20 lakhs or a little more has been allotted to the Council for Cultural Relations.

While this country is not in a condition to day to be a major military or economic power, this land has always abounded in its culture and its spirit and we are the proud inheritors of one of the greatest cultures of the world which has always been looked upon and admired all the world over. And at a stage when there is such a crisis in the conscience of mankind, we should give ten times more than what has been allotted to the Indian Council for Cultural Relations. I certainly want the House to appreciate this and that is why I particularly started on this theme.

I have recently been to the South-East Asia. There the pleasantly surprising thing that I found was that if you go to Indonesia or Malaysia, it will take five hundred years for United States or countries like Pakistan to get into the hearts of those people because Indian culture lives there and by Indian culture, I do not certainly mean Hindu culture alone. I mean Hindu and Buddhist and Islamic cultures all synthesized and this has to be seen in its purest form in South East Asia.

You have a person like President Suharto declaring himself to be a great Islamic general and the President of an Islamic Republic. Yet on the day he organised the coup in Indonesia, President Suharto was lying in the temple of Vasukinaga.

If you go to Thailand, you find their ancient capital called Ayodhya. The Indonesian Airlines is called Garuda Airlines. In Malaysia again at many of the musical shows that were presented to us we could distinguish many of the themes, tunes and inspirations of the North Indian music. The Vice-Chancellor of Malaysian university was very keen on the idea of a visit by Begum Akhtar. We have to pay greater attention to the

Council for Cultural Relations. We should pay much more attention to South-East Asia and give much greater grant to the Council for Cultural Relations. If Prof. Mukerjee had been here he would have agreed with me.

While I am on the subject of cultural relations, I would like to enquire one thing from the Minister. Now that the Council has taken up the administration and management of foreign cultural centres in India, it is surprising that I and others who belong to the Governing Body of the Council for Cultural Relations were never informed as to who and how somebody was appointed as the head of the Russian Cultural Centre in Trivandrum. I am particularly worried about this because, I would like to stress in this House, to the extent I know, some of the activities of the CIA now in this country are concentrated on the 'progressive' or the 'progressive' friendship societies who some how are basically advocating the point of view of the CIA. I do not want to say that whosoever has been appointed in Trivandrum is a CIA agent. But I feel askance at the self-styled-progressives trying to influence our establishments.

It is said that we are going to have three cultural centres opened abroad this year. It has been said that there will be 3 centres, San Francisco, Gyana and Fiji. The Deputy Minister spoke about Gyana and Fiji. What happened to San Francisco? I have no knowledge about it at the level of the Council.

We should open more centres in places like Thailand, Beirut, Europe and Africa. I would urge upon the Government to open one centre in each continent. Small countries like Iran and Poland have cultural centres but India has never really been very much bothered about this.

The Indian Council for Cultural Relations has existed for a long time. It is a pity that one of the most cultured Members of this House should point out that there is more money spent Rs. 20 lakhs is very small compared to Rs. 56 crores which is the External Affairs Ministry's expenditure for the year.

Mr. Samat Gaha made certain suggestions on our emissary at Moscow. I would

say this much that it is the worst possible thing that could be said right at the moment when we are negotiating with a country. To say the least, it is in bad taste, if not worse. And I do not think that Shri Samar Guha would have wanted to say this, being the great nationalist and the patriot he is. It does not matter who sits in Murree. It is India sitting at the conference table. When my erratic and dramatic friend Zulfikar Ali Bhutto spoke or tried to insult Shri Swaran Singh, it was not Shri Swaran Singh whom he was insulting, but it was India whom he was insulting, and when again Zulfikar Ali Bhutto tore up the papers at the UN and wept, he wept not to Shri Swaran Singh or Shri T. N. Kaul, but he wept to India and showed the absurdity of his position.

I am glad that while many other things have been talked about, this is the very first time since I have been in this House when external publicity has not been criticised, when the Ministry of External Affairs had an extremely difficult job; last year was one of the years when more must have been done about publicity than ever. I would want this House to be charitable and also utter a word of praise wherever good things have occurred.

While I disagree with Shri Samar Guha and Shri H. N. Mukerjee much as I like them, it is paradoxical that I should have to start by agreeing with Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, and I do agree with him quite absolutely when he says that on cold frozen nights, *nimbupani* should not be served.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Then, what should be served ?

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH : While I do agree with Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee on this, that does not convert me to being a Jan Sanghi any more than it converts him into a Congressman, and that is why I am surprised when he says that 'Why must Mr. Brezhnev and the Prime Minister of India talk about Asian collective security ? The fact that we agree about *nimbupani* does not mean that there is a complete identity of views or that he and I are in conspiracy any more than the Prime Minister of India and the people in power in Russia..

MR. SPEAKER : The question of *nimbupani* transcends all party and national alliances.

SHRI SANT BUX SINGH : Asian collective security has been thought about for a great length of time. It must have been thought about or spoken about by Sun Yat Sen. It must have been dreamt by Iqbal, Tagore and Gandhi. It was thought about and worked for by Jawaharlal Nehru. I am quite sure that Vir Savarkar and Bal Gangadhar Tilak must have dreamt of a time when this continent would be free from war. Therefore, the fact that there is an occasion when the Soviet Union in its own way and we in our own way are thinking about Asian collective security must not be suspected, and must not be criticised. I am quite certain that there is nobody in this House who would not want us to get together, and to want to stand against war pacts or war bases or various kinds of threats that we face.

Recently a Panchsheel agreement was signed by President Nixon and Mr Chou En-lai which was drafted by Dr Henry Kissinger. I have a book here which says that the original Panchsheel was drafted by Mr. T. N. Kaul. I do not think that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee will say that Mr Kissinger came to Shri T. N. Kaul for advice.

Mr hon. friend Shri K. Manoharan voiced an extremely nice sentiment, the sort of sentiment that we Indians are apt to indulge in. He said that but for the fact that Mr Nixon was the President of the USA, our relations with the USA would be good. It is one of the great tragedies of history that the United States which started as an anti-imperialist country, which started as a democratic country immediately in 1945 when the colonial powers were crumbling, took over all the colonial legacies from the British, the French and the Dutch. Way back in 1945 or 1947 the US delegate to the United Nations said 'Nehru's Hindu India with a Brahmin Prime Minister will soon become a stooge of communist Russia.' It was not an ignorant American that spoke. It was John Foster Dulles himself who was the delegate then.

So what has gone wrong between India and the United States is surely of the mak-

ing of the United States. The United States today is under a system which, if it does not change, stands in danger of being subject to forces that go against everything that is decent and proper in humanity.

Here I would like to quote from the *Congressional Record* of the US. This is what Senator Church said:

"Today the US Government is the principal arms dispenser of the world—giving away, arranging credit and promoting the sale of a volume of arms more than six times that of our nearest rival, the Soviet Union. It is estimated that, since 1945, the United States has bestowed an incredible \$165 billion worth of weaponry on foreign Governments, a deluge of arms unprecedented in the history of the world."

If there is this combination of the army, the political elite, industry, the monopolists and the capitalists, the US Government will have a lot of its own citizens killed, will use all that is meant for progress and decency to suppress all the best that there is in mankind. Today what we face in Asia is not so much a threat from China, not a threat from the Soviet Union; there is no threat to India's neighbours from large-size India. It is the United States of America which has kept this continent bombed, its citizens maimed or destroyed. Every possible thing of this type has been happening. Until the US leaves Asia, there is never going to be peace in Asia, no matter what the intentions are no matter how sublime the thoughts of certain people are.

We are today in this country at a very crucial stage. We have fought and we have survived. And we have had the pride of having fought to increase democracy in the world. Although the US has said that it is fighting for democracy, never has its choice been for democracy whenever it has had a dictatorship to support. If today to the free world, a country has been added, if today with the addition of Bangla Desh the world of democracy has increased, it is not because of, but in spite of, the the US and its Enterprise.

So a great deal of introspection has to go into the thinking of the people of the US who must, first of all, come to terms with themselves and end the "exploitation

that we see. We in this country now face a situation where it is only by fighting injustice, social inequality and poverty that can we forge ahead and be really great. Nations around us are looking forward to this great experiment, and if we have to make India's foreign policy meaningful, the fight will have to be right in this country.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, broadly, one can say — and I do not want to sound unduly harsh—that we have only a policy towards Pakistan or towards the Soviet Union and a non-policy towards the rest of the world. To my mind, we are increasingly becoming insular and inward-looking and we seem to satisfy ourselves with the ritualistic incantation of some portmanteau, phrases, phrases based on the grand principles which were laid down by the architect of our foreign policy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, we have more or less, it seems, come to believe in the theory, "Nothing succeeds like nothing." We had earlier heard of the adage, "Nothing succeeds like success." Mr Oscar Wilde modified this, he disagreed with this and said "Nothing succeeds like excess." But our Government seems to believe in the theory that "Nothing succeeds like nothing."

So, we have a policy of masterly inactivity so far as the basic principles of our foreign policy are concerned; and words without action, as somebody has said, are assassins of idealism. At this rate, I have no doubt that the tenets of our foreign policy will very soon reek like faded violets.

To my mind, the most crucial question for us to consider is whether our foreign policy has accepted the challenge of an adaptability to the emergent constellation of forces in which India finds herself at the present moment.

Our capacity for response is challenged by four or five factors.

The first factor is the detente between the United States and China and their almost identical reactions to some of the vital questions which concern us, namely, Kashmir and Bangla Desh. The joint communique issued after the Nixon-Chou talks made a reference to Kashmir in terms which constitute an attempt to interfere in our internal affairs.

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

The second factor is the developing situation in Vietnam. We can no longer be a bewildered spectator of this monstrous drama and confusion that goes on there. If we have no role to play in Vietnam, let me make it clear that we have hardly any role to play anywhere in the world.

It is that we have had no policy so far as South-East Asia is concerned. We did have a policy of some sort so far as the Middle East or even West Asia is concerned. But we have had absolutely no policy so far as South-East Asia is concerned. There are now new patterns emerging in South-East Asia and a new situation there demands of us a new response. To my mind, India will have to emerge as a South-East Asian power and project itself as such.

The third factor is the second revolution through which Bangla Desh seems to be passing at the moment. During the present phase of the second revolution, that is, the socio-economic revolution, there is bound to be three kinds of ideological divisions around which important countries of the world would be grouped, to which the important countries of the world be directly or indirectly aligned. These ideological divisions, to my mind are the right, the left and the centre. At the right of the spectrum would be the United States and the United Kingdom. At the centre would be India and the USSR. At the left would be China and a part of the Indian political forces. It is upon the outcome of this ideological confrontation that the relations between India and Bangla Desh would depend.

I do not know whether our Government is quite aware of the developments that are taking place there. The statements made by Maulana Bhashani indicated that the emerging trends in Bangla Desh are not going to be all too favourable as we had expected. Similarly, the statement of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman during the course of an interview to a representative of the *Guardian* indicated that he is under pressure of public opinion in his own country not to get too close to India.

Now the fourth factor which has entered as a parameter of the emerging order is the Indian Ocean to which a reference was made by the hon. Deputy Minister yesterday. I was surprised when he said that some big

powers were taking some initiatives in this matter and it was for them to invite countries concerned or not. To my mind the primary concern should be of the countries which are round about the Indian Ocean, not of the big Powers. Here I find that India has not had any initiative to show although it should be one of the countries fully concerned with this.

The Lusaka Declaration said: "Hands off the Indian Ocean." It seems to have fallen on deaf ears so far as the big Powers of the world are concerned and the Indian Ocean now bids fair to be the battleground for the naval supremacy of the big Powers and very soon, it appears to me, that the Indian Ocean is going to be infested with more submarines and warships than there are crocodiles in the Indian Ocean. Here, therefore, I should like to sound a note of warning, that if this happens and if the naval supremacy of the big Powers is established, it will have a strangulating influence on the independence of the countries around.

The fifth factor which does not seem to enter into the calculations of the Foreign Ministry is the rise of Japan in Asia and the world and we have waited for a certain evidence of the awareness of the rise of Japan. Japan has already become a super economic Power and in the not too distant future, it is going to be a super Power in every way. The GNP of Japan is 1.5 times that of China and probably much more than that of the rest of Asia. It is the proportion of foreign trade of a country in the world trade that determines the influence of a country but unfortunately the proportion of our foreign trade is decreasing.

The point that I want to emphasise is that Japan is also groping towards a policy and it is at this stage that intimate relationship between India and Japan could bring about formulation of policies which would be in the interest of Asia.

After having touched on these basic aspects of our foreign policy, I should like to deal with a few relatively minor matters but quite important in their own way.

In this context, I should first say a few words about the wonderful annual report presented to us by this Ministry. If I may say so, we have not come across a more flamboyant and pompous report than this. To say the

least, it lacks in dignity it lacks in balance and a sense of style to which we are accustomed. It bears to my mind the impress of the cultural revolution which the ruling Party and the Government seem to have undergone. It was, indeed, a good year for the foreign office and I was heartily agreeing with my hon. friend Shri Sant Bux Singh when he spoke highly of the role played by our external publicity, particularly at the time of Bangia Derh developments. So we could have given good words to the Ministry ourselves.

But what do we find ? This report is outrageously full of self-congratulations and self-adulation and what is more objectionable, it contains references and remarks and ineundos about some countries which could not be called dignified. Whatever our differences with those countries we do not have to lose our sense of balance and proportion and restraint. We expect a certain amount of simplicity, austerity and matter-of factness in these reports.

This is, I must say, an example of what great harm can be done by an over-zealous and an over-solicitous agency. I do not blame the officials I always demand the head of the minister. I would never demand the head of the officials. That is not an honourable course to take for any Member of Parliament. It was a peculiar sight yesterday when one Member after another began praising the officials sitting in the official gallery. This is not the kind of tradition to which we have been accustomed.

I would give another example of how Parliament is being treated by this Ministry. Recently, a communication was sent by our Prime Minister in reply to President Bhutto's. The venue and date of the meeting between the two emissaries of the two countries were also fixed. But the Foreign Minister, for reasons best known to him, was not pleased to inform the House about this important development. We have to be grateful to Mr. D. P. Dhar for informing us and the world about this important meeting from Dacca on the 1st April. We are told that the Foreign Minister did not even share this information with his Party Standing Committee, though he was specifically asked whether communication by way of reply had been sent from our Prime Minister to President Bhutto.

AN HON. MEMBER : Where did you get this information from ?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : After all, the thread of fraternity does not get snipped so quickly, Fraternity remains, though there are new persons coming over.

We cannot say that our Foreign Minister did not know about this meeting. But then why this secretiveness on his part and why did he not share with us and the world all this information, as Mr. Dhar did ?

Our Foreign Minister may reconcile himself stoically to any kind of situation, but let it be made quite clear to him that this Parliament cannot reconcile itself to any situation like this.

While I am on this subject, I would like to say that it beats us why our journalists have not been allowed to go to Murree to cover the important conference there. This would only mean that we will have to depend entirely on foreign agencies like the Pakistani agency or the European agency to get a glimpse of what is happening there. This, incidentally, also involves the vital issue of freedom of the Press.

Another wonderful style if this ministry is exhibited in the way our relations with the Soviet Union are sought to be projected. We have indeed very cordial and friendly relations with the Soviet Union. We value these relations very much and we would like to maintain them in all their freshness and strength, so far as it lies with us. But the way in which these relations are being flaunted, idolised, celebrated and politically exploited, one gets a feeling that we have yet to develop the maturity and balance in international relations as would be commensurate with our position in the world. There is hardly a week or a fortnight when a Soviet official does not descend upon the Indian soil or an Indian official does not leave for the Soviet Union. There is hardly any week when some celebration either cultural, literary or political, does not take place. There is hardly any fortnight without loud protestations or freindship and fraternal ties.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kaupur) : So what ? When you go to the American Embassy, we do not object.

SHRI SHYAMANANDAN MISHRA : What the hon. Minister of Steel, Shri

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

Kumaramangalam said the other day is typical of this attitude. He said :

"It was the physical presence of the Soviet Union that saved us from the threat of the U. S. Seventh Fleet during the recent Indo-Pak war."

Shri Kumaramangalam said that India was not worried by the entry of the Seventh Fleet into the Indian Ocean since it was confident that "while we are fighting on land, somebody else was looking after other things." Now, as you will observe, it does not do any credit to India to give an impression to the world that India is functioning under the Soviet umbrella. Either you take the whole credit yourself, or you say that the fear of the US Seventh Fleet was not there because there was protection granted to us by the Soviet Union.

Finally, the frame work which has been left by Pandit Nehru was of cultivating friendship with all countries of the world. I find that no consistent effort in that direction has been made. I have always been pleading for down-grading our Embassy in the United States because it does not seem to be producing any result on the United States Administration.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Do you support the US policy towards India ?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : I am advocating the downgrading of our Embassy in USA, which he has never suggested.

If we can have an Embassy in the United States, I do not see any reason why we cannot have an Embassy in Peking. United States is no less hostile than Peking at the moment. So, my humble suggestion is that we should try to work within the framework which has been handed down to us by Pandit Nehru, of cultivating friendship with all the countries of the world.

Since there is no time, I leave the matter where it is.

श्री संकर देव (बीरर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपनी बारी के लिए बहुत देर से इंतजार कर रहा था। बाकिर वह था ही नहीं।

सबसे पहले मैं अपने विदेश मंत्रालय को बख्श देना चाहता हूँ। हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय की पालिसी जिसको तकरीबन दस साल हो गए, पहले हमारे भूपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने बनाया था, उस बख्त शायद इनसान चन्द्रमा पर नहीं पहुँचा था लेकिन आज क्योंकि जमाना इतनी तेजी से बढ़ रहा है तो भारत को भी अपनी पालिसी के बारे में अवश्य विचार करना पड़ेगा। इसके बारे में मैं अपने सजेशन रखना चाहता हूँ। भारत हमेशा के एक आदर्शवादी देश रहा है जबकि दुनिया के समस्त राष्ट्र बिल्कुल प्रेगमेटिक रहे हैं। तो हिन्दुस्तान को अपने आदर्शों को सामने रखते हुए, अपना जो पंचशील का प्रोग्राम है उसकी जगह पर हमको आज के तमाम हालात को देखते हुए विदेश नीति का जो बेसिक आचार है जो मूलभूत सिद्धान्त है उसके बारे में हमको बल्ड यूनिशन बनानी पड़ेगी, बल्ड फेडरेशन रखनी पड़ेगी और बल्ड गवर्नमेंट रखनी पड़ेगी। हमारी जो फारेन पालिसी होगी वह बल्ड गवर्नमेंट को दृष्टि में रखकर बनानी पड़ेगी। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूँगा क्या वे इस दिशा में गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचने के लिए तैयार हैं। आज यदि हम बल्ड गवर्नमेंट को अपनी फारेन पालिसी का बेसिस बनाये तो हम वह समझते हैं कि हमारा जो भारतीय सिद्धान्त है उसके आचार पर ही हम इसको बना रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने यहां पर श्री बाजपेयी जी के विचार सुने। बाजपेयी जी भारतीय संस्कृति के हमी हैं और जनसंच के नेता हैं। उन्होंने यह कहा कि प्रिंसिपल्स और नेशनल इन्स्टिट्यूट—इन दोनों में जब क्लैस आता है तो हमको नेशनल इन्स्टिट्यूट को ही देखना चाहिए। मुझे सुनकर बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ कि जो भारतीय संस्कृति के हमी हैं वे किस प्रकार यह कहते हैं कि नेशनल इन्स्टिट्यूट को देखना चाहिए और प्रिंसिपल्स को छोड़ देना चाहिए।... (अव्यक्त)... यह बड़े आश्चर्य की

बात है कि बाजपेयी जी, जोकि एक भावार्थवादी रहे हैं, उनके मुँह से ऐसी बात सुनाई दे। इस दृष्टि से मैं यह कहूँगा कि हमको अवश्य बल्ड फेडरेशन को अपने ध्यान में रखकर चलना चाहिए। लेकिन मैं इसके बारे में एक बात बता दू कि इसके लिए किस प्रकार की योजना बनाई जा सकती है। बल्ड यूनियन या बल्ड गवर्नमेंट की तरफ चलने के लिए हम धीरे-धीरे स्टेप्स लेते हुए एक छोटा सा कन्फेडरेशन बना सकते हैं, और वह इस तरह से कि हमारे देश के आस-पास के जो देश हैं—जैसे बर्मा, नेपाल, अफगानिस्तान, सीलोन—यह तमाम फ्रेंडली नेशन्स हैं, उनका एक कन्फेडरेशन बनाया जा सकता है। और धीरे-धीरे उसको बढ़ाते हुए हम बल्ड गवर्नमेंट की तरफ जा सकते हैं। इसके बारे में विदेश मंत्रालय को गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचना पड़ेगा।

13. hrs

मैं एक सुझाव यह देना चाहता हूँ कि उधर बंगला देश के 1 करोड़ इधर भाये और लगभग 9 महीने तक वह भारत को पीड़ा देते रहे। भारत ने इन 1 करोड़ मुसीबतज्वा लोगों को यहाँ अपने ऊपर कष्ट सह कर मेंटेन किया। जाहिर है कि इस तरह से 9 महीने तक भारतमाता को पीड़ा देने के बाद जो स्वतंत्र बंगला देश के रूप में बच्चा जन्मा है वह बंगला देश हमारे भारत के खिलाफ नहीं जा सकता है। उसको कम से कम अपने साथ रखकर भारत और बंगला देश का एक फेडरेशन बनायें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह एक छोटा सा कदम हो सकता है जोकि बनाते बनाते हम बल्ड गवर्नमेंट की तरफ जा सकते हैं। आप कह सकते हैं कि उससे फायदा क्या है? उससे फायदा यह हो सकता है कि हम अपने डिफेंस के ऊपर जो खर्च करते हैं उस खर्च में कमी हो सकती है क्योंकि भारत और बंगला देश दोनों की रक्षा के लिए भारत के पास जो सेना है वह पर्याप्त है और वह दोनों देशों की रक्षा कर सकती है। ऐसी दृष्टि से यदि हम दोनों देशों

का एक फेडरेशन बना लेते हैं तो सेना के ऊपर जो लाखों करोड़ों रुपया खर्च कर रहे हैं उसमें काफी बचत हो सकती है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : लंच का टाइम हो गया है माननीय सदस्य लन्च के बाद बोल सकते हैं।

श्री शंकर देव : इस समय विश्व के राष्ट्र मिल कर 375 करोड़ रुपया प्रतिदिन डिफेंस के ऊपर खर्च करते हैं, पीने चार अरब रुपया सेना पर खर्च करते हैं ..

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य भेरे द्वारा कई बार घटी वजाये जाने के बाद भी बोले चले का रहे हैं।

श्री शंकर देव : अभी मुझे सिर्फ पांच मिनट दिये गये हैं। मैं बल्ड फेडरेशन जैसे महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर बोल रहा हूँ। मेरा सबसे आखिर में बोलने के लिए नम्बर रखा गया है इसलिए मुझे थोड़ा बोलने के लिए और समय दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह माननीय सदस्य को किस ने कह दिया कि उनको बोलने के लिए समय नहीं दिया जायेगा। जब मैं घंटा बजाता हूँ तो कोई शौक से थोड़े ही बजाता हूँ लेकिन अब चूँकि एक बज चुका है लन्च का टाइम हो गया है इसलिए अभी तो माननीय सदस्य बैठ जाये और फिर लंच के बाद दोबारा हाउस के मिलने पर वह बल्ड फेडरेशन अपनी बना लें और अपना भावण लंच के बाद जारी रखें।
We adjourn for Lunch to meet again at 2 O' Clock

13 30 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock

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

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—Contd.
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd

श्री शंकर देव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बतला रहा था कि आज विश्व के तमाम राष्ट्र मिलकर के अपनी मर्यादा के ऊपर, डिफेंस के ऊपर, 375 करोड़ रु० प्रतिदिन खर्च कर रहे हैं। यह जो 375 करोड़ रुपया प्रतिदिन डिफेंस के ऊपर खर्च हो रहा है, राष्ट्र के नाम पर, मैं कह सकता हूँ कि वह मानव के लिये अत्यन्त हानिप्रद है।

मैं यह चीज बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी फारेन पालिसी वर्ल्ड फेडरेशन के ऊपर बेस्ट है। जब सब राष्ट्रों की सरकार बनेगी तब हम को भिन्न-भिन्न राष्ट्रों के पास आज जो मिलिटरी फोर्म है उसमें रखने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी। तब वर्ल्ड की एक छोटी सी पुलिस फोर्स रहेगी, जिस पर बहुत नामिनल खर्च होगा।

आज गाये राष्ट्र मिलकर जो 375 करोड़ रुपया प्रतिदिन डिफेंस के ऊपर खर्च करते हैं यह बहुत बड़ा अमाउंट है जिसको बचाने के लिये हमारा भारत कोशिश कर सकता है। भारत हमेशा से एक ग्रांडडियल देश रहा है, हमेशा ऊँचा देखने वाला रहा है। वह कभी नीचे की बातों को नहीं सोचना, ऊँची बातों को सोचना है, और हम इस दिशा में बहुत कुछ कर सनने हैं। मैं अपने विदेश मन्त्री से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि वह इसके बारे में गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचे कि क्या हम इस तरह की कोई पालिसी बना सकते हैं जिसके जरिये हम एक वर्ल्ड गवर्नमेंट की तरफ जा सकें।

मैंने यह बताया कि हम छोटी शुरुआत के तौर पर अपना एक छोटा सा कफेडरेशन बना सकते हैं जिसके अन्दर हम भूटान, सिक्किम, अफगानिस्तान, बर्मा और हो सके तो नेपाल को भी, मिला सकते हैं। जब इस तरह का पाँच छः देशों का कफेडरेशन बनेगा तो जो आज करोड़ों रुपये हम डिफेंस के ऊपर खर्च कर रहे हैं उसको करने की जरूरत नहीं होगी।

हम करोड़ों रुपये बचा कर दूसरे राष्ट्रों के सामने एक भिन्नान पेश कर सकते हैं और एक वर्ल्ड गवर्नमेंट की तरफ जा कर अपने डिफेंस के खर्च को बिल्कुल खत्म कर सकते हैं।

मैं आप से स्पष्ट कह देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमने इस वक्त इस दिशा में वर्ल्ड को लीड नहीं दिया तो भारत का बखूद नहीं रहेगा। मैं मानता हूँ कि आज जितने भी राष्ट्र हैं वह सब रिजलिस्टिक हैं, प्रैग्मैटिक हैं, उपयोगितावादी हैं और आज क्या होना चाहिये इसको सीचते हैं। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान हमेशा दूर की बात सोचता रहा है, और आज भी उसको उसी तरह से दूर की बात सोचनी चाहिये। इस दूरदर्शिता के कारण भारत को नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है, लेकिन यदि आप विदेशों में भ्रमण करें तो आप देखेंगे कि जो वर्ल्ड के लोग हैं वह आज भी हमारी ओर देखते हैं। मैं आप को अपना अनुभव बतलाता हूँ। एक बार मुझे लन्दन जाने का मौका मिला। वहाँ मैं एक इन्स्टिट्यूशन में जा रहा था। दूसरी तरफ से एक लेडी आई। उसने पूछा कि क्या आप हिन्दुस्तान से आये हैं। मैंने कहा येस मैडम। उसने कहा: बेन यू मस्ट बी ए फिलॉसफर। कहने का मतलब यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान हमेशा इस आदर्श पर चलता रहा है।

यूनियां का जो सबसे बड़ा साइंटिस्ट हुआ है आईस्टीन उनसे एक प्रेस रिपोर्टर ने जा कर पूछा कि फर्स्ट वर्ल्ड वार में एयरोप्लेन का इन्वेंशन हुआ था और दूसरे विश्व युद्ध में एटम बम का और अब आप बतायें कि तीसरा विश्व युद्ध अगर होगा तो उसके अन्दर कौन से भयंकर शस्त्र का निर्माण होगा। उन्होंने पाँच मिनट सोच कर कह कि तीसरा विश्व युद्ध अगर होगा तो उसके अन्दर कौन से भयंकर शस्त्र का इस्तेमाल होगा यह तो मैं नहीं बता सकता हूँ लेकिन चौथा विश्व युद्ध अगर होगा तो मैं कह कर बता सकता हूँ कि उसमें स्टॉक,

बिक्स, स्टिक्स, ब्लोज, स्लैप्स एंड किक्स चलेंगे। इससे आपको यह समझ लेना चाहिये कि तीसरे बिस्व युद्ध में ही समस्त नष्ट हो जाएगा, हमारे पास कोई चीज नहीं रह जाएगी, मानव सभ्यता, संस्कृति, विज्ञान, सब चीजें खत्म हो जाएंगी। इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि बल्ड फैंडेशन बनाने के लिए और उसके वास्ते प्लान तैयार करने के लिए भारत सरकार की ओर से एक सैपरेट मिनिस्ट्री कायम की जानी चाहिये जिन का नाम हो मिनिस्ट्री फार वन वर्ल्ड। उसका काम यह होगा कि वह हर एक देश के अन्दर इस बात का प्रचार करे, कि हम सब राष्ट्रों के लोग एक हों, हम बेसिकली अलग-अलग नहीं हैं और राष्ट्रवाद समाप्त हो। आज राष्ट्रवाद के खिलाफ भय में कुछ बोलता हूँ तो आप सब लोगों के अन्दर तनाव पैदा हो जाएगा। अफसोस की बात है कि इसके बारे में आज कोई सोचने के लिए तैयार नहीं है।

मैं एक अंतिम स्लोगन देकर समाप्त करता हूँ। अखंड भारत नारा दे दुनिया को "जय जगत" का।

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): I have been listening to this very important debate with close interest. It was with much disappointment and with a feeling of sadness that a listened to very experienced speakers in this House like Prof. Hiren Mukerjee, Shri Manoharan, Prof. R. K. Sinha and others make eloquent pleas on various subjects, that the country should recognise GDR, should recognise the Provisional Government of South Vietnam, should condemn bombing in North Vietnam, etc., but only passing reference was made by them to the one really important question that faces the country today.

We are about to start discussions with Pakistan with the hope, justifiably, I think, that the discussions, if rightly handled, I would lead to lasting peace. We have been searching for that peace for the last 25 years with no success. If these discussions could be successful, if the discussions could cover the three countries now on this sub-continent, then, we shall have at one stroke removed the big powers from having any influence on

this sub-continent. It seems this was not the subjects which interested these distinguished speakers; but they all seem to have felt that the other subjects were of greater and immediate interest to this country. Sad.

I am at one with those who have congratulated the Government for the admirable manner in which the country's affairs were conducted during 1971, leading to the establishment of Bangla Desh

The remarkable administrative competence shown in the way in which the large number of refugees were looked after months on end reflects great credit on all concerned and indicates that when moved by great humanitarian considerations, we are capable of achievements even in the administrative field, of which any country could be equal. The efficiency with which the war itself was conducted when it was forced on us also compelled even the patronising critics of the West to admit that Indian military strategists had kept themselves abreast of military thinking and strategy that its fighting men drawn from all sections and parts of the country were capable of fighting with intelligence and determination and had great capacity for endurance. The image of India throughout the world has gone immensely as a result.

But then there has come a strange faltering. Is it not surprising that four months should have been allowed to elapse since hostilities terminated? And yet we have not thought fit to define our terms and conditions for peace. Mr. Bhutto understandably hesitates to take initiative. But why do we not take the initiative instead of waiting to react to whatever developments may take place? Ultimately, we shall have to show generosity even to a fault. Why not proceed to point out what we consider to be the essentials?

We have moreover is fairness to carry Bangla Desh with us and not let it feel that in a matter of such vital importance today, ultimate relationship with Pakistan can only be established in consultation with it. We cannot leave Bangla Desh to find its own salvation.

The issue of prisoners of war is an extremely tender for Pakistan. But then so is the question of the trial of those who were guilty of war crimes for Bangla Desh and so far as we are concerned, of the

[Shri H. M. Patel]

territories in our occupation. We cannot hand over whatever is essential for the future security of our borders. We cannot also take it for granted that Pakistan has altered its objectives. Nothing in its conduct so far warrants such an easy and wishful assumption. The Pakistanis by and large do not regard this as an end to war. They hope to continue as soon as their build-up permits and it would appear China and even the USA seem ready to assist Pakistan in this process. They do not want peace on this sub-continent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Unfortunately, the hon. Member has very little time.

SHRI H. M. PATEL : I shall finish in two or three minutes. What then is the answer. The answer is to start talks, as we have done, to make clear to the people of Pakistan that India does not wish dismemberment of Pakistan and that it would like to have a durable peace with it, if Pakistan wants it. We should openly call upon all great powers to assist in the efforts to secure a durable and lasting peace. Let the onus be put fairly and squarely on them for any contrary move on their part. Certain foreign journalists have suggested that India is adopting a paranoic attitude and does not make a real effort for peace. This, of course, is untrue. But such untruths have a way of being accepted. Before that happens, we should move with determination and after clear terms for peace, how far we are prepared to go in our search for peace, what is negotiable and what is not. This is an age of open diplomacy.

Our foreign policy is stated still to be faithful to the concept of non-alignment. No one, not even its original propounder, the late Pandit Nehru, succeeded in defining it with precision. At one time, it was generally understood to mean non-involvement in any pacts, friendship with all countries and malice towards none. As we began leaning left-wards, we claimed non-alignment not to preclude closer friendship with some countries, closer to a point where actions were found to be excusable in those countries, even when similar actions by other countries were subjected by us to severe adverse criticism. Non-alignment was considered compatible with open hostility on our part towards a small but brave country

like Israel, our excuse being to placate Arab countries whose friendship we have been anxious to retain at all costs. Even the open hostility shown by Arab countries towards us, some of them even assisted Pakistan during the hostilities, giving it valuable war materials—has not been considered sufficient by us to realise that they are not our friends. Indeed we looked for excuse to explain away their inability to speak even a word in favour of Bangla Desh, in whose support we fought this war with Pakistan.

Strange indeed is this concept of non-alignment. There is, and ought to be, nothing sacrosanct about nonalignment. It was a policy which served us well when there obtained an international situation of cold war between the two super-powers. As the international situation changed, it was advisable for us to modify our policy. We did not do so; rather we did in fact modify it, but still continued to persist in maintaining that we are adherents of the policy of non-alignment. We have now entered into a treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation with Soviet Russia and consider that the principle of non-alignment has gained added strength thereby. There must be some limit to the flexibility of a principle. You surely cannot twist it so as to make it stand for its opposite.

We recognise that there have been changes of great and far-reaching significance in great-power relationships and it is because of that that we have entered into close, friendly relationship with one of the two super powers. While our relationship with the other super-power, USA, is strained to near breaking-point, that with the other power, China, continues to be unfriendly, we still maintain that we are following a policy of non-alignment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He must conclude now. Shri R. L. Bhatia.

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATIA (Amritsar) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, after consolidating our position at home, it is necessary that the Ministry of External Affairs play a more effective role in foreign affairs. Three events have happened or are likely to happen which have a great bearing and which we must take into consideration.

The first is the Chou-Nixon meeting which has a great effect on the affairs of Asian countries. Secondly, an event which

is likely to take place, and that is, we will witness another Dien Bien Phu in Vietnam shortly. You will see the American forces defeated and the consequences thereof. The third event is the emergence of Bangla Deah with our assistance. Our forces were there not only to assist them in their liberation but for a cause. This event alone has brought a tremendous effect in Asian affairs. So, while taking into consideration all these things, I expect and desire that our Government should play a better role, a more effective role in foreign affairs.

After this Bangla Deah event, a Chinese diplomat said that "so far we have been thinking that there has been a force behind India, but now we realise that India is a force"

Sir, coming to Pakistan, it is a good anxiety that Mr. Dhar is already there to negotiate peace. With Pakistan we have always been saying, our worthy Foreign Minister has always been emphasising a desire that we should have a permanent peace with Pakistan. But it is unfortunate that it has not been possible due to the connivance of big forces over there. The Pakistanis have realised the realities of the situation, and the realities that are facing Asia today. So, in view of those forces, I would like that our Government should strive for a permanent peace with them. We had three times a war with them, but nothing has been solved. So, this is an opportunity again, because Mr. Bhutto is well-placed; he has established his position and he is in a better shape and a better mind. If we can take advantage of the situation and make Pakistan realise the realities of the situation, there is possibility that we will have a permanent peace with them.

With regard to Ceylon, we have very cordial relations. But there are some problems which require a new look. Just now we had a trade agreement with them, but they had some problem with their surplus rubber goods and tyres, etc. It is a very ordinary thing; we buy from them and solve their problem. But so far as the political problems are concerned, namely, the Indian settlers over there, and Kachativu Island, I would suggest that our Prime Minister should have a dialogue with the Leaders of the Opposition and take a final decision and go to Ceylon and solve this important matter so that we can develop

our friendship with that country which is so geographically placed and where there are chances of foreign countries playing an important role.

Similarly, there is the question of Nepal. The Prime Minister of Nepal was here and we have had a dialogue with him also. There are some problems with Nepal also; there is surplus electricity there; they want to sell it; we should be prepared to buy it. Or, there is the question of building roads. We should certainly do it. We should have that mentality that every time we must look into the matter as to whether it is a gain to us, financially or otherwise. There are certain factors which we must take into consideration and see that our friendship develops faster.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATTIA : Since you have rung the bell and you have not given me enough time, I will just say a few more words about Nepal and finish my speech. There are 30,000 applications lying with the District Magistrate in the Terai area. It is in regard to the people who have settled down in Nepal and are cultivating there. They have been asked, under the new reforms in Nepal, to have a non-objection certificate from the Indian Government. I hope our Government will look into this problem so that those people will settle down there.

If there are some friends of America, in this House, I want to tell them what America has gained in a situation like the Indo-Pak conflict. They have shattered Pakistan into pieces; they have lost the friendship of 55 crores of Indian.

श्री तुलक चंद कलबाघ (मुनेरा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। माननीय सदस्य श्री राम चन्द्र विकल मदन में सो रहे हैं ..

श्री कुल्लु बख्श पांडेय (खलीलाबाद) : कहां सो रहे हैं ?

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATTIA : They are the people who have increased the Soviet influence in this area. I should like them, if there are any friends of America here, to inform their friends that

[Shri Raghunandan Lal Bhatia]

the furcoat of America is not suited to tropical India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Rudra Pratap Singh. Please take five minutes.

श्री रघु प्रताप सिंह (बाराबंकी) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, क्या बताऊँ कि तनी हसरत दिल के धफसाने में है। सुबह गुलशन में हुई तो शाम बीराने में है। बहुत कुछ कहना चाहता था मगर आमान् जी ने 5 मिनट का समय दिया है। अब बड़ी उसमन में पड़ गया हूँ कि क्या कहूँ क्या न कहूँ ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Take one point, the most important point and put it across.

श्री रघु प्रताप सिंह : श्रीमान् विदेश मन्त्रालय की सफलता और असफलता इस बात पर निर्भर करती है कि हमारे मित्र देशों की संख्या में वृद्धि हुई है अथवा कमी आई है, इस बात पर निर्भर करती है कि जिन देशों के साथ हमारा मतभेद रहा है वह मतभेद कम हुआ है अथवा उसमें वृद्धि हुई है। मुझे भारत सरकार के प्रतिनिधि के रूप में संयुक्त राष्ट्र सच के छम्बीसवें अधिवेशन में भाग लेने का अवसर मिला था। मैं इस बात को गर्व के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र सच के समक्ष वो ऐसे प्रश्न थे जिनका भारत सरकार के साथ बहुत गहरा सम्बन्ध था। एक प्रश्न था बंगला देश से आए हुए लगभग 1 करोड़ शरणार्थियों की समस्या और दूसरा था गणतंत्र चीन के संयुक्त राष्ट्र सच में प्रवेश की समस्या। इन दोनों समस्याओं के साथ भारत-वर्ष का सम्बन्ध जुड़ा हुआ था। जहाँ तक पहली समस्या की बात है मैं इस बात को कह सकता हूँ कि योग्य और अनुभवी विदेश मन्त्री थे जिस प्रकार से वहाँ पर विदेशों से जो बेली-केशन आये थे उनके साथ बातचीत करके इस बात की व्यवस्था की उससे अधिक से अधिक देशों

का समर्थन हमें मिला। जिन देशों का हमें समर्थन नहीं मिल सका उनकी अपनी सीमाएं थीं।

फिर भी हम इस बात को कह सकते हैं भले ही उन्होंने मौलिक रूप से हमें समर्थन न दिया हो लेकिन यह बात सत्य है कि उसके हृदय में हमारे देश के प्रति सद्भावना और सहानुभूति में वृद्धि हुई। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में विभिन्न देशों की अपनी सीमाएं होती हैं, अपनी परिस्थितियाँ होती हैं, उन सीमाओं और परिस्थितियों से उठकर कार्य करने में कठिनाई होती है। मगर इसके होते हुए भी यह बात सही है कि आज तक का जो इतिहास रहा है उसमें हमारे विदेश मन्त्रालय की जो नीतियाँ रही हैं उसे विदेशों का भारी समर्थन मिला है। साथ ही साथ जहाँ तक गणतंत्र चीन के सदस्य बनाए जाने की बात थी भारत सरकार सदैव यह चाहती थी कि गणतंत्र चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र सच का सदस्य बनाया जाय और इस विषय पर भी भारत का जो यह कदम रहा है उसमें जिस तरह से दुनिया के सारे देशों से हमको समर्थन दिया है उसके लिए हमें भारत की विदेश नीति की सराहना करनी चाहिए। इस समीक्षाधीन वर्ष के अंदर जिस प्रकार से बंगला देश से आए हुए शरणार्थियों की सुरक्षा की गई और उन्हें सम्मानपूर्वक स्वदेश वापस भेजा गया, जिस प्रकार से बंगला देश को मान्यता प्रदान की गई, जिस प्रकार से उसको स्वाधीनता प्रदान की गई हम निश्चित रूप से कह सकते हैं, विश्व के इतिहास में, विष्व समुदाय के समक्ष यह जो लोकतंत्र, धर्म-निरपेक्षता और गुट-निरपेक्षता का सिद्धांत हमारा रखा गया है उसका बड़ा प्रभाव पड़ा है। मैं इस बात को गर्व के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि यह वर्तमान वर्ष हमारे भारत के इतिहास में सर्वश्रेष्ठ वर्ष रहा है। इस वर्ष के लिए हम यह कह सकते हैं कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विचार में इस वर्ष में भारत कपी सूर्य का उदय हुआ है और

इसे यदि हम इंदिरा-युग कहें तो इसमें कोई अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी। मैं यह कह सकता हूँ—

लोग कहते हैं बदलता है जमाना हर दम।

मैं वह हूँ जो जमाने को बदल देते हूँ ॥

श्रीमती इंदिरा जी ने विश्व समुदाय के सामने अपने देश की जो लोकतंत्र की धर्म-निरपेक्षता की और गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति रखी है उससे विश्व-समुदाय में भारतवर्ष का मस्तक बहुत ऊँचा हो गया है। इसके लिए मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी की और विदेश मंत्री जी की हृदय से बधाई देता हूँ और विदेश मंत्रालय के अनुदानों का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate. After a long time, a consensus appears to have developed amongst all the parties represented in this House about the basic policies in the sphere of external affairs, and this debate has been remarkable as important leaders of various political parties have participated in it. If I may venture to remark, the debate has been of a high order and important issues have been high-lighted and analysed. Besides this analysis and appreciation of the problem, some hon. members have also given thought to possible suggestions that could be profitably pursued in order to give content to this national consensus. There have been many notable speeches both from the opposition benches as well as from my own colleagues and there is hardly any aspect of the international situation that has not been touched upon.

My colleague, the Deputy Minister, while intervening in the debate yesterday, did comment upon some aspects of our relations with our neighbours. He also referred to certain programmes of economic cooperation and technical cooperation that we are trying to implement in the mutual interest of some of these countries and of us. He also touched upon certain other aspects.

Much as I would like to reply to all the points that have been raised, there are limi-

tations and I will, therefore, try to confine myself in my reply to some of the important points of interest to the House, of interest to the country and to a certain extent of interest to other countries as well.

The most significant event since we discussed our budget demand last year has been the emergence of Bangladesh as a free, independent and sovereign country. We are very happy that a neighbour has emerged primarily by its own sacrifices, aided by us also to a certain extent. This is an event of great historical importance and significance to the sub-continent and this region. Here I should like to pay homage to the courage, heroism and bravery of the valiant freedom-fighters of Bangladesh, who bore untold suffering in the cause of their freedom. I should also like to pay homage to the people of India, to the military and para-military forces of India, who shared the hardships of their brethren in Bangladesh and cemented our ties of friendship with them through blood and sacrifice.

Bangladesh is the eighth most populous country in the world. It is rich in human talent and natural resources. It is a reality that has been recognised by more than 60 countries, including four permanent members of the Security Council. We appreciate the stand of the Soviet Union, Poland, Mongolia and Bhutan and most countries of Eastern Europe in the United Nations on the freedom struggle in Bangladesh. We also appreciate the realistic attitude adopted by France, the United Kingdom and Denmark in the United Nations on this subject. We are glad that most other countries have now come to recognise the reality of Bangladesh.

We welcome Bangladesh as a partner and brother in the common task of strengthening peace, stability, security and progress of the sub-continent. Our Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Peace with Bangladesh is a solemnisation of the close bonds and interests that bind our two countries together. It is not aimed against any third country and it does not prevent either country from developing similar relations with third countries. It is, however, a warning to outside powers not to interfere in the internal affairs of either country, or to threaten their peace and security. In the strength and stability of Bangladesh lies our own strength and we hope that a strong and stable India will be

a source of strength and stability for all our neighbours. It is in this spirit of friendship, equality and partnership that we have offered our co-operation to the Government of Bangladesh. We shall share our last loaf of bread with them, if necessary. I should like to thank the great leader of the people of Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and his colleagues for the spirit of friendship and co-operation they have shown towards us, which we fully reciprocate. The visit of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman to India and the return visit of our Prime Minister to Bangladesh have demonstrated the close ties of friendship and co-operation between our two countries and peoples. I am glad to inform the House that the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh, Mr. Ahdul Samad is arriving in Delhi today and we hope to have further exchange of views with him on the common problems that face us.

Some hon. Members have warned us against smuggling and illegal trade between Bangladesh and India. I should like to assure the hon. Members that we have already taken various steps to control such evil practices under the trade agreement that was signed with the Commerce Minister of Bangladesh in New Delhi towards the end of March. We want our border with Bangladesh to be a model of peace and friendship and we will not allow smugglers, blackmarketeers, spies or other antinational elements to exploit this border. This is the common objective of both India and Bangladesh.

Several hon. Members have rightly referred to the present situation between Pakistan and India. I would like to say something about this important matter. What I have said about Bangladesh, I am sorry, I cannot say the same thing about Pakistan. Unfortunately, during the last 25 years, Pakistan had adopted an attitude of confrontation against India. We had to defend our territories against Pakistani aggression four times since Independence. It is our earnest hope that these trends will now be reversed and we will be able to achieve durable peace so that the people of India and Pakistan can live as good neighbours in friendship and cooperation.

It is with this objective in view that our Prime Minister has sent her emissary, Shri D. P. Dhar, to have a preliminary meeting with his opposite number in Pakistan. The Prime Minister has agreed to have a sum-

mit meeting with President Bhutto. We must ensure that such a summit meeting will lead to some positive and concrete results. The emissaries are meeting to pave the way and to prepare the ground for a successful summit meeting. The meeting has started today in Murree and, I am sure, the hon. Members will join me in wishing the emissaries every success in their task.

One hon. Member, unfortunately, made some baseless and unjustified remarks about our emissary, Shri D. P. Dhar. I should like to take this opportunity of categorically rejecting the insinuation made by the hon. Member Shri D. P. Dhar has a distinguished record of service to the country in various fields. He was a Minister in the State of Jammu and Kashmir for a long time. He was our Ambassador in the Soviet Union. In view of his intimate knowledge and experience, he was selected as the Chairman of the Policy Planning Committee in the Ministry of External Affairs with Cabinet rank. The same hon. Member asked what was the status of Shri D. P. Dhar. On the analogy of the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission who was not always a member of the House or of the Council of Ministers and still had Cabinet rank, Shri D. P. Dhar was also given a similar status. I categorically reject the insinuation by the hon. Member that Shri D. P. Dhar has, in any way, created misunderstandings between India and Bangladesh. Such uninformed talk is neither fair nor justified. It is not even in our national interest.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Was his status questioned that you are mentioning it today? You have mentioned about his Cabinet status and all that. That was not the Point raised.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: One hon. Member did ask. What is his status? Who is he? Why he has gone to Bangladesh? The hon. Member, naturally, is not present all the time when Members are speaking. But I am present all the time. (Interruption)

The emissaries' meeting is not just a routine matter. It is for this reason that we selected a person of Shri D. P. Dhar's experience to lead the delegation at these preliminary talks. We hope that this gesture will be appreciated by Pakistan and that they will be as much interested as we are in bringing about lasting peace in the sub-continent.

Some Hon. Members have asked : What is our attitude in these emissary-level talks ? The hon. Members are fully aware of our attitude which has been clarified by the Prime Minister and by me on several occasions. We know what the outstanding issues are and our views are also well-known on each one of them. It would not be wise for us to say more at this delicate stage. All I can say at this stage is that we would like to have a stable, durable and lasting peace on the sub-continent and resolve all the problems that stand in the way of achieving this objective.

Naturally, Bangla Desh will be a necessary party to the settlement of issues that concern them also. In fact, we have kept them informed of the developments at all stages and will continue to do so in future.

One thing is clear that it is only by direct negotiations that we could settle our problems with Pakistan. Our experience has shown that third party intervention and raising the matter in the U. N. have only made the settlement of problems more, and not less, difficult in the past. Another lesson that we have learnt from the past is that it is not enough to resolve a few peripheral issues of less importance and leave the main issues or difficult issues for settlement at a later date. It is, therefore, our determination to try to resolve the basic as well as the simpler issues together, so that we may end for all time the threat of another conflict and eliminate the resort to force for resolving unsolved problems.

It is tragic that there should have been four violent conflicts between India and Pakistan during the comparatively short period of 25 years after our independence. There are more things that unite the interests of the peoples of India and Pakistan than those that seem to divide them. We respect Mr. Bhutto as the democratically elected leader of the largest single party in Pakistan. We have started a dialogue with him in a spirit of friendship and accommodation. Friendship is a two-way traffic. We hope that he will clasp the hand of friendship that we have extended to him. We hope, a day will come when we shall be able to speak of Bangla Desh, India and Pakistan as three friendly countries of the sub-continent working together for peace, friendship and co-operation for the common benefit of the 700 million people of this sub-continent. It

is only through this common tripartite approach that we can bring about lasting peace on the sub-continent. I am grateful for the various suggestions made by hon. members and we shall certainly bear them in mind in the course of our forthcoming negotiations.

Several hon. members have drawn pointed attention to the problems that are faced by countries where shooting war is either going on or where there is uneasy peace, and the situation in Vietnam has been prominently referred to in this connection. We had about three hours' debate the other day on Vietnam, and there was unanimity in the House about our approach to the problem and there was unmistakable expression of solidarity with the valiant freedom fighters of Vietnam ; and there was also unanimous expression of our feeling of deploring the aggressive actions taken by the United States.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Do not spoil your speech. So far, it was very good.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Fortunately, there are other persons in the House besides Mr. Piloo Mody.

We regret that the conflict in Vietnam has been raging violently for the last many years. It is a tribute to the courage and heroism of the brave people of Viet Nam that they have been able to stand up successfully against the might of a great military power. We are convinced that no solution can be imposed on Viet Nam . . . (Interruptions) from outside and there can be no military solution to this problem. The people of Viet Nam have a right to live the way they choose and no other country has any right to interfere in their internal affairs.

All foreign forces and, particularly, those of the United States.

SHRI PILOO MODY : What are you reading ? A Soviet hand-out ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Can I say I am reading a hand-out prepared by Mr. Piloo Mody ?

SHRI PILOO MODY : This is libel, he must withdraw that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : All foreign forces and particularly those of the United States, who are in largest numbers, must be withdrawn from Vietnam at the earliest date possible and the people of Vietnam must be left to decide their destiny in accordance with their own genius and the wishes of their people.

We are horrified at the indiscriminate, large-scale and inhuman bombing of the last few weeks over the territory of North Viet Nam which, far from cowing down the people of Viet Nam, has only strengthened their determination to resist with even greater valour and success than before.

We can see a ray of hope in that the Paris talks are going to be resumed. We hope that these talks will result in a speedy and successful conclusion of the conflict in Viet Nam and usher in an era of peace, progress and stability in this whole region.

The liberation of Bangla Desh was a great heroic event. The liberation of Viet Nam will be an equally heroic and great event. We have every hope that the solution of the problem of Viet Nam will also lead to the solution of the difficulties in Laos and Cambodia.

We believe that the solution to the present situation in Indo-China lies in a broad-based agreement within the framework of the Geneva Accords which respect the unity, territorial integrity, independence and neutrality of each of the Indo-China States.

Some hon. Members have criticised India for not taking the initiative as Chairman of the International Control Commission to resolve the situation. I would like to remind them that the functions of the Commission are defined in the Geneva Accords, that is, to supervise the implementation of the agreement by the parties concerned. Instead of being able to supervise the implementation of a peace accord, the Commission is a helpless witness to a violent war. In the circumstances, there is little the Commission can do because it was meant to supervise peace and not war. However, India, Poland and Canada, in spite of the difficulties they are facing in Viet Nam, are continuing to stay on there as a symbol of the Geneva Accord at the express desire and request of the

parties concerned and the Co-Chairman. No party has any right to change the composition of the Commission and we categorically reject any interference with the functions of the Commission by any party. I would like to express my appreciation of the dignified, calm and patient manner in which the representatives of the three supervising powers have conducted themselves in the face of serious difficulties in South Viet Nam.

Hon Members would no doubt be aware that a suggestion has been made on behalf of North Viet Nam and the representatives of the provisional Revolutionary Government that the Paris Peace talks may be resumed. This morning we have seen the announcement that the United States is prepared to respond to this and it is our hope that the resumption of these peace talks in Paris may open up the possibility of taking this problem from the battle field to the conference table and we would very much like that a peaceful solution of this problem is found and the people of Viet Nam who have faced such great difficulties for such a long time are enabled to shape their future according to their own desire and in accordance with their own genius.

I would like to say a few words about China. Some hon. Members mentioned that the present time was opportune for normalising our relations with China. Some other hon. Members thought that any unilateral gesture by us was not likely to succeed. As my colleague, the Deputy Minister, said yesterday, our relations with all our neighbours are friendly and cordial except with China and Pakistan. I have already mentioned our attitude to Pakistan.

15 hrs.

As for China, geography has placed us as neighbours. The diplomatic missions of each country are functioning in the capital of the other. Whenever any possibility will happen for taking some concrete action to improve relations we shall certainly take such steps as may be possible on the basis of equality, mutual respect and reciprocity. In spite of the hostile and bellicose statements made by China against us in the last conflict with Pakistan, in and outside the United Nations we have deliberately refrained from being provoked in order not to increase tensions.

In this connection, I would like to clarify that the Indo-Soviet Treaty does not stand in the way of our normalising relations with China. It is not directed against China or any other country. We cannot accept any conditions that the normalisation of relations with any country that may deter us from developing friendship with any other country. The Soviet Union itself has been trying to normalise relations with China and would be happy to see the normalisation of relations between India and China, as we would be happy to see normalisation of relations between China and the USSR.

It is in this spirit that we welcomed the visit of President Nixon to China because we had hoped that it would lead to a relaxation of tension without injuring the interest of any third country.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN Madras (North): Not in that spirit he visited; it is very clear.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: We were hoping that this will be the outcome.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: It was a pious hope.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: We can review our attitude in the light of the outcome of that visit. However, we must say that we were shocked and surprised at the references to Jammu and Kashmir in the Joint Communiqué of President Nixon and Premier Chou-En-lai because it amounted to interference in our internal affairs.

Several hon. Members have raised some other issues and I would like to take this opportunity of giving very briefly our comments on some of these issues.

About the Indian ocean, there appears to be a general consensus that every effort should be made to keep it as an area of peace, free from big power rivalry and free for navigation and also that the security of the littoral States should be ensured. This was exactly the objective when this matter was discussed at Lusaka. A vast majority of the littoral States surrounding the Indian Ocean were actually present there and they participated in those discussions. The absentees were those countries who are members of Defence

Facts and obviously they could not be present at the Lusaka Conference.

Later on, this subject was again taken up in the United Nations at the initiative of the Ceylonese delegation and a broad consensus emerged that every effort should be made to preserve the Indian Ocean area as an area free from big power rivalry and free from the deployment of naval armament and naval crafts carrying nuclear weapons. I know that this is a matter which will not be capable of easy solution. We have to continue our efforts. The positive feature of the situation is that the vast majority, or, overwhelling majority of the littoral States are firmly of this view that every effort should be made to keep this area free from tensions and this in itself will go a long way in dissuading the countries which have got the capacity to deploy their navies in this region, from going ahead with their designs of building permanent bases in this region or to send in their navies in larger and larger numbers. It is very interesting that where any country decides to send its navy in any considerable strength, they always say that they do it as a counter-measure to what has been done by the others. We have to break this vicious circle and I think that the united action on the part of the littoral States will go a long way in creating that atmosphere.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: But what is his assessment? Has the situation worsened or improved after the Lusaka conference?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: It has not changed much; it has not changed for the worse; it has not changed for the better; it could be worse. We have, therefore to continue with our efforts, both amongst the non-aligned countries and amongst the littoral countries and also in the United Nations, and it is our expectation that there will be growing pressure on the countries which have got big navies to desist from going ahead with their programmes. Even the experience of other regions where such rivalry started is not gratifying even to those countries which have stepped up their naval presence in those regions. For instance, in the Mediterranean and in the North Atlantic etc., where the rival navies are present in a big way there are already talks of limiting their presence.

SHRI PILOO MODY : All the fishes are running away. They are so overcrowded that all the fishes are running away.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The fish is so huge that it cannot run away easily.

I am glad to find that all hon. Members welcomed the friendly and mutually beneficial relations that so happily exist between the Soviet Union and India. We are proud of our friendship with the Soviet Union, which is based on the principle of equality, mutual respect and co-operation.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Question.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We are grateful to the Soviet Government and people that they stood by us in times of need and difficulty, while others wavered and hesitated and even went against us. We are not an ungrateful nation. Our relations with the Soviet Union have developed more particularly during the last fifteen years rapidly and satisfactorily. We have entered into various agreements in the economic, commercial, cultural, technical and other fields with the Soviet Union during recent years. These agreements are open and public and there are no secret clauses to them. They have been tested by time and have proved their value in both countries and helped in strengthening peace, stability and security and progress in this region.

We regard the Soviet Union as a reliable friend. Some critics are deliberately and maliciously propagating the thesis that India has gone into the Soviet orbit.

SHRI PILOO MODY : That is I.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Shri Piloo Mody is a solitary dissenter. But even he did not have the courage to participate in the debate.

SHRI PILOO MODY : It does not require courage, believe me, One has to be foolhardy to participate in this debate.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : He could be plenty of that, I think.

Such critics like Shri Piloo Mody forget that a country with the traditions, culture

and the size of India cannot be satellite of any other country. The great people of India overthrew the mighty British empire. They refused to be dominated by the economic and military might of the USA. They stood up as a united nation against onslaughts from other countries. India will not be a camp-follower or a client-state of any other country. India stands on her own strength and on the united will of her own people as a self-reliant and self-respecting nation. However, this does not mean that we should spurn the hand of friendship of any country that extends it to us on a basis of equality and mutual respect.

I do not want to be apologetic. I would tell hon. members, to whom it has become a usual pastime always to say things and put them in such a manner as to toe the line of some of our foreign critics, that we should know who our friends are. We should also be careful as to who are not friendly to us. This general attitude of trying to club everyone together is not in our national interest. It is not based on facts, nor on reality.

I know the House would expect me to say something about our relationship with the United States of America.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Skip it.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : (Pratapgarh) You should not take him seriously today because he is in a some mental pain.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am glad that he is also a party to this general consensus that we should skip it because it is not pleasant to talk of unpleasant things. But we have a duty to perform. The country should know what our attitude in this respect is.

SHRI PILOO MODY : You have a duty to perform. Quite right. You do it. Perform your duty and abuse them.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I must say he has a remarkable capacity for being flippant.

I should like to say a few words about our relationship with the United States of

America. We admire the principles of democracy, individual liberty and freedom which are enshrined in the American Constitution. We have warm feelings of friendship towards the people of the United States of America. However, we regret that this warmth has not been reciprocated in the attitude adopted by the US Government towards India during the recent developments in the sub-continent in which they adopted a partisan and anti-Indian attitude. We are prepared to forget the past and start afresh. We are prepared to have a dialogue with America on a basis of equality and mutual respect, and not on any other basis. We do not see any basic conflict between the interests of America and India in this region. But we cannot be expected, as a self-respecting nation, to endorse the actions of any government that we consider detrimental to peace, stability and harmony in this region.

Our contacts with the US administration through diplomatic channels have been continuing, but we do not yet see any concrete sign on the part of the US Government to improve relations.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : It will never change.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We can understand the pulls and pressures, internal and external, that may affect the policy of the US administration for a temporary period. We make allowance for this and hope that in the not too distant future the US Government will begin to appreciate the peaceful, constructive and positive role that India wishes to play for the development, stability and security of this region, and not attribute wrong motives to us, for that is not the way to develop understanding. I must, however, make it absolutely clear that if the US Government start rearming Pakistan directly or indirectly, we shall take it as a deliberate attempt to disturb the peace of the sub-continent, to increase tensions and to hamper the chances of a lasting settlement.

The US Government will, I hope, give due consideration to the feelings expressed by hon. members of all parties in this House. This might help them in shaping a correct policy towards India and this region.

Several hon. members made reference to the idea of collective security in South East Asia. Most of the observations were based on press reports that found their way to print after the last meeting of the Indian envoys in South and South-East Asia.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : Is it wrong news?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is not full news, because no official briefing as such was given ; no press-release hand-out was given.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Some contradiction could have come later.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is not necessary. Now is the occasion to state our position clearly.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : You could have contradicted it; point by point, it was analysed. (Interruption)

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Even if the press reports are examined, you will find that the same material has not appeared in all the newspapers. It varies from newspaper to newspaper and it varies according to the inclination of the newspaper also, depending upon the ideas of the reporters, which is not unnatural. I have no complaint on that basis.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : You supply us notes.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : In fact, there is nothing to be supplied by way of material on this issue. I will try to clarify the position as it exists today.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : The meeting of the envoys reached some broad conclusions. That, you have. Is it not?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The meeting was held for a number of days, and a large number of problems, political, economic, cultural and bilateral relations, matters relating to the region, all matters were discussed.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : All talked out, or any conclusions reached?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : In such matters, it is for Parliaments to arrive at con-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

clusions. So far as these meetings are concerned, it is our duty to transmit the conclusions arrived at by Parliament to our heads of missions so that they could implement them, and take action on them. This is the object of such a meeting. The envoys do not meet to arrive at conclusions.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Have you finally decided to recognise the DMK?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: At any rate, we have decided not to recognise the Swatantra party.

SHRI PILOO MODY: But that does not, as usual, answer the question.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: My submission is that there is no Swatantra party at all. Where is the question of recognition?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: You are right; so there is nothing to recognise.

Sir, this idea of collective security is an idea which is a good one, because, if the countries of this region can have the satisfaction, have the feeling of security, then, obviously it is good for each country and also for the region. But an attempt has been made by several hon. Members here to connect it with the Brezhnev proposal which was put across by the USSR leaders some years back. Again, some ideas have been suggested without any justification that we are in some way trying to put across the ideas which had their origin in the USSR. We are in touch with the leaders of the USSR and the Government of the USSR has not put forward any concrete proposal to any country in the region, not even to us. It is, therefore, wrong for anybody to suggest that we are in any way peddling about ideas which are not our own. But we are vitally interested in creating a general atmosphere in this region where the sovereignty and independence and freedom of action of these countries are assured. In this respect, each country derives strength by mutual co-operation with its next-door neighbour, with its near neighbour, with its distant neighbour, and with this co-operation in the economic field, in the cultural field and in every other field and support of each other, if the sovereignty of any country is threatened, these are the connections that grow very strongly in favour of giving strength to those countries, and thus strengthen their sovereignty and their

independence. There is no agreement as such. There is no concrete proposal as such which has been put forward.

But let us remember that the whole situation in this region is undergoing a great change. Some hon. Members rightly referred to the vast changes that are taking place. If you have a careful look at the South-East Asian region, many countries in this region were members of defence pacts for which the main architect was the United States Government at the time of their anti-communist alliances.

The United States also was generally wont to look at these countries in terms of black and white; they can never think of intermediate attitudes among any of these countries. All these outmoded and old ideas received a jolt when the process of détente started between the United States and Peking. In the initial stages many countries put across ideas which showed a great deal of concern about this changing situation and they started looking elsewhere for their safety because, unfortunately they had never developed enough internal strength by co-operating with neighbours which would give them the requisite confidence.

It was in this situation of flux that these ideas were put forward. They are good ideas and if there is response from these countries, then some concrete shape can be given. In a small way we ourselves have a Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and peace with one of our neighbours, Bangla Desh. There could be similar treaties, if not in those terms, similar to this among any other neighbours in this region, between any two neighbours or any two or three countries. This is the way in which the idea of collective security can be realised.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: This is bilateral security, not collective security.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Bilateral action results in collective security.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: One does not see the process.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Because there is no move at the present moment and all the arguments were based as if there was any proposal put forward by any country,

The instigation was that the USSR perhaps put forward the idea and the others are trying to be roped into that. I should like to say that there is no such proposal at the present moment. These are ideas.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: Some country must take the initiative.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : In this case it will not be very wise for any one country to take the initiative; it is something which has to grow out of appreciation by various countries of the problems they face and what is the best solution for these problems. They have already had an experience of a sort of defence arrangement and they thought that this gave them collective security. Now it is clear that it has not given them collective security; it has not even solved the problems of the region. Even war has not been prevented. A shooting war is going in Vietnam at the present moment. There has been trouble in Cambodia, even in Laos and in several other countries. There can be re-thinking on this. It will not be wise for any country to take the initiative in this respect. That might create misapprehensions and may defeat the very objective which should be before all of us, of the countries in this region. Their independence and security should be assured. In this process it is not difficult to bring in even some of the big Powers.

An hon. Member said that perhaps by making this suggestion we are trying to bring them into pacts. That is not the idea. The point is whether some big countries can guarantee the sovereignty and independence of these countries on the pattern, for instance, of the Geneva accords, although experience of that has not been good. That is the type of thing that is visualised. It is not the conclusion of any multilateral treaty or any multilateral protocol to be signed by all the countries. It will not be proper for us, therefore, to criticise something which is just an idea. There is no concrete proposal as such.

But there is interest in this. For instance, Malaysians have shown interest in it. Even a country like Australia, which is a member of defence pacts, has shown interest. If ideas of collective security can develop, they would like to study them carefully. Whereas there are no concrete proposals as such, the ideas are there and the stage has not arrived

when we could concretise them further. I would not like to take the initiative in this respect, because at the present moment, it is liable to be misunderstood.

I would like to say a few words about the situation in Western Europe. It is necessary for us to keep the European scene in front of us because in our life time, we have seen two world wars and the origin of both was in Europe. We welcome very much the initiative and spirit of cooperation shown by USSR, Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany in signing the treaties of Moscow and Warsaw. They initiated the process of *détente*. These treaties are still pending ratification by the German Parliament. The hon. Members are aware of the difficulties that Chancellor Willy Brandt is facing in getting these treaties ratified. We also welcome the agreement concluded between the four powers about Berlin. These are all positive developments and we hope that these steps will result in stabilising the forces of peace and that tension will be reduced. This is something in which the entire world is interested. We are interested in it because all our programmes of development and economic growth are dependent to a very large extent on the maintenance of peace in Europe.

I am grateful to the hon. Members—although it was objected to by certain others—who have said good words about the work done by the Ministry and by our Missions abroad.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : And by the Minister.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The Minister can take all the shocks; I am grateful to the hon. Member. The encouragement given by hon. Members from all sections of the House will go a long way in giving the officials in the Ministry and in the Missions abroad encouragement to tackle the tasks with greater devotion and greater earnestness. I am happy that even the efforts of the Publicity Unit of the External Affairs Ministry have also been praised, although unfortunately on earlier occasions generally they came in for a good deal of criticism. This will certainly encourage them to tackle the task with greater devotion.

There is one aspect about which I will have to say something. That is about West

[Shri Swaran Singh]

Asia, because several hon. Members have criticised the attitude of certain Arab countries and certain other countries of West Asia. There are always champions of Israel. So, it is necessary to state our position clearly.

Our relations with countries of West Asia, from Afghanistan and Iran to the Mediterranean, remain warm and friendly. Some hon. Members expressed their dissatisfaction at the lack of response from Arab and some other countries in West Asia on Bangladesh. This disappointed us also but we made every effort to explain the realities of the situation to the leaders of these countries, through visits by our Ministers and other high level delegations, through constant contacts with their governments, through our Ambassadors as well as in New Delhi through their diplomatic Missions and through the press and other information media. Bangladesh is a reality and this fact cannot be ignored, in West Asia or in any other part of the world. It is our impression that this reality is dawning more and more on countries of West Asia. Bangladesh has been admitted as a Member of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation. Some tentative contacts are being sought by some of the West Asian countries with Bangladesh. Time will, no doubt, make them recognise realities increasingly.

Our relations with countries of West Asia have been traditional. Our independence gave a new dimension to them and our relations were established not only at the political and cultural planes but led to a growing economic exchange between us, which has been of mutual benefit. No passing of disappointment should mar these close relations which are in our mutual interest. No passing feeling of disappointment should mar these close relations which are in our mutual interest.

We have supported the Arab countries, in the United Nations and elsewhere, on the Arab-Israeli issue. This support, based on principles, continues. We also strongly support the Palestine refugees in their liberation struggle. We hope that this long-pending matter would be solved, not by force and conflict but through discussion and negotiation.

We welcome the entry into the community of independent nations and to the

United Nations of the States of Oman, Qatar, Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates in the Gulf. They have been our close neighbours and our contacts with them go back to antiquity. We have established diplomatic relations with them at Embassy level. Resident Missions have already been established in Muscat and Bahrain and will shortly be established in Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. There are great possibilities of developing economic and commercial co-operation between them and India and we hope to develop these to mutual advantage.

Several hon. Members have mentioned about the freedom struggle that is going on in the continent of Africa against the racist regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia and also the freedom fight that is going on against the colonial regime of Mozambique and Angola. Our support to the freedom fighters is consistent and we are solidly with them in their freedom struggle and we have given them some help from time to time. In the United Nations and also in the Non-aligned Conference we are solidly with them, and all the African countries are fully aware of our consistent and determined stand in this respect, and this policy continues to be adhered to with firmness. We ourselves having attained our independence after a long struggle, our sympathies and our support is ungrudgingly available to all the people who are struggling for their freedom and independence, more so to those who are still groaning under colonial and racist regimes.

In Latin America many changes are taking place. Several hon. Members have rightly drawn our attention to the importance of the continent of South America. There are very significant changes, some freshness of idea and some new approaches that are discernible in Latin America. We attach importance to Latin America and that is why our Prime Minister undertook a tour of several countries in Latin America. We are taking every measure to consolidate our friendship with them and also to develop economic and other relations with them so that the under-developed world as a whole, whether these are the countries of Latin America or Africa or Asia, should march together and continue their struggle for freedom, not only from colonial rule but also freedom from economic exploitation.

tion. In this we will carry on our struggle in a united manner.

Sir, I know that I have perhaps already taken a little more time. I am grateful to you and to the hon. Members who have given me this much time to clarify some of the issues. Maybe, prof. H. N. Mukerjee wants me to say something about G. D. R. and P. R. G. These are issues on which I have already made my statement and I have no fresh statement to make.

श्री शंकर देव : मैंने बल्ब के रेकॉर्डिंग की स्थापना के बारे में जो प्रोपोजल रखा था, उस के बारे में मिनिस्टर साहब ने कुछ नहीं कहा है।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The hon. Member put forward some very fine ideas which are highly idealistic and he will have to work a little more before these ideas catch up.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East) : Sir, I suppose, you can give some direction in regard to Ministers' speeches and replies specially during the Budget session. We were saddled with soporific speech which the Minister just made when specified cut motions were there, when specified question were there, which had to be discussed.

This is not an occasion for a general description of the international scene and the philosophical basis of India's foreign policy or whatever that might be. That is very important. But this is the Budget session. The Demands for Grants are placed before the House; the cut motions are proposed and specific question are asked. No specific subject is taken up and answered. I am terribly disturbed by this pattern of ministerial reply. It is a very valuable speech philosophically worded and that sort of a thing. But I get terribly disturbed when I find it to be a soporific speech, an exercise which is not very sound and healthy in so far as the Budget session is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I am sorry I do not think I have anything to help you in that respect.

There are a number of cut motions moved. Shall I put all of them together?

Yes, I put all the cut motions moved by Shri Dasaratha Deb, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and Shri N. Sreekanthan Nair to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, I put the Demands relating to the Ministry of External Affairs to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper be granted to the president to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of the heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof against Demand Nos. 9 and 10 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted

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

DEMAND NO. 9—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,50,94,000 be granted to the president to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 10—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,89,41,000 be granted to the president to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

15.39 hrs.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 52 to 54 and 120 relating to