

"That this House do agree with the Thirty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 7th April, 1969."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet at 2-15 P. M.

13.15 hrs.

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

The Lok Sabha reassembled after lunch at eighteen minutes past fourteen of the Clock.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR *in the Chair*]

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

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, I want to raise a Point of Order under Rule 376. It is a very serious matter. I would like to draw your attention to Rule 340. The business before the House is that we are discussing the grants of the External Affairs Ministry. Under Rule 340 the debate on this may be adjourned. I will explain why. I have just got information from Calcutta—a telephonic message—that there has been a brutal firing on Defence employees working in the Gun and Shell Factory at Cossipore, West Bengal. This happened when they were going in this morning, and five employees have been killed. There are about 10,000 employees there I would suggest to you that either this House shall be adjourned and we should discuss this or the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs should ask the Defence Minister and the Home Minister to come here and make a statement, because five employees have been killed there is going to be an all-India strike. Moreover, I am the President of All India Defence Employees Federation, and the Defence people have sent me a message. I want a state-

ment to be made by the Minister of Defence.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : We have tabled an Adjournment Motion today.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA (Anand) : It is a State subject.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : The C.R.P. is not a State subject.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : How can you say that it is State matter ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Banerjee, will you please address the Chair ? There should not be any cross talks.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I will do that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : The hon. Member said that it is a State subject. To rule the Colonies the Central Government is sending all the *goondas* there,

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Basu, kindly resume your seat. The matter is most important. The Speaker has ruled more than once that at this time such issues cannot be raised in this manner. However important the issue may be, it has to be raised by giving proper notice. I hope such a notice will be considered by the Deputy Speaker expeditiously because the matter is very urgent and important. As the matter is raised in the House, naturally the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs may convey the importance of the matter to the Ministers concerned.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : We have also tabled an Adjournment Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, Order. That is enough for the time being.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I want to give a personal explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No personal explanation is needed for this now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : Mr. Chairman, Sir, before you proceed with the business of the House, I want to raise a question involving a breach of privilege of the House and of an hon. Member. A series of serious allegations of tax evasion, corruption, bribery.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Basu, I hope you will raise the matter in the proper form.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : I have seen the hon. Deputy Speaker and I told him that I would raise the matter before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have no instructions from the Deputy Speaker about the same.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : I want you to give me only two minutes. Then, you can give your ruling and we will abide by that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I cannot give any ruling on the matter. As far as the matter is concerned, it is not on the Agenda and I have no instructions from the Deputy Speaker about this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU :.....and mal-practices have been published in a front page leader article of a much circulated independent Calcutta Weekly Darpan in its issue dated 28-3-69 against an hon. Member of this House and a former Central Law Minister, Shri Ashok Sen under the caption "Shri Ashok Sen is in danger with his black money, Incometax Department wanting enquiry through CBI." It has been alleged, mainly that during 1960-63 when he was a Central Minister he was earning piles of black money and using them in different business through dummy persons; floating bogus organisations and companies; that he took money from Shri Shanti Prasad Jain so that he could give legal opinion in favour of his Company, Bennett Coleman and Co. whose case was pending before the Law Ministry and also P. L. Talukdar of Hindustan Pilkington and Co.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Basu, will you please resume your seat ?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : All his company shareholders and the lenders were bogus; creation of a bogus organisation by name National Publicity Forum and for newsprint, highly inflated circulation shown of his daily paper, Basumati, as one lakh against actually of 65,000 by showing bogus newsprint.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please resume your seat. Nothing will be recorded. This cannot go on like this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : **

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : (Caddalore) : Sir, is it proper on his part.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Sharma, all of you please resume your seats. I will manage Mr. Basu.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : Sir,.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Basu, you give proper notice and raise it at the proper time. It may be an important matter, but I am not concerned about it, as it is not on the Agenda. Let us proceed with the Business of the House which is on the Agenda. Dr. Ranen Sen.

****SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU rose —**

MR. CHAIRMAN : If he persists in this nothing more will go on record. Dr. Ranen Sen.

SHRI N. K. Sanghi (Jodhpur) : On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN ; Everything is over now.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI : It is another matter I am raising. When he has raised one matter, I should also be allowed to raise another matter with which I am concerned. It is a matter of disrespect to the Chair. I want to draw your attention to the fact that yesterday there were certain call attention notices given with regard to the doctors' strike. Earlier it was rejected. Later, certain call-attention notices were accepted and the Chair was good enough to say that

[Shri N.K. Sanghi]

all those call attention notices would be clubbed together and the members concerned given an opportunity to put questions. I want to bring to your notice that this was not done. I think this is gross disrespect to the Chair and also to the members who had tabled call-attention notices.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I do not know where the member has this information.....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : He is the heaviest member.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I...because I am told that all the notices were balloted; even those which were disallowed were revived and they were all balloted together. This is the information given by the Secretariat and I have to go by it, unless it is proved otherwise. The member has got other remedies for the same. I hope he will not raise the matter here again.

The hon. Minister will reply to the debate at 4.15 P.M. Dr. Ranen Sen.

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : I had just started yesterday when the House took up some other business.

I see for the last seven years that whenever foreign policy is discussed, there has been attack on Government on the question of the policy of non-alignment which is being followed by Government, which has been acclaimed in this House in the past. The main point raised was that it was the fault of the non-alignment policy that is at the root of all this trouble that is taking place, that is at the root of the fall in India's image in the comity of nations. I want to say that the malady lies somewhere else. The malady is that whatever anti-Imperialist content there was in the non-alignment policy in the past—and it was not a big content—that is now gradually being wiped out, diluted and eliminated from our foreign policy. Today the non-alignment policy is more or less emasculated; it has become passive, suffering from inanity. That is why today we find the image of India going down in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other continents.

I can make a comparison. In 1955-56, in the Ministry's report we used to find

such expressions as—'the Government of India have made clear their sympathy with the nationalist movements in Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco' and so on and so forth; 'India is interested in enlarging the area of peace and opposes all forms of racial domination etc.' But today we will not find any mention of what is happening in this world, how the imperialists are behaving. In this report, you do not even find any mention of the freedom fighters of Angola and Mozambique who are fighting against the imperialism of Portugal, a Nato power; there is no mention of how the Wilson Government's army is raping Anguilla, how American imperialism is carrying on its depredations in Vietnam, how it is intriguing and informing in the internal affairs of Laos and Cambodia. None of these things finds a place in the report submitted by the Ministry for 1968-69. Yesterday, the Deputy Minister tried to say that the report about the American attempt to establish bases in the Indian Ocean was not true, because they have got information from the USA and U. K. But I want to say that not only in our papers, but in the American papers also, it was reported that there is a search for bases in the Indian Ocean by the USA and U. K. This is due to the fact that gradually the Government is going away from the path of non-alignment that the Government profess till now. The Government of India is blind to the CIA activities in India. One Mr. John Smith, a former CIA agent, has exposed in his book an ex-Brigadier, E. T. Sen to be a CIA agent. In E. T. Sen versus D. P. Sinha case, the Delhi Court issued summons to be served on clerk of the U. S. Embassy for the verification of a specimen handwriting which is alleged to be the handwriting of John Smith in order to give justice to the Indian citizens. Even though he is a clerk and not a diplomatic person, it is a damn shame that he is being given protection of diplomatic immunity, under the pressure of the American Embassy. Will the minister explain why diplomatic immunity was extended to him? The income of this gentleman, E. T. Sen, is not more than Rs. 1500 per month. But in this case, he is employing such an outstanding lawyer like Mr. Chagla, M. P. paying him Rs. 3000 per day. He has also employed one Mr. Sarin who is the counsel for the American Embassy here and who appears on behalf of them. One is surely

entitled to conclude, therefore, that there is a connection between the American Embassy and this gentleman. It is known that a fabulous amount of money derived from PL 480 is spent by the U S Embassy. At present, they have got Rs. 98 crores, probably more than the revenue receipt of the Assam Government to spend in India. There are spending it for various purposes.

There is infiltration in the services and also in educational institutions in the name of Foundations, etc. But Government is blind to all this. In the name of Innocent Indo-US cooperation, there is a publication called *Participant Journal*. The printer and publisher of this journal is one of Dr. John P. Lewis, Minister-Director, U. S. Agency for International Development Mission to India, New Delhi. The editor is Dr. V. M. Kapura. On the front page and back page of this journal, there is the coat of arms of the U. S. A. Inside there is the emblem of India. Has India become the 53rd State of USA? One can understand cooperation and goodwill. Two flags could be printed side by side. But are we becoming a subservient colonial country? This is how things are proceeding in India and our Government is covering them up under the pressure of American imperialism. Shri Mohan Ranade openly made this statement in the Indian press that the Government of India have not tried for release of Shri Ranade and Dr. Mascaranhas who is still in jail. He has openly stated that 4000 Portuguese prisoners of war have been released by Government of India unilaterally. Under whose pressure did the Government of India do this thing?

Another instance of pressure from the imperialist side is the instance of our refusal to give recognition to the German Democratic Republic. It is known to the Minister, to the Government of India and to the people of India that this is a State born out of the ruins of fascism, it is a peace-loving State, a fast-developing State, economically getting more and more powerful every day and very friendly to India. Such a State remains ostracised by the Government of India. Even a small country like the United Arab Republic has political relations with the GDR and has accorded diplomatic recognition to it. Even small countries like Burma and Ceylon have relations with GDR. But our Government is afraid of given diplo-

matic recognition to GDR because the German Federal Republic and its Hallstein Doctrine pressurise on the Government of India not to give recognition.

In the Rajya Sabha there was a debate on a resolution to give recognition to GDR. All the parties in Rajya Sabha except, of course, the Swantra Party almost unanimously supported the resolution but the Government of India did not give any answer to that debate.

Then comes the question of our relations with the British Commonwealth. The Wilson Government refuses to apply military sanction against the Ian Smith Government but readily invades the small territory of Anguilla while, according to a newspaper report, only one rifle or gun could be found in that island. It is high time that we wake up and quit the Commonwealth. After all, what is the benefit? The Immigration Act prevents Indian citizens from going and settling there. People of Indian origin having British passports are not allowed to settle there. The latest example is of the Transport Authority in Wolverhampton which has ordered that all Sikh people from India should shave of their breads. Such indignities are being hurled on Indians and still we refuse to leave the Commonwealth. It was said that we have some economic advantage accruing out of our membership of the British Commonwealth. The latest report of the British Trades Council recommending to the British Government to impose 50 per cent tariff duty on Indian cotton goods affects our people so much that even the Federatian of Indian Chambers of Commerce and industry have started chrieking that this is an attack on the Commonwealth preference that India used to enjoy. So, it is either in the interests of the people of India, nor in the interests of the Government of India that we should remain within the Commonwealth. Rather, it is a matter of prestige for India that we quit the British Commonwealth because there is no justification for remaining inside the British Commonwealth.

Then, much has been said by hon. Members about the tour of our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to

[Dr. Ranen Sen]

Latin America, Australia and South East Asia. They have said it was a successful tour. I want to ask the Prime Minister whether she knows that all those States in Latin America that she visited are satellites of American imperialism. She did not visit Cuba, which is building socialism and is fighting against imperialism. And it is an irony of fate that during her tour she wanted to go to Peru but because of a *coup d'etat* she could not go there. Similarly, she wanted to go to Panama. But, on the eve of her departure to that country there was a *coup d'etat* there and so she could not go there. All those countries she visited are either dictatorial or under the tutelage of American imperialism.

Then she visited some South East Asian countries. It is necessary that we should have good-neighbourliness and economic co-operation with those countries. Yet, India should be a little vigilant about the role of some of those countries also. It is a well-known fact that Australia, as a member of the ANZUS powers, is connected with American army imperialism. Today when even Britain wants to quit Singapore, the Australian army is not prepared to quit that area of South East Asia. It is fighting shoulder to shoulder, side by side with the American army against the Vietnamese people in Vietnam. Therefore, any overtures from such governments as of Philippines, Australia, Malaysia or Thailand should be taken with a grain of salt, as they are directly or indirectly under the tutelage of American imperialism.

An attempt is being made today to build up a defence pact. The Prime Minister has rightly rejected that idea. But another idea is going round in that area for a regional co-operation pact. What that cooperation pact is God alone knows. I fear that this is an attempt to rope in countries like India. So, India should be cautious against any such temptations, particularly when they come from countries which are connected with American imperialism.

The policy of non-alignment pursued by this Government brought India some prestige in the world. As this policy is

getting more and more emasculated and as the government is following a more passive policy we find that India's image is going down. The remedy for it is not to discard this policy of non-alignment but to follow this policy more vigorously, the main content of which is anti-imperialism, the main content of which is to stand by the people who are fighting for democracy, freedom and social justice. If India pursues that path, naturally the image of India will shine better in the world.

Lastly, there is a small point about Sikkim. In the Report there is some mention about our relations with Sikkim. It is better to have good relations with the Government of Sikkim, friendly relations with the Chogyal, but is it known to the Government of India that there is no vestige of democracy in that State. India is a country that at least professes democracy. Though internally we do not observe much of the democratic methods (*An hon. Member* : Question.), still we profess it. But the Government of Sikkim do not allow any democratic movement to grow in that country. I have before me a small paper, the *Himalayan Observer*, published in Kalimpong. In that paper there are stories of gruesome suppression of the democratic movement in Sikkim. This is also happening in Bhutan. Therefore, without interfering in their internal affairs, can our Government not give a piece of advice to the Chogyal and such fellows not to pursue that method and to have a little bit of the democratic liberties for the people?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) :
Gyalmo.

DR. RANEN SEN : He says,
Gyalmo.

If India wants to play a role, India should pursue a vigorous policy against imperialism, for world peace, brotherhood and fraternity with the people fighting for freedom and social justice. Then alone will the image of India shine brilliantly and will India occupy a leading position in the world today.

MR CHAIRMAN : Shri Supakar. I have got a big list of Congress speakers

with me ; so, you will kindly finish in 10 minutes.

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur) : I shall try.

Mr. Chairman, enlightened self-interest should be the basis of our foreign policy but it has often been suggested that our foreign policy should be guided by some allergies—allergies to USA is suggested by some ; some people say that we should be allergic to the USSR ; others says that we should be allergic to the United Arab Republic and others, to Israel and so on and so forth.

We also find that it is suggested that for the purpose of raising our image in foreign countries, we should be the very first country to condemn some country or the other whenever there is some conflict in some part of the world. These suggestions were made when the Arab-Israel conflict took place last year and when the Czechoslovakia crisis came and we thought that the role of the Minister of External Affairs in India should be that of a Don Quixote charging at windmills.

Now another windmill has appeared in the Indian Ocean and our Minister of External Affairs is asked to charge at that windmill in the Indian Ocean. I would myself suggest such a charging, had I know the cost of the armour, the horse and other paraphernalia necessary for a Don Quixote. But I do not know whether it will be proper on the part of our country to divert our attention from the north and look south, because we find that we have two very powerful and very deadly enemies on our northern border.

In this connection I must draw the attention of our hon. Minister to two very important events which took place last month, in the month of March. The first incident is the conflict between the Chinese and the Russians which took place on the 2nd March, 1969, in what is called the Damansky Island of the Ussuri River.

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts) ; Have you accepted that it is Damansky Island ?

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR : Damansky of Chenpao, it does not matter. It makes no difference.

SHRI SWELL : I thought you had accepted that.

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR : We have found that the Chinese People's Republic have been taking a very bellicose attitude towards several countries who are their neighbours. Not only that. In 1967, we found their behaviour and ill-treatment to our diplomats, Mr. Raghunath and Mr. Vijai and their subsequent dealings with some of the officials of the British Embassy against all diplomatic principles.

Now, only when in the first week of March news filtered through newspapers and radio that huge demonstrations were taking place by the people of Russia before the Chinese troops on the night of the 2nd March, 1969 against the people who were in the island of Damansky, resulting in the death of 31 officers and the men, the Russians, and this was followed by the cartographical conquest or rather a claim by the Chinese of a large portion of the area which was for about a century under the occupation of the Russians to the east of Chinese territory on the Pacific coast. There is a strange similarity between this and the unprovoked attack by the Chinese on the Indian territory in October, 1962 followed later on by their withdrawal. When they put forward a cartographical claim over a vast territory of this land, in 1962, when the Chinese attacked India, they advanced the argument that they are not bound by the treaty entered into by Dalai Lama with the imperialist British Government. Similar argument for the support of the present attack is advanced today by saying that they are not bound by the treaty of Czars with imperialist China decades ago. In the present conflict, we must disapprove of the unprovoked attack by the Chinese on the Russians. I am glad to learn that the U. S. S. R. has taken some initiative.....

SHRI SWELL : Is it Russian foreign policy or Indian foreign policy debate ?

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR : Indian foreign policy. Both Russia and China are our neighbours and, therefore, we must make proper precautions in that matter.

[Shri Sardhakar Supakar]

I am glad to learn that U. S. S. R. has taken some steps to ease the tension between the two countries. But I do not know how far that will be successful. I also believe China will not precipitate the conflict in spite of the exchange of hot words between the leaders of these two neighbouring countries. In spite of the fact that China is in wrongful occupation of a large part of the Indian territory and in spite of the fact that China has always been helping Pakistan in taking a hostile attitude towards India, we do not want the people of China and U. S. S. R. to suffer as a consequence of the holocaust of nuclear war which is bound to follow if the conflict escalates.

We have noticed with dismay the increase in tension in several parts of the world, particularly between Israel and U. A. R. and the challenge to the UNO and world peace on account of the members of the world body like Israel not fulfilling the Resolutions of the United Nations. Indeed, if the Resolutions of the U. N. are thus flouted by powers either with or without connivance of their more powerful friends, I am afraid that the authority of the United Nations will be watered down and if that happens, then the world will be in great danger.

The dramatic events in Pakistan must also be a matter of deep concern for all of us. The history of 1958 is now being repeated. The people who had high hopes of restoration of democratic Government in that country are now frustrated by the imposition of martial law in that country and the taking over of all powers of the State by Gen. Yahya Khan. Though Gen. Yahya Khan has declared that he is the head of a caretaker rule preparatory to the restoration of democratic rule, it is difficult to believe how far his statement is sincere. I hope, he will be true to his words and both the wings of Pakistan will soon be governed by people elected on adult franchise at an early date.

One word about the Indian Ocean. Grave concern has been expressed by the members of this House over the deployment of warships and nuclear submarines of several nations, including the USSR, USA and France, to the Indian Ocean. Of course, legally, we have nothing to say when something happens in the high-seas, far far away from our territorial

waters. But I feel that it is high time that the United Nations and the international lawyers of the world framed suitable international law and enforced it with universal consent, if possible, so that the peace-loving nations may not be subjected to attack from a long distance from the sea. The law of territorial waters was adequate when the firing range of cannons was small. But with the introduction of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles, the restriction on jurisdiction of land to a few miles beyond the shores has lost all meaning. This must be looked into.

I am glad that, so far as Nagaland is concerned, peace has been restored to a large extent and there is not the same amount of trouble that used to be there a few months ago. I hope that the conditions will improve.

With these words, I support the Demands.

SHRI VISNANATHA MENON

(Ernakulam) : I have gone through the Report submitted by the Ministry of External Affairs and I agree fully with Mr. Dwivedy's opinion that it is a catalogue of some tours conducted by Ministers and the Congress President. There is nothing enlightening about the policy that we have been following for the last 22 years. Actually if we study the reports, we come to the conclusion that there is a change of policy from what we had been pursuing for the last so many years. The Indian independence movement has got a long tradition of anti-imperialism. We were under imperialism for more than 100 years; we were fighting imperialism and we have a long tradition of anti-imperialism. Unfortunately, if we look at the present policy followed by the Indian Government, we will see that it is losing its anti-imperialist fervour and inch by inch we are going into the grip of American imperialists. On the question of Vietnam the policy followed by the Indian Government and the steps taken by the Indian Government really, according to me, are deplorable. If we claim that we are a socialist country, if we claim that at least we are a democratic country if we claim that we are anti-imperialist country

we should help the national liberation front of Vietnam. If we cannot give them arms, at least we should allow others to take arms to that country. We do not do that and the role we have played was actually supporting the American imperialism to have their own say and kill the people there. Fortunately the heroic people of Vietnam are teaching a lesson to the imperialism. That does not mean that Indian Government's policy is vindicated.

15 hrs

If we go to other countries also, about the African liberation movement or the Latin American liberation movement, what is our attitude? We are only supporting the actions taken by the American imperialism. My friend, Dr. Ranen Sen, was referring to the report of the tour of our Prime Minister to the Latin American countries. She has gone to some countries, all stooges of American imperialism. The people of Latin America were fighting at every stage. Those people were forgotten and our Prime Minister was going there and supporting the American imperialism and giving a glamour to the American imperialism. She has not gone to Cuba, a land where Fidel Castro, a young revolutionary fighting alone against the American imperialism. She did not say a single word. Further, we have not got any trade relations with Cuba. It is really deplorable and what is our attitude about other countries? Our attitude is one of supporting the American imperialism. Inch by inch we are dancing to the tunes of America. Take the case of the German Democratic Republic which has got more connections with us. More than Rs. 35 crores worth of trade is going on between our country and GDR. Even then we are not prepared to have diplomatic relationship with the GDR. Why? According to me, only to please the American imperialism. That is the attitude that the Indian Government is taking. We are expecting something dynamic from you. We are expecting something dynamic from the Indian Government against imperialism and something in favour of the people who are fighting all over the world against imperialism. About Anguilla my friend has said. I do not want to go more than that. My humble submission is: on these anti-imperialist points we should have

taken up a strong, fervent and very strong stand. We have bungled and now what is our position about our neighbours?

Take the case of Ceylon and take the case of Nepal. What is our attitude towards these small nations which are our neighbours? We are behaving like a big brother. We should change our attitude towards Ceylon and Nepal. If we persist in this attitude, what will happen? Naturally these Nations also will become places where American imperialism will dominate. We should settle the dispute with the Ceylonese people. The so called chauvanistic cry of war against Ceylon is nonsense. My humble submission is that we must get our finishing right. We must have the passage of shipping. At the same time Ceylon must have the right to obstruct the people who are illegal immigrants, going to Ceylon without any valid permit. That right must be accepted to by us. It is very easy to have agreement with them. Tall talk of war and such kinds of things will only pave the way for the American imperialism to step into the Indian ocean and that will give rise to so many problems in the southern parts of our country.

On the question of China also we should have a re-thinking. I am very happy that on Pakistan our Prime Minister has said that doors are open for negotiations. I welcome that idea. If press reports are correct, in Burma, when our Prime Minister visited that country, the Chinese representative also was present for the reception. I do not know whether it is correct. If it is correct, it is a welcome thing. We should try to negotiate whether it is Chou-En-lai, or Lin Piao. We should negotiate and settle our border disputes. Without that we are not going to make much progress in our country. But what is happening in our country is this. There is a Taiwan lobby here. There is a lobby here and somebody is fighting for Dalai Lama. All these things are there. All these are really the internal matters of these countries; we should not interfere with them. We should settle our border disputes. But what is happening is contrary.

In the name of Gandhi centenary a delegation from Taiwan came over here and those people are propagating all over the

[Shri Vishwanath Monger]

land. They are doing propaganda work. Is it allowed, Sir? Is this diplomacy? Even a man without any knowledge of diplomacy would not have behaved like that. So, the problem of settlement of border disputes is a very important and urgent one.

Another thing is this. We should have much more trade connections with Burma. We should get rice from Burma. We may export our textiles to Burma. We can have far more trade connection with Burma. Like that we should get rid our border disputes with every country including Pakistan.

In Pakistan, the democratic movement is developing. We should utilise this opportunity. We should have close contacts with them, and better understanding with Pakistan. War-cry and chauvinistic attitude will not solve the problem.

About Pakistan, it is very easy to say, war is a solution. Actually war will never be a solution. The solution is only through negotiations. You can negotiate with Pakistan and try to settle the border disputes. The democratic movement in Pakistan is catching up. I agree that is not an easy thing, but we should pursue this approach. Talking in terms of use of arms against Pakistan and talking in terms of such non-sense is not at all diplomacy, of the 20th century. It may be diplomacy of the 19th or 18th century but not of the 20th century. Now, we should try to settle our border disputes.

I would request the hon. Minister to take up courage and fight against imperialist forces of the world and go to the rescue of the African people, the Latin-American people and the people of South-East Asia and against the fight in Viet-Nam. They must have the courage to fight out imperialist forces in all these regions.

Then I come to the Commonwealth. What is the Commonwealth, Sir? I do not want to go into the details, because I do not have the time. Even our Sikh friends know this. For their turbans, for their beards, in the Commonwealth, they showed racial discrimination. It is *apartheid* in a new form and still we are in the Commonwealth. I do not want to say of those things, or about Rhodesia or South African

issue. All things are there and added to them now is the question of Sikh community. This Indian community has been treated shabbily and insulted. I expect that the new Foreign Minister will come out courageously and take some bold stand on these issues. But there is one little difficulty which I appreciate because he is in the Government and the Government of India is being run by seventy-five monopoly business houses. Naturally the interests of these seventy-five monopoly houses will dominate. Whether the Indian Government will come out successful in their fight against imperialism or not is a doubtful point. Even than I, on behalf of my Party, expect him to have a dynamic foreign policy and to fight against imperialism and to be the champion in the fight against imperialism. Let him have the courage to come out and raise our national dignity and honour and let us be the champions in the fight against imperialism which we were before we became independent. Let us have that glamour again. With these words, I conclude.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :
(Barh) : Mr. Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN : The time is very short and therefore you must compress your speech within ten minutes.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA
Sir, I rise to speak on this debate and naturally I have to comment on the remarks made by worthy predecessor who preceded me. When I was listening to speech, I thought that the time has stood still for him for the last thirty years. He was still speaking in the terms of those days when world was divided into polarised entities and there was by polarisation of the forces of the world. Since then, time has moved so much of which unfortunately the Hon. Member who preceded me has not been aware. I could understand sleep; I could understand long sleep. But I could never understand somebody being Rip Van Winkle in foreign affairs. He says that the Government of India is dancing to the tune of Americans. Which is that tune to which we are dancing. We have never heard it.

AN HON. MEMBER ; Rock-n'-Roll.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA :
They know it more. They know the tec-

hunique of Rock-n'-Roll and therefore they know probably those tunes. I hope the other countries to which they extend always praises have also changed their voice and therefore his master's voice must also change.

Government of India may have committed mistakes in the past. We are not omnipotent. Only the Hon. Member has the privilege of being omnipotent in everything. I never can claim and nobody can claim that we have never committed mistakes. After all, foreign policy is a continuous assessment of the situation. It is not only assessment of the situation, but certain anticipation of the situation. Therefore, certain assessments can be wrong. But Government of India has kept its eyes open. Government of India has also changed according to the changing situations in the world. Other powers have also changed. Only then, Indian spokesmen have not changed. Unfortunately, they are acting like bad lawyers, arguing the briefs which neither gives advantage to the person, nor the powers on whose behalf they, talk. The hon. Member was talking about Cuba. The way he was pleading eloquent about Cuba, if even half of that warmth could be given to other countries, that would have proved his objectivity ; but in their dictionary this word does not count.

The Indian foreign policy cannot afford to be hysterical. It can be a policy which is firm and which is positive, but it can never be hysterical. Then also we cannot ignore certain developments which have taken place in the world, in the international scene. No country in the world can afford to ignore those things.

Sir, they have been talking about the question of recognition. They have been talking about non-alignment. But the persons who talk about non-alignment most vociferously are the same persons who plead for alignment with a particular angle. It is they who want us to be aligned with all countries near to the Soviet Union or China but we should have nothing to do with America, and we should have nothing to do with other countries of the world. We should positively sing to the tunes of Russia or to the tunes of China, if the hon. Mem-

bers' pleasure would have us to do it, but we should not assess objectively the world conditions and see how our foreign policy should be moulded'. I cannot understand this approach of maintaining permanent enmity towards certain countries of the world. They may not like the system of America ; they may not like the system of some of the countries of Europe. But they must realise that even those powers which were completely polarised in the past have come together. The big powers, the Soviet Union and America are together in so many respects. Actually, they are together in the non-proliferation treaty. We are not with them in that. (*Interruptions*).

You keep yourself to your own records ; don't try to be my record—gramophone record. I am capable of speaking my own mind ; I don't speak other people minds.

They don't realise that in the present world today, even in the Western Bloc, the the country of NATO have been trying to evolve an independent approach to the problems. Naturally, the significance of regional pacts have gone down for the countries belonging to the Western Bloc. But the clock has not moved for the hon. Members, though it has moved for the other countries of the world including the Soviet Union and China. They would not realise that even the Warsaw Pact countries are reacting in different ways. Countries Rumania, Yugoslavia and even Hungary and Czechoslovakia have been developing their personalities. We may not agree with everything that happens there. But can we afford to ignore the change, that has taken place in their approach to international issues ?

I am reminded of a story which I read in my childhood, Alice in Wonderland: There, Alice had to run a race in order to be where she was. I could not understand the meaning of that sentence then. But I think the hon. Members who preceded me, the two Members—of course in between one Congress Member came up and I am not discussing about him now—belonging to different political parties must realise that even in order to be where they were 30 years before, they have to move forward and they have to change their approach. Their

[Shri Tarkeshwari Sinha]

approach has to be changed because of the requirement of time. The regional pacts have not worked satisfactorily and, therefore, the complexion of the regional pacts has changed. But, meanwhile, there is no vacuum in the power politics. They talk in the tune which is very much out dated, the tune which was played 30 years back. May I remind them of a statement of a country which they always condemn? I will mention the name of the gentlemen who made this statement. He is Mr. Josef Strauss, who is likely to replace Mr. Kiesinger. May I read out what he said? It is said about him—

“On the basis of pragmatic thinking Herr Strauss is of the opinion that China is interested in the presence of a strong power on the western border of the Soviet sphere of influence, in Central Europe, while West Germany is interested in the USSR being more tightly contained on the eastern border in Asia”.

He adds :

“For these reasons, the interest of West Germany and China temporarily and partially coincide”.

This is the attitude which has developed in the world, but, unfortunately, many of the hon. members to my right are not aware of it...

SHRI SWELL : Not me.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Not he, but many others.

Even President Nixon has been wooing China. He has been sending feelers to China, because America is interested in having an edge over Russia in diplomatic manipulation. Not only that; America and other western powers are not interested, as has been clearly mentioned by Herr Strauss, in keeping the area of conflict in Europe; they want to shift it to Asia. The Vietnam problem is probably likely to be settled, or it may be a longer statement. But a new area of confrontation has been created in Asia and that is between China and Russia. This suits the western bloc very well. Therefore, Mr. Nixon also has been sending feelers to China. Actually, very high level talks have been going on.

Therefore, taking advantage of the situation between Peking and Moscow, the entire approach of the western bloc is to relieve the pressure on Western Europe. Hence it is understandable that President Nixon and the West German Ministers should be interested in this confrontation.

Now, we do not realise this. Therefore, we have not recognised the situation. I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister saying that in this confrontation, India must take a positive stand. Positive stand does not mean that you condemn anyone; it means that you take note of the situation, that here is a confrontation on Soviet territory. Even the Chinese have recognised the Soviet presence there. I am not talking to the brief of the Soviet Union, but this is my opinion about it. It shows that we are objective; they are not. There is the Soviet presence on that soil. China has committed aggression. The Indian stand in the past on such border disputes has been that they should not be settled by force. Second, our stand has been that these disputes must be settled through negotiation.

On the one hand, we find the Soviet Union prepared for negotiation. On the other, there is no response from China. This is the situation. Can we remain unaware of it? It does not mean that always you condemn one country vis-a-vis the other. But we should take note of the situation. That is very necessary for a positive approach in our foreign policy.

Do we not realise that 700 million Chinese—these are the words of the Chinese leaders—will shed their last drop of blood in defence of the Fatherland as long as required? That shows their determination to stay in that area. Does it not affect our defence strategy? Does it not influence our approach to foreign policy vis-a-vis Asia, vis-a-vis that region? We cannot remain unconcerned about it. We have to take note of it. Then we have to assess how the situation is going to develop. Do we not realise that Russia has a defence pact with Mongolia, as we have with some of our neighbours? Russia has a border with China extending over 7,000 miles. Naturally, this confrontation is not such a light affair that after this, nothing will

happen. Even if nothing happens, we have to keep our eyes open and realise that the entire burden of the European conflict is being shifted to Asia. As an Asian nation, we should know what our duty is.

Coming to the Soviet arms deal to Pakistan, I do not know the intentions of the Soviet Union, whether to protect themselves, they have strengthened the other neighbouring countries as they are improving their relations with Turkey and other countries, or they have assisted Pakistan militarily to make Pakistan stronger. But a very unfortunate statement was made by the Soviet Defence Minister, Mr. Grechko, during his recent visit to Pakistan. The press report says :

"Marshall Grechko was quoted by the Pakistan Press and Radio as saying that the Soviet Union was interested in Pakistan strengthening its defences against its enemy and in the maintenance of military balance in the region."

According to the declared statement of Pakistani leaders, India is their enemy. Any military balance they have to hold is against India. I am surprised how the Soviet Defence Minister has tripped into the situation by making this unfortunate statement. I wish the Government of India would bring this to the attention of the Soviet Union that such statements are going to damage Indo-Soviet relations. There have been reports of many items of aircraft given to Pakistan and also 200 tanks. Everything may not have been given, but certainly it has increased the striking power of Pakistan and has created a lot of misunderstanding in this area. It is not going to help the Soviet Union even in their strategy regarding Asia.

MR. CHAIRMAN : She must conclude now.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : A word about West Asia.

MR. CHAIRMAN : She is depriving her own party members of their time.

I have a list of 16 Congress members and I want to accommodate one or two of them.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : You have allowed 15 minutes to the opposition members and I have a right to take 15 minutes.

If I am to get only 5 minutes, I would not have spoken at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Chair is helpless in the matter. You have to take it up with your party whips.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Regarding West Asia, I must commend the Indian Government that they are not over-planing the situation ; they have learnt their lessons after making many mistakes, though they have lost their capacity of manoeuvrability in West Asia. Though the US Plan has not been accepted by President Nasser, there is a new hope because President Nasser has decided to keep his eyes open about the US Plan on West Asia presented to the Soviet Union, France, Britain, UAR, Jordan and Israel. I am really unhappy about the very unreasonable attitude of Israel. Though India has lost her capacity for manoeuvrability with Israel, she has certainly a lot of goodwill with Arab countries. I think India can convince them that this plan is going to provide a basis for the ultimate solution of this problem. I feel India can take this initiative in this matter with the Arab countries. I am glad that President Nasser has given an encouraging response to this proposal. Sir one last word and I have done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : No more 'last word'. The hon. Member must conclude now.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Sir, I must say that if the time you are spending in interrupting me would have been saved I would have finished my remarks by now.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are very unfair in making this remark. What can I do in this matter ?

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : About the Indo-Iran economic cooperation so much hopes were built by the communique issued after the visit of the Shah of Iran, but the matters which were decided upon then have been kept pending in the External Affairs Ministry, they have been kept pending in the Commerce Ministry and in the Industries Ministry. I would like to hear from the Minister of Foreign Affairs what progress has been made *vis-a-vis* Indo-Iran joint economic collaboration. I find that they are finding other collaborators in the world and we are sleeping. The sleep will really be costly to us if we lose this opportunity. I would like to appeal to the hon. Minister to catch this opportunity and to make good the delay. It will do a lot of good to this country not only *vis-a-vis* Iran but to formulate a new economic policy *vis-a-vis* the Middle-East and South-East Asia. We have been missing many chances in the past, I hope there will be more awareness about our economic collaboration, economic cooperation and laying a foundation of economic policy *vis-a-vis* foreign policy for the betterment of this country.

With these words, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : सभापति महोदय, आज जब पर-राष्ट्र मंत्रालय की मांगों पर बहस हो रही है तब मैंने सोचा था कि खास करके श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा सरकार की जो निरपेक्षता की नीति है उस पर कुछ रोशनी डालेंगी। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में मैं बहुत निराश रहा।

मेरा भारत सरकार पर आरोप है कि पिछले बीस बाइस सालों से लगातार जो विदेश नीति और पर-राष्ट्र नीति उसने अपनाई उस में न तो राष्ट्र के हित की कोई नीति रही है और न सारी दुनिया के हित की कोई बात रही है। उस के पीछे कोई आदर्शवाद नहीं, कोई नई नीति नहीं और कोई विचार नहीं। इससे यह साबित होता है कि भारत सरकार की पर-राष्ट्र नीति पूर्ण रूप से असफल रही, और मेरी तो यह राय है कि भारत सरकार

ने इस का अर्थ भी नहीं समझा कि निरपेक्षता की नीति या बिना लगाव की नीति क्या है।

कल वैदेशिक-कार्य उप मंत्री श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह ने फरमाया था कि हम लोगों की वैदेशिक नीति सफल रही और दुनिया में इस नीति को बहुत प्रशंसा मिलती है। मुझे तो ताज्जुब होता है कि एक मंत्री अपनी विदेश नीति के बारे में इतना आत्म-सन्तोष लाभ करते हैं कि दुनिया भर में उन की नीति को प्रशंसा मिली। मैं आपकी खिदमत में यह चीज रखना चाहता हूँ कि श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह, जो उन का 26 मार्च का बयान इस सदन में हुआ उस में कहते हैं कि चीन ने हमारी 14,500 वर्ग मील जमीन हड़प ली है और पाकिस्तान ने 32,500 मील वर्ग मील जमीन हड़प ली है। यह उन का 30 मार्च का बयान है। इस बारे में हमारी राय तो दूसरी है क्योंकि हम मानते हैं कि अगर तिब्बत को मिला लिया जाये तो हम ने करीब-करीब डेढ़ लाख वर्ग मील भूमि पिछले बीस बाइस सालों में विदेशों को दे दिया है इस सरकार की नीति के कारण। एक तरफ हम भूमिदान करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ श्री सुरेन्द्रपाल सिंह फरमाते हैं कि हम लोगों की दुनिया भर में प्रशंसा मिल रही है।

मैंने इस रिपोर्ट को देखा है। इस सारी रिपोर्ट को आप पढ़ेंगे तो आपको इस में यही देखने को मिलेगा कि श्री दिनेश सिंह ने यहां यहां का दौरा किया है, दूसरे मंत्रियों ने यहां यहां का दौरा किया है। हमारे मंत्रियों के दौरों का ही इस में आपको विवरण मिलेगा। कोई नीति की बात इस में नहीं है, कोई नई सोच वाला बात इस में नहीं है, कोई नई दिशा नहीं है। दिशाहीनता और नीतिहीनता ही सरकार ने अपना रखी है।

चीन के बारे में हमारी नीति क्या है? चीन ने हमारी लाखों हज़ारों वर्ग मील भूमि

हड़प ली है। क्या हम लोग खामोश बैठे रहेंगे ? क्या कोई नीति हम नहीं अपनायेंगे ? प्रश्न यह पैदा होता है कि चीन ने हमारी जिस पवित्र भूमि पर अधिकार किया है, उसको हम कैसे वापिस लें। सरकार को सदन और देश से माफी मांगनी चाहिये कि उसने बार-बार यह कहा है और हमारे देश के भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने बार-बार यह कहा है कि भारत की जिस भूमि पर चीन ने अधिकार किया है वह पथरीली है, जंगली है। यह बात उन्होंने बिना सोचे विचारे ही कही है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार की अभी भी यही नीति है कि वह जमीन पथरीली है, जंगली है ? क्या सरकार अब भी यही समझती है कि हम लोगों का उस भूमि से कोई सरोकार नहीं है ?

आज दो कम्युनिस्ट राष्ट्रों के बीच में झगड़ा पैदा हो गया है उसूरी नदी को ले कर। चीन और रूस दोनों ही यह कहते हैं कि वह हमारी पवित्र भूमि है। आप देखें कि हम लोगों को ये राष्ट्र सिखाया करते थे कि तुम सीमा के बारे में झगडा मत करो, यह तो गौण सवाल है पहला सवाल पेट का सवाल है। लेकिन अब इन दोनों की कम्युनिस्ट राष्ट्रों ने झगड़े वाली भूमि के बारे में पवित्र भूमि शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया है। क्या सरकार उन से कुछ सीख ग्रहण करेगी ? क्या सरकार ऐसी नीति अपनायेगी जो सही नीति हो और जिससे दुनिया का भला हो और जिस में अपने राष्ट्र की भलाई भी निहित हो ? श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा रूस सरकार के बारे में कुछ बोली हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी स्वामिमानी सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि वह यह घोषणा करे कि हमारे राष्ट्र की जो सीमायें हैं उनकी हिफाजत करना हमारा प्रथम कर्तव्य है, वैसे करने के लिये हम कटिबद्ध हैं और हम तभी रूस सरकार का समर्थन करेंगे जब

रूस सरकार इस चीज को मान ले कि तिब्बत का सम्बन्ध ज्यादा तर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ है, तिब्बत चीन का हिस्सा नहीं है, तिब्बत पूर्ण आजाद हो। अगर रूस इस बारे में वचनबद्ध होता है, रूस हमारा साथ देता है और कहता है कि तिब्बत हमारा है, भारत के साथ उसके ऐतिहासिक, भौगोलिक और संस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध है, तब हम लोग इस पर विचार करेंगे कि रूस और चीन के बीच जो सीमा विवाद है, उस में हम रूस का समर्थन करते हैं। उस अवस्था में जो समर्थन वह हम से चाहता है वह समर्थन हम उसको दे सकते हैं। रूस इस शर्त को मान ले कि तिब्बत चीन का अंग नहीं है, तिब्बत का सम्बन्ध हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहा है सदियों से, और तिब्बत को भारत और चीन के बीच एक स्वाधीन राष्ट्र के रूप में कायम रहना चाहिये।

मेरे मन में उलझन है। मैं समझने के लिये मजबूर हूँ कि क्या भारत सरकार के मंत्रियों और हमारे विदेश मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री के दिमाग में कहीं अराष्ट्रीय तत्व तो भरा हुआ नहीं है ? वे कुछ सोचते ही प्रतीत नहीं होते हैं। उनका दिमाग काम ही करता प्रतीत नहीं होता है। सभापति महोदय, आप देखें कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक जनवरी को क्या बयान दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि हम चीन के साथ बातलाप करना चाहते हैं, उससे बातचीत करने के लिए हम तैयार हैं। बिना नीति को बताये हुए प्रधान मंत्री ने जो बात कह दी उसके लिए उन्हें सारे देश से माफी मांगनी चाहिये। वह कहती हुई चली गई कि चीन के साथ हम सम्बन्ध रखना चाहते हैं, उससे बातचीत करना चाहते हैं। इसका मतलब क्या होता है ? पंद्रह अगस्त 1947 को जिस दिन भारत आजाद हुआ उस दिन जो सीमा थी, ब्रिटेन के भारत छोड़ने के समय हमारी जो सीमायें थीं उन सीमाओं के आधार

[श्री रवि राय]

पर क्या हम बात नहीं करना चाहते हैं ? अगर चाहते हैं और अगर चीन इसके लिए राजी हो तब तो बात हो सकती है, वरना नहीं। भारत सरकार को कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को भी ठुकरा देना चाहिये। उन प्रस्तावों के चलते चौदह हजार बर्ग मील भूमि चीन को देनी पड़ती है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार कोलम्बो प्रस्तावों को अब भी मानती है ? मैं समझता हूँ कि कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव हिन्दुस्तान के स्वार्थों के खिलाफ, हिन्दुस्तान के हितों के खिलाफ पड़ते हैं।

श्री दिनेश सिंह जी नए विदेश मंत्री बने हैं। वह नौजवान हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह भारत की विदेश नीति को एक नई दिशा प्रदान करें। उसूरी नदी के ऊपर जो चीन और रूस में झगड़ा चल रहा है, उसको लेकर तिब्बत का सवाल उनको रूस के सामने रखना चाहिये। रूस के अन्दर इस तरह की चीज चल भी रही है। हमारे एक पत्रकार हैं श्री निहाल सिंह जी। वह लिखते हैं मास्को से कि वहाँ इस तरह की चीज चल रही है। रूस के रेडियो से, रूस और चीन के झगड़े के बाद, 1962 में जो भारत पर आक्रमण हुआ था, उसका जिक्र हो रहा है। लोग सोचने लग गए हैं कि हम को इससे फायदा उठाना चाहिये। हमको इस मौके का लाभ उठाना चाहिए और हमको इस पर विचार करना चाहिये।

रूस और अमरीका के बारे में हमारी सरकार की नीति क्या है ? हमारी सरकार कभी तो रूस की दास बन जाती है और कभी अमरीका की नौकर और कभी अमरीका की दास और रूस की नौकर। इस तरह से ये जो राक्षस देश हैं, दुनिया के दो बड़े देश हैं, इनकी सेवा करने में सरकार लगी रहती है और इसी में इसका सारा समय व्यतीत होता है। आप जानते ही हैं कि रूस और अमरीका दोनों ही फिलहाल पाकिस्तान में जो सामरिक शासन

स्थापित हुआ है, याहया खां ने हकूमत संभाली है, उसकी आलोचना नहीं कर रहे हैं। इस सदन में पाकिस्तान के बारे में खुद दिनेश सिंह जी ने बयान दिया था आठ दस दिन पहले। तब उन्होंने कहा था कि खामोश रहो, कुछ मत बोलो। पाकिस्तान में एक अनोखी चीज हुई है। तीन महीने लगातार वकीलों ने, विद्यार्थियों ने और पत्रकारों और साधारण जनता ने, सभी लोगों ने वहाँ विद्रोह किया अयूबशाही के खिलाफ और वह विद्रोह काफी हद तक, पचास प्रतिशत से ज्यादा तक कामयाब भी रहा और अयूबशाही को उसके आगे झुकना पड़ा। उनको जनता के सामने घुटने टेकने पड़े। उनको यह मानना पड़ा कि बालिग मताधिकार लोगों को दिया जाए और इस आघार पर प्रतिनिधि चुन कर भेजने का अधिकार उनको दिया जाये, प्रजातन्त्र की वहाँ स्थापना की जाये। लेकिन बाद में वहाँ दूसरी तरह की चीज चली और उसके कारण याहया खां की सरकार वहाँ बन गई। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ जो सरकार अब बनी है, उसके रहते क्या हमारी सरकार वहाँ जो दूसरे तत्व हैं, जो प्रजातान्त्रिक तत्व हैं, उनको अपना समर्थन प्रदान करेगी ? एक तो वहाँ प्लूनिस्तान के लिए आन्दोलन चल रहा है और उस आन्दोलन के नेता खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां आज भी अफगानिस्तान में बैठे हुए हैं। दूसरी तरफ खां अब्दुस्मद खां बलोचिस्तान के हैं। इधर मुजीबुल रहमान और मौलाना भाषानी हैं। एक और लड़का भी है जिसका नाम तुफैल अहमद है जो कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में इस सारे जन आन्दोलन का जनक है। वह एक विद्यार्थी नेता है। वह मुजीबुल रहमान और मौलाना भाषानी से भी ज्यादा विख्यात वहाँ हो चुका है। इन लोगों ने वहाँ पर क्रान्ति करके शासन को झुका दिया और अपनी प्रजातान्त्रिक मार्गों को मनवाने के लिए सरकार को मजबूर कर दिया। अब वहाँ पर जो याहया खां की सरकार बनी है उसके बारे में

हमारी सरकार यह कहती है कि अगर हमने कुछ कहा तो यह उस सरकार के आंतरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप हो जायगा। लेकिन असल बात यह नहीं है। असल बात यह है कि रूस और अमरीका के डर से भारत सरकार कोइ बात नहीं कहना चाहती है, कोई अपनी नीति नहीं बनाती है। मैं कहूंगा कि भारत सरकार को वहां पर जो प्रजातंत्रीय शक्तियां हैं, खान अब्दुस्समद खां हैं, खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां हैं, मुजीबुल रहमान हैं, तुफेल अहमद हैं, उनके साथ हाथ बंटाना चाहिए। मैं कहूंगा कि भले ही भारत सरकार उनको समर्थन न दे लेकिन उसके बिना भी जो यहां पर प्रजातंत्रीय पाटियां हैं ये उनको अपना समर्थन देंगी, देकर रहेंगी। ऐसा अगर किया गया तभी आगे चल कर भारत और पाकिस्तान का रिश्ता बढ़ेगा और डा० लोहिया का और हम लोगों का जो सपना है कि भारत और पाकिस्तान का एक महासंघ बने, वह साकार होगा। वह होकर रहेगा, भले ही भारत सरकार इसमें मदद न दे।

आप जानते ही हैं कि आठ दस दिन पहले एंग्लिला में एक चीज हुई। वहां इंग्लिस्तान का हस्तक्षेप हुआ। वह एक अनोखा दिन था जिस दिन स्पीकर साहब की ओर से भी एंग्लिला में जो इंग्लिस्तान का आक्रमण हुआ, उसका जो हस्तक्षेप हुआ, उसके खिलाफ आवाज उठी। लेकिन आज एक बढ़िया बात हो रही है। वहां जो एंग्लिला के नेता हैं वेस्ट्र साहब उन्होंने कहा है कि सात दिन के अंदर अंग्रेज अपनी सेनाएं हटा लें। जैसे हम लोगों ने भारत छोड़ो, आन्दोलन के लिए नारा दिया और गांधी जी ने अंग्रेजों से कहा था भारत छोड़ो, उसी तरह से एंग्लिला के नेता इंग्लिश सरकार से कह रहे हैं कि आगामी सात दिन के अन्दर तुम्हारी सेना को एंग्वेला छोड़ देना चाहिए। मैं अपने विदेश मंत्री से जानना चाहता हूँ कि सात दिन के अन्दर इंग्लिस्तान की सरकार

अपनी सेना को वापस नहीं लेती है तो इनको कहना चाहिए कि हम लोग कामनवेल्थ नेशस में नहीं रहेंगे इस आधार पर कि इंग्लिस्तान कैरेबियन सागर के इस द्वीप को, एंग्वेला को दबा रहा है। यह सात दिन के अन्दर इनको करना चाहिए।

अन्त में सभापति जी, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। खुद मोहन राना साहब का यह बयान है कि उनकी जो रिहाई हुई पोर्चुगीज जेल से वह भारत सरकार के दबाव से नहीं हुई। उनका कहना है कि पोप का दबाव पड़ा, सारी दुनिया के प्रजातंत्रीय आन्दोलन का दबाव पड़ा तब वह छूट कर आए हैं। इन का सारा भंडाफोड उन्होंने किया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज सारे पार्लियामेंट की ओर से दिनेश सिंह को बोलना चाहिए, एक दूसरे बड़े नेता डा० मैस्कीन अभी भी जेल में बंद हैं, उनकी फौरन रिहाई होनी चाहिए, संयुक्त राष्ट्रसंघ की ओर से हो, भारत सरकार की ओर से हो, पार्लियामेंट की ओर से हो, सब तरफ से कार्यवाही करनी चाहिए और वादा करना चाहिए कि कब तक उनकी रिहाई कराएंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं परराष्ट्र मंत्रालय की मांगों का सख्त विरोध करता हूँ।

श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव (आजमगढ़) : माननीय सभापति जी, मैं सबसे पहले विदेश मंत्री जी को इस बात की बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने हाल में ही इस महत्वपूर्ण विभाग के कार्यभार को संभाला है। श्रीमन्, इस वाद-विवाद में विरोधी दल की तरफ से दो तीन प्रश्न मुख्य रूप से उठाए गए हैं। सब से पहला प्रश्न यह उठाया गया कि भारत सरकार की कोई अपनी स्वतन्त्र नीति नहीं है और भारत सरकार या तो रूस या अमेरिका के दबाव में आकर अपनी नीतियों में परिवर्तन करती है और उसी के मुताबिक काम करती है। दूसरी

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

बात यह कही गई कि भारत सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में घट गई है। हमारी आवाज की कोई कीमत नहीं है दुनिया के अन्दर। तीसरी बात यह कही गई कि हम अपनी समस्याओं को सुलभाने के बजाय दुनिया की दूसरी समस्याओं के अन्दर उलझ गए हैं, यह हमें नहीं करना चाहिए। हमें एक भूक दर्शक की तरह से चीजों को देखना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह तीनों आरोप जो विरोधी दलों की तरफ से लगाए गए हैं यह बिलकुल निराधार आरोप हैं। इसके पीछे एक वह राजनैतिक भावना काम कर रही है जो पिछले 20 वर्षों से आजादी के बाद से जब से हमने अपनी वैदेशिक नीति की बुनियाद डाली है और उसको लेकर हम काम कर रहे हैं, तब से यह आरोप लगातार, निरन्तर लगाए जा रहे हैं। यह कहना कि हमारी कोई वैदेशिक नीति नहीं है गलत है। मैं कहता हूँ कि चीजों को ठीक से, एक आवेकित्व तरीके से देखा नहीं जाता है। हमने अपनी नीतियों को बहुत सफाई के साथ आजादी के बाद से ही कहा है। हमने इस बात को कहा कि हम विश्व शान्ति और दुनिया के अन्दर गुट निरपेक्षता की नीति को प्रतिपादित करना चाहते हैं, दुनिया के किसी फौजी खेमे के अन्दर हम नहीं जाना चाहते। हमने इस बात को बहुत सफाई के साथ कहा है कि हम दुनिया के किसी भी देश के आन्तरिक मामलों में कोई हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहते। हमने इस बात को मजबूती से कहा है कि दुनिया के वह गुलाम देश को अपनी आजादी के लिए संघर्ष कर रहे हैं उनके साथ हमारी सहानुभूति है और हम उनको हर तरह से बल देना चाहते हैं। हमने इन नीतियों को बढ़ी मजबूती के साथ कहा है और आज मैं यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया के अन्दर भारत की प्रतिष्ठा इसलिए बढ़ी थी कि कुछ सिद्धान्तों को सामने रख करके, कुछ आदर्शों को सामने रख करके हमने दुनिया के अन्दर पहलू की और दुनिया के अन्दर इन नीतियों के अनुसार हमने

काम किया। श्रीमन्, इसकी जड़ में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता। राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के समय से ही जब हम अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे, उस वक्त से हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू दुनिया के कोने-कोने में जहाँ भी कोई घटना होती थी, अपनी प्रतिक्रिया उस पर प्रकट करते थे, दुनिया की शान्ति के लिए अपनी परेशानी व्यक्त करते थे, दुनिया के देशों के साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने के लिए प्रयास करते थे। दुनिया का कोई देश अपनी गुलामी की जंजीरें तोड़ना चाहता था तो उसको अपना नैतिक समर्थन देते थे। हमारी नीतियां इन आधार शिलानों के ऊपर निर्भर हैं। यह कहना कि हम अमेरिका और रूस के गुलाम की हैसियत से काम करते हैं, तथ्यों के ऊपर परदा डालना है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ नार्थ वियटनाम के ऊपर अमेरिका ने हमला किया, वहाँ अपनी फौज भेजी तो हिन्दुस्तान ने बगैर इस बात की परवाह किए कि हमें आर्थिक सहायता अमेरिका से मिलती है, हमारा उससे आर्थिक सम्बन्ध है, हमने अपनी आवाज बुलन्द की कि अमेरिकी फौज को वापस जाना चाहिये, नार्थ वियटनाम पर बम्बारी बन्द होनी चाहिये, नार्थ वियटनाम की जनता जो अपनी आजादी के लिए संघर्ष कर रही है उसके साथ हमारी हमदर्दी है। हम ने इस बात की परवाह नहीं की कि अमेरिका हमारी मदद रोक देगा या उसके साथ हमारे आर्थिक सम्बन्ध बिगड़ जाएंगे। इसी तरह जब जेकोस्लोवाकिया के अंदर रूस की फौजें दाखिल हुईं तो बावजूद इसके कि रूस के साथ हमारा सम्बन्ध बहुत मैत्रीपूर्ण है और रूस के साथ हम उस सम्बन्ध को भविष्य में भी कायम रखना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम ने सिद्धान्त के आधार पर इस बात को कहा कि रूस को अपनी फौज वापस बुलानी चाहिए। हमने जेकोस्लोवाकिया की उस जनता के साथ जो शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से अपनी आजादी की रक्षा के लिए कदम उठा रही थी, सहानुभूति प्रकट की और हमने कहा कि किसी देश के आन्तरिक मामले में किसी

को हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिए। हमने अपनी आबाज को मजबूती के साथ रखा। जब वेस्ट एशिया के अंदर अरब मुन्कों पर इस्त्रायल ने हमला किया तो दुनिया का कोई भी देश, किसी समाजवादी देश के नेता ने भी प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त नहीं की थी जब कि सबसे पहले हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि इस्त्रायल हमलावर है, उसने हमला किया है, उसे अपनी फ़ौज वापस बुलानी चाहिए। हमने उसकी निन्दा की। हमने इस बात की कोई परवाह नहीं की कि साम्राज्यवादी खेमे के देश जो उस रीजन के अन्दर संकट उत्पन्न करने में तत्पर हैं, वह हम से नाराज होंगे या खुश होंगे। इस प्रकार यह जो तीन बड़ी घटनाएं दुनिया के अंदर घटीं, उसके ऊपर हमने अपनी नीति को मजबूती के साथ रखा। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत की नीति दुनिया की समस्याओं को सुलझाने की है।

एक आलोचना मैं मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि हमारी जो प्रतिष्ठा आजादी के चन्द वर्षों में थी, हमने कहा था, कि हम चाहते हैं, दुनिया में गुट निरपेक्ष देशों की ताकत बढ़े, हम चाहते हैं कि ऐसे लोग जो फ़ौज के जरिए दुनिया को बांटना चाहते हैं, उनकी ताकत को हम रोकें, हम चाहते हैं कि दुनिया के अंदर जो न्यूक्लियर पावर्स शस्त्र के आधार पर दुनिया की शान्ति को भंग करना चाहते हैं, उनका यह रवैया खत्म हो, मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी वह पहल आज कमजोर हो गई है। मैं इस बात को कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार को इसके ऊपर गौर करना चाहिए, सोचना चाहिए कि आज क्या कारण है कि दुनिया के अन्दर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की शक्ति घट रही है। अगर रूस और अमेरिका किसी बात पर समझौता कर लें तो सारी दुनिया को बेकार कर देते हैं। रूस और अमेरिका दो दुनिया की बड़ी शक्तियाँ किसी चीज पर बीटो

पावर का उपयोग कर लें तो सारी दुनिया मूक दशक की तरह से बैठी हुई रह जाती है। इसके ऊपर भारत सरकार को, आज वक्त आ गया है, कि फिर से पहल करनी चाहिए। वरना हम दोष क्यों देते हैं कि लैटिन अमेरिका के छोटे-छोटे देश अमेरिका के पिछलग्गू बन गए हैं या अफ्रीका और एशिया के देश जवान नहीं खोलते हैं क्योंकि उन्हें खतरा है कि उनके देश पर हमला होगा तो कोई उनकी रक्षा नहीं कर सकता। आज वेस्ट एशिया के ऊपर इस्त्रायल की फ़ौजें बैठी हुई हैं। दुनिया की कोई शक्ति उन्हें हटा नहीं रही है। एक छोटा सा देश इस्त्रायल मनमानी ढंग से वर्त्ताव कर रहा है। जोर्डन के ऊपर हमला करता है। उसकी निन्दा होती है, अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन दोनों उस पर तटस्थ रह जाते हैं। एक तरफ शान्ति की बात करते हैं, दुनिया के मसलों को सुलझाने की बात करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा मंच जो अपना एक फैसला करता है, प्रस्ताव पास करता है, उसका कार्यान्वयन नहीं हो पाता। आज यह एक गंभीर सवाल है। दुनिया को सोचना पड़ेगा कि इसका कोई हल हो सकता है या नहीं। ऐसे मौके पर हिन्दुस्तान को फिर से पहल लेनी चाहिए और मैं समझता हूँ कि मार्शल टीटो ने जो यह आर्हवान किया है कि दुनिया के छोटे देश, आजादी पसन्द देश और जो गुट निरपेक्ष देश हैं, आज इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि हम उनका सम्मेलन बुलाएं। आज इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि दुनिया के अन्दर जनमत तैयार करें, दुनिया के ऐसे देश जो इन बुनियादी चीजों पर सहमत हैं, जो दुनिया में शान्ति चाहते हैं, जो दुनिया के किसी देश की आजादी को कुचलना नहीं चाहते, किसी के आन्तरिक मसले में हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहते, ऐसे देश आज इकट्ठा हों और मुझे इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि यदि इस प्रकार की जनमत दुनिया में तैयार किया गया, इस प्रकार का सम्मेलन किया गया और इस प्रकार की आवाज बुलन्द की गई तो यह जो बड़ी शक्तियाँ हैं इन

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

को भी सोचना पड़ेगा कि वह कहाँ जा रहे हैं और किस तरफ दुनिया को ले जा रहे हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान को उसमें पहल करनी चाहिए। आज हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ लोगों की आँखें हैं। यह कहना कि आज दुनिया में हमारी कोई कद्र नहीं है, हमें दुनिया में कोई पूछता नहीं है, यह बड़ी भूल होगी। अगर यह बात है तो विरोधी दल के लोग यह क्यों कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान ने यहाँ यह जवान खोल दी इसका असर सारी दुनिया पर पड़ गया, हिन्दुस्तान को यह काम करना चाहिए, हम इसके ऊपर मौन बँठे रह गए? हमारी खुद की जनसंख्या इतनी बड़ी है कि दुनिया के अंदर आज 52 करोड़ इंसानों के देश की कोई भ्रवहेलना नहीं कर सकता। हमारी सबसे बड़ी ताकत यह है। एशिया और अफ्रीका के अंदर हम एक बड़े देश हैं। हमने दुनिया के मसलों पर पहल की है और दुनिया के अंदर हमने कुछ सिद्धान्तों पर काम किया है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी हमारी भर्थादा है, आज भी हमारा अपना स्थान है, आज हम को पहल करनी चाहिए। मैं आज महसूस करता हूँ श्रीमन्, कि चीन के हमले के बाद, 1962 के बाद हमने अपना आत्म-विश्वास खो दिया है। हमें ऐसा लगने लग गया है, हम डरते हैं कि शायद हमारे ऐसा करने से, दखल देने से कहीं ऐसा न हो कि यह ताकत नाराज हो जाय या वह ताकत नाराज हो जाय।

दूसरी चीज जिसे मैं महसूस करता हूँ, श्रीमन् हमारी आर्थिक कमजोरी है। हमारी विदेश नीति का हमारी आर्थिक नीति से चोली दामन का साथ है, बहुत गहरा सम्बन्ध है। मैं समयाभाव के कारण पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू का उद्धरण नहीं देना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन उन्होंने कहा था कि दुनिया में कोई हमारी आवाज नहीं सुनेगा, दुनिया में हमारी गुट-निपेक्षता की आवाज नकारखाने में तूती की आवाज बनकर रह जायगी, अगम हम आर्थिक रूप से मजबूत

नहीं होंगे, अपने पैरों पर खड़े नहीं होंगे। यह हमारी कमजोरी है। आज सबसे बड़ी जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम अपनी आर्थिक शक्ति को बढ़ायें।

एक दूसरा खतरा जिसकी तरफ में आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ—जो आज दुनिया में पैदा हो गया है—वह है न्यूक्लियर पावर का खतरा। आज दुनिया के कुछ मुल्क इस बात की कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि वे न्यूक्लियर पावर बनें। एक तरफ कहते हैं निशस्त्रीकरण होना चाहिए, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ कहते हैं कि जब तक हमारी शक्ति नहीं बनेगी, हमारी सेना मजबूत नहीं होगी, हमारे पास हथियार नहीं होंगे, तब तक दुनिया में शान्ति कायम नहीं रह सकती। जो राष्ट्र आज बड़ी शक्ति कहलाते हैं, जो दुनिया में अपनी बात को मनवाने में समर्थ हैं, जैसे अमरीका जिसके पास बड़ी भारी फौजी शक्ति है, जो अपनी ताकत से बात मनवाने में समर्थ हैं, जैसे चीन—जिसकी ताकत के भय से लोग भयभीत हो रहे हैं, अगर यही प्रवृत्ति बढ़ती रही, जो न्यूक्लियलर पावरवाला बनेगा, जिसके पास फौज होगी, जिसके पास शस्त्र होंगे, दुनिया में उसकी आवाज सुनी जायगी—यह दुनिया की शान्ति के लिए बहुत बड़ा खतरा है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि छोटे देशों को, जो अपना आर्थिक विकास चाहते हैं, जो अपनी आर्थिक मुक्ति के लिए लड़ रहे हैं, उनको एक मंच पर लाया जाय, उनकी आवाज को उठाया जाय, उस आवाज को ठुकराया नहीं जा सकता और भविष्य में भी नहीं ठुकराया जा सकेगा, लेकिन इसमें हिन्दुस्तान को पहल लेने की जरूरत है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार इस पर अपनी नीति निर्धारित करे।

यहाँ पर दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया का जिक्र किया गया है। आज जापान अपनी इकानामिक डिप्लोमेसी के ज़रिए उन क्षेत्रों में अपना प्रभाव

बढ़ाना चाहता है। चीन के पास फौज है, वह किसी भी समय उन क्षेत्रों की शान्ति को भंग कर सकता है। आज ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि उन देशों के साथ नजदीक के सम्बन्ध स्थापित किए जायं, उन के साथ बैठकर उनकी समस्याओं पर विचार करना चाहिये।

एक चीज कही गई है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने लैटिन अमरीका के कुछ छोटे-छोटे देशों का दौरा किया, जिसका कोई प्रभाव नहीं है, वे देश अमेरिका के पिछलग्गू हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बड़ी गलत आलोचना है। दुनिया के छोटे देश हों या बड़े, सबकी सार्वभौमिकता की हम कद्र करते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी इस बात के लिए धन्यवाद की पात्र हैं, उन्होंने दुनिया के उन छोटे देशों को, जिनकी लोग उपेक्षा करते थे, जिनको सम्मान नहीं देते थे, उनका दौरा करके उनकी समस्याओं को समझने, उनके साथ दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाने की ओर जो आवाहन किया है, उसके लिए भारत सरकार की नीति बधाई की पात्र है। हमने उन देशों को बड़ा सम्मान दिया है और हमें इस नीति की ओर आगे बढ़ाना चाहिये।

श्रीमन्, हमको कभी-कभी ऐसा अनुभव होता है, एक वेशीलेशन हमारे दिमाग में कभी-कभी पैदा होता है—उदाहरण लिए जी० डी० आर० का सवाल है। इस सवाल पर आज ही इस सदन के नेताओं ने, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी को छोड़ कर सभी पार्टियों के प्रतिनिधियों ने, अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी उसमें नहीं जा पाये, लेकिन उनका भी समर्थन था, श्री एस० एम० जोशी जी थे, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता थे, डी० एम० के० के नेता थे, डिप्टी स्पीकर उसके चेयरमैन हैं, कांग्रेस पार्टी के नेता थे, हम सबने मिल कर प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहा कि जी० डी० आर० आज एक वास्तविकता है उसका अपना अस्तित्व है, दुनिया उसको मान्यता दे रही है, आज दो जर्मनी हैं—दुनिया में इस तथ्य को

मानना चाहिये इस बात से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है। स्वयं पश्चिमी जर्मनी जी० डी० आर० के साथ 50 करोड़ रुपये का व्यापार करता है, लेकिन हमसे कहता है कि हम जी० डी० आर० के अपने सम्बन्ध ज्यादा न बढ़ायें। पश्चिमी जर्मनी चीन के साथ 100 करोड़ रुपये का व्यापार करता है, पश्चिमी जर्मनी के सैनिक विशेषज्ञ चीन में जाते हैं और हमसे कहते हैं कि हम जी० डी० आर० के साथ सम्बन्ध न रखें, हम पर दबाव डालने की कोशिश की जाती है। ऐसा इसलिये होता है कि हमारी एक कमजोरी है—हमको आर्थिक सहायता चाहिये। आज इस नीति से हमारी गुट-निर्पेक्षता की नीति की कमजोर हो रही है, दुनिया के सामने हमारी तसबीर घुंघली बन कर घाती है, इसलिए इस तदन की भावना को व्यक्त करते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब सब का समर्थन है तो भारत सरकार को अपने कदम आगे बढ़ाने चाहियें। भारत सरकार को पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता देनी चाहिये, उसके साथ दौत्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने चाहिये, वरना हमारा इमेज कुछ मसलों पर कमजोर दिखाई पड़ता है।

श्रीमन्, आखिर मैं एक चीज और कहना चाहता हूँ। आज पश्चिम एशिया का सवाल सारी दुनिया के लिये सिरदर्द बना हुआ है। चार बड़ी शक्तियां वहां मिल कर उस समस्या का समाधान ढूँढना चाहती हैं, लेकिन इजरायली उसका निरन्तर विरोध कर रहे हैं। आज भारत सरकार को इस प्रश्न में पहल लेनी चाहिये और पहल लेकर ऐसे देशों पर—जैसे अमरीका है। दबाव डालना चाहिये, यहां तक कि उसकी निन्दा करने में हमें हिचक नहीं होनी चाहिये। एक तरफ अमरीका कहता है कि हम शान्ति चाहते हैं, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ अमरीका जब सुरक्षा परिषद में मामला आता है तो तटस्थ रह जाता है। इस अन्तर विरोध दोहरी नीति की हम को डट कर भतंस्ना करनी चाहिये।

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

चीन और रूस की सीमाओं का संघर्ष है। मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की नीति सही है कि सीमाओं के प्रश्न को शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से बातचीत करके हल करना चाहिये, भारत सरकार ने इसके ऊपर कोई जल्दबाजी नहीं की है। लेकिन एक बात भारत सरकार को करनी चाहिये थी। जब रूस ने इस बात को कहा कि हम इस बात के लिये तैयार हैं कि चीन सरकार के साथ बैठ कर इस मसले पर बातचीत करें, शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से इस मसले को हल करने के लिए तैयार हैं तो भारत सरकार को रूस की इस घोषणा का स्वागत करना चाहिये था और खुले रूप से कहना चाहिये था कि कम के कम रूस ने इस मामले में पहल की है कि हम बातचीत के जरिये इसको हल करना चाहते हैं। ऐसे मसलों पर जब हम चुप रहते हैं, अपनी प्रतिक्रिया देर से देते हैं तो ऐसा लगता है कि हम अपनी पहल खो रहे हैं।

16 hrs.

अन्त में, श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की विदेश-नीति, जो पिछले 20 वर्षों से हमने इस देश में लागू की है, उसकी अपनी एक दिशा है, कुछ सिद्धान्त हैं, कुछ आदर्शों की बुनियाद पर हमारी विदेश नीति आधारित है। उसका फल दुनिया में आया है। इसलिये इस नीति का हृदय से समर्थन करना चाहिये। भारत सरकार को चाहिये कि हिचक छोड़ कर, मजबूती के साथ दुनिया का मूल्यांकन करके, पहल करके इन मसलों पर जैसे पूर्णरूप से निःशस्त्रीकरण हो सके, पश्चिमी एशिया से इजरायल की फौजें वापिस जायं, नार्थ वियतनाम से अमरीका फौजें वापिस जायं और इसी तरह से जो दूसरे प्रश्न हैं, इन पर भारत सरकार को पहल करनी चाहिये और जो हमारे नये आजाद मुल्क हैं, जो पिछड़े हुये देश हैं, जिन्होंने हमेशा भारत की तरफ आशा भरी निगाह से देखा है, जो एशिया और अफ्रीका के देश हैं, यदि हम उनकी तरफ

दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ायेंगे तो निश्चित रूप से हमें उनका समर्थन मिलेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस अनुदान का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI SWELL (Autonomous Districts) : Year after year we are ceremonially presented with the copy of the annual report of the External Affairs Ministry. I don't know if they also perform a *puja* in their office in South Block before they bring this report to House. And year by year I have always been struck by the drabness, pedestrianism and perfunctoriness of these reports. But this year's Report has beaten all the rest in all these qualities and for sheer inefficiency.

Sir, my good friend, Shri Dinesh Singh may advance the plea that he has taken charge of the Ministry only the other day on the eve of the session. But he has been connected with this Ministry for as long as I remember as a Member of this House first as Deputy Minister then as Minister of State and even during the interlude when he was in the Ministry of Commerce he never divested this connection because he was member of the External Affairs Committee of the Cabinet.

Now that he has realised his life's ambition and, I wish him well in that. I thought he should have been extra careful and he should have come before this House putting his best foot forward. But he has not done that. May I quote a few gems from this report !

I term this report a mere rigmarole, recital of visits paid to this country by foreign dignitaries, including Deputy Ministers, who, I am told, Sir, walk along the corridors of this House with files that have no papers inside.

At page 22, paragraph 3, this report says:

"There has been an increase in Indian exports to Thailand of steel and allied products and petroleum products. For the period of Jan. December 1967 Thai imports from India amounted to Bahts 267, 783 as against Bahts 109,000 in 1965 and Bahts 91,675,000 in 1966".

May I ask the Minister how in his wonderful arithmetic when there has been a

decrease of as many as more than ninety-one lakhs of Bahts between 1966 and 1967 he still maintains and insists that our exports to Thailand have increased? I will leave it to the arithmetic of the Minister and the House to find that out.

In another part, at page 35 in paragraph 3, there is another wonderful statement. It says :

“There was continued unrest in the whole of southern Africa during the year.”

very correct. Then it goes on :

“South Africa continued to float—(I repeat float)—the UN Resolutions...”

Sir, I have yet to learn English. I have heard of flouting the resolutions. But this is the first time that I hear this kind of English speaking of a country floating the United Nation Resolutions. May I ask.....

AN HON. MEMBER : A clerical error.

SHRI SWELL : All the more preposterous then.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let us proceed to more serious matters.

SHRI SWELL : I am coming to them. This is not how a report on the Ministry of External Affairs ought to be drawn up. To me, a report, if it is to be meaningful, has got to be an expert analysis and summary of world events, developments and trends and the part that we have played or sought to play in these and any factual account of who said what, who went where and who did what must find a proper place against this setting. May I say that the intervening twelve months have been months of the greatest significance both to us and to the world. A mere mention of a few things would bear this out; the aggression against Czechoslovakia by Soviet Russia and the Warsaw Pact countries, the continuing tension in that country, and the Sino-Soviet clash, both of which have once and for all demolished the myth of a Communist monolithic world order

and have restored nationalism to its primacy as a determining factor in International relations; the search of the Soviet Union for new levers of power in the Indo-Pakistan continent through the Soviet arms deal with Pakistan; the rapid advance of China in nuclear technology and weaponry reducing to nonsense the much proclaimed non-proliferation treaty and adding a new dimension to the nuclear arms race, in the development of the ABM system; the new relationship and the thaw in rigidity to which my friend Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha and many others have drawn your attention, between China and the Western countries; and nearer home, the recent developments in Pakistan culminating in the reimposition of martial rule. Each one of these or all together I submit, could have been fit subjects that the Ministry with its army of Secretaries, Ambassadors, experts and Assistants, country have dealt with meaningfully and on which we could have offered some constructive suggestions.

But so far as general observations go. I am conscious that my time is ruthlessly limited and therefore I shall confine myself to only two of the most important questions of the day, questions of the greatest import and consequence to us—the developments in Pakistan and in China.

Sir, let me preface this by briefly stating my general approach, and I think it is the approach of every sensible man in this country to both these questions and to the question of our foreign policy in general.

I may explain that the fundamental duty of our foreign policy is to safeguard, promote and strengthen our national interests. Now, how has the national interest been served by our present foreign policy? It must be obvious to everybody what a crushing economic burden our confrontation with China and Pakistan, has been. It must be evident also that because of this confrontation and because of our blind adherence to that sanctimonious nonsense, which I don't really understand in the present context, non-alignment—the other powers of the world have fallen into the habit of taken us for granted. In this context nothing is more shameful than the recent visit of Marshal Grechko to this country and

[Shri Swell]

to Pakistan. He acts like a man having two wives. He comes to one wife and says 'I love you more than the other'. That is what he said here. Then he goes to Pakistan and says: 'I love you more than India; I will give you arms to defend yourself against your enemy'. I submit that all this 'must change. We must regain our freedom of action. We must regain our self-respect. We must regain our freedom of manoeuvring the freedom to use the cranks in the game of power politics. And if we are going to do this, the direction is clear. We must come to an early and honourable settlement with both these our two neighbours.

Sir, what do we see around us today? In Pakistan, we have just seen the collapse of authoritarianism, the utter bankruptcy of paternalism as a political system. Yet, during the years when President Ayub ruled the roost, either through naked military dictatorship or through what he called basic guided democracy, it was mouthed around in the capitals of the world and also in this country that Pakistan had succeeded where India had failed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member should try to conclude.

SHRI SWELL : I have just begun.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is the biggest joke.

SHRI SWELL : I think the Minister would be somewhat benefited if you allow me to have my full say. It was mouthed around that political stability and economic prosperity had come to Pakistan while India was bedevilled by political defections and economic stagnation.

16.14 hrs.

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

The fact that in Pakistan during President Ayub's rule 20 families appropriated to themselves the national wealth and that Pakistan was a gilded prison was ignored and even overlooked. But the aspirations and the resentment of the people went on building under the walls of this prison. And

the system did not allow for any safety valve through which this resentment would escape, as our system did, and it did not give the people the opportunity to change the system through the democratic process of popular elections. And so the explosion took place, and when it did it took a chaotic turn, broke up the nation emotionally. The imposition of martial law in that country is itself a standing monument to something in that fundamentally and radically wrong that is country. It is like the administration of a huge dose of antibiotic to stem the tide of poison, but it is useless if the poison is generated by the body itself.

I wish—let me tell this to the Minister because this Government has failed in this that at this hour of their travail somebody in authority in this country had spoken up in sympathy for the people of Pakistan.

AN HON. MEMBER : And invite trouble !

SHRI SWELL : I wish we had sent our sympathy, our good wishes, to the people and the rulers of Pakistan, that democracy and order would quickly come to that country. I wish we had taken this opportunity of reiterating our stand that in the stability and prosperity of Pakistan, we have a stake.

This is the great psychological moment between our country and Pakistan. In all the confusion there, I can clearly discern signs of the people of Pakistan trying to reach out to us, in their demand for copies of the Constitution of our country, in the speeches of such people as Sheikh Mujibur Rehman who had said that all the efforts to build up anti-India hysteria in Pakistan were only devices to deflect the people of Pakistan from their true goal, the restoration of their democracy and freedom.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : His time is up.

SHRI SWELL : I am leaving out China though I feel that the Minister would have benefited by what I have to say about China.

Let not the Minister think that I am talking claptrap. I am giving this warning today, that with what is happening in West Bengal, East Pakistan and the whole of eastern India, we are in for a period of new equations with Pakistan. Let me remind him that one of the demands of the people of East Pakistan besides more autonomy and democracy, is that the representation in the Pakistan Parliament should be on the basis of population, which would give the people of East Pakistan an edge over the whole of West Pakistan, which would make the people of East Pakistan the virtual rulers of Pakistan. This is what the people and the Government in West Pakistan are not going to accept.

Therefore, we may very soon see another convulsion in Pakistan, between the population of West and East Pakistan, I shall not be surprised if in that whole process, East Pakistan may be compelled to spread out across its borders as many as 20 million people into West Bengal, Assam and other places.

I ask the Minister; with all your experts and secretaries, have you ever thought about this? What are you going to do? This is going to be a traumatic experience. It would be traumatic in the beginning, but it may be opening a new chapter of unity between us and Pakistan in the near future. But what preparations have you made about it? Have you got the machinery? I should like a definite answer to this. What is your new policy towards Pakistan?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Kindly conclude.

SHRI SWELL : I am sorry because I do not have time I cannot deal with another and more important subject, which is China.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : On the next occasion.

SHRI SWELL : The whole world would change by the next occasion.

श्री अ० सि० सहगल (बिलासपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि विदेशों में जो भारतीयों की सम्पत्ति है और जो जायदाद के मामले हैं और जो विदेशों की सम्पत्ति के सम्-

बन्ध में निर्यात शीघ्र नहीं लिया जा रहा है, मैं चाहूंगा कि जितने भी ऐसे मामले पड़े हुए हैं उन का जल्दी से जल्दी कोई जिक्र, जो अभी इस रिपोर्ट में नहीं दिखाई देता है, किया जाय। साथ ही मुझे यह भी निवेदन करना है कि प्रशासन और संगठन का जो कार्य हमारे मंत्रालय में चल रहा है उस में तीव्रता हमें लानी चाहिये; उस पर अधिक ध्यान देकर जितना ज्यादा हम कार्य कर सकते हैं करें ताकि हम में तेजी आये।

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं आप से कहूंगा कि अभी कुछ के मामले में पाकिस्तान ने जो कि छठवां हमारा पिलर था, जिसको उन्होंने मान्यता दी है कि यह भारत का है यह एक अच्छी ही बात हुई है। जिसके लिये हम लड़ रहे थे उसकी उन्होंने हम को इजाजत दे दी है।

इस के अलावा जो खास चीज कहनी है वह यह है कि इंग्लैंड और हिन्दुस्तान कामनवैलथ कन्ट्रीज हैं। जब तक उन्होंने हमारे ऊपर राज्य किया सिखों की उन्होंने बराबर प्रशंसा की है और सिख उन की लड़ाई में अफ्रीका और दूसरे मुल्कों में जाकर लड़े हैं। लेकिन आज एक बड़ा घृणित काम उन्होंने किया है, वह भी हमारे कामनवैलथ के भाई हैं, लेकिन यह चीज उनके लिये अच्छी नहीं थी। वहां पर उन्होंने जा कर के, मैं मानने के लिये इसको तैयार नहीं हूँ, उन्होंने आप के साथ बहुत कुछ किया है और आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि आपके साथ ईमानदारी नहीं की। स्वतंत्रता हमने जरूर प्राप्त की है। लेकिन हम ईमानदारी के साथ कहना चाहते हैं कि हमारा उन पर आभार है और हम मानने के लिये तैयार हैं, लेकिन जो कार्य उन्होंने हमारे साथ किया है, सिखों के साथ किया है कि बसों में जो बहां पर कंडक्टर हैं उनसे कहा जाता है कि आप अपनी दाढ़ी मुड़ा दें, अपने बाल कटा दें तब हम लेंगे, यह बहुत खराब बात है और इस

[श्री इ० सि० सहगल]

पर हम को विरोध प्रकट करना चाहिये। खाली शेष शेष कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा। अभी जो डेमान्स्ट्रेशन यहां यू० के० ऐम्बेसी के के सामने हुआ है यह इस बात का चोटक है कि यहां पर क्या फ्रीलिंग चल रही है और उस को देखते हुए भारत सरकार को अपना रवैया इंग्लैंड के बारे में बदलना पड़ेगा। आज हमारे वहां के जो हिन्दुस्तानी हैं उन पर भी आफ़त आ रही है। कोई निकालने की सोच रहा है, कोई हटाने की सोच रहा है लेकिन अपने देश में हमने उनके साथ कुछ कार्यवाही नहीं की। उन के लोगों के साथ, जो कि यहां पर मौजूद थे, हमने ईमानदारी उन के साथ बरती है। उन्होंने अपना प्रसार यहां पर किया है, हम ने बराबर इजाजत दी है। लेकिन यदि हमारे साथ किया जाता है तो हम इसका तीव्र विरोध करते हैं और चाहते हैं कि इस पर हमारा मंत्रालय उन से लिखा पढ़ी करे और उस के बारे में जो भी वह जवाब देना चाहते हैं, उन्हें यहां पर देना चाहिये।

सिखों के बारे में जो घृणित काम किया जा रहा है यह अच्छा नहीं है इससे लोगों में रोष है। आज यहां के जो सिख हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के रहने वाले नहीं बल्कि जो विदेशों में सिख हैं उन लोगों में एक तीव्रता आयी है और लोग सोचने लगे हैं कि कामनवैलथ में इंग्लैंड के साथ हम क्या रिश्ता रखें। मैं चाहूंगा इस चीज को मद्देनजर रख कर हमें इस पर कार्यवाही करनी है।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : Sir, I am conscious of the tremendous responsibility that has been placed on me in the conduct of the affairs of the Ministry of External Affairs, which has been presided over for nearly two decades by our first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Then his successor, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri presided over the affairs of this Ministry. Again, his successor, our present Prime Minister, presided over this Ministry.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : What about Sardar Swaran Singh and Mr. Chagla ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I did not want to give in a chronological order all the people who came. I was only trying to say that the Prime Ministers of this country had presided over this ministry. I shoulder this responsibility with the hope that I shall continue to receive the advice, assistance and cooperation from all sections of this House, as has been indeed demonstrated in the debate that has just concluded. Foreign affairs is the concern of the nation as a whole.

In a growing measure the question and the problems relating to foreign policy of our country, as of other countries, have come to acquire very direct relevance to the every-day life of its citizens. The lives of common people all over the world have become even more inter-twined. Today the strength of a country is no longer limited to its military capability. In international affairs, the strength of a country is also its economic strength, its industrial development, its inventive genius, the strength of its science and technology, the strength of the better organisation of its human resources and the strength of the people to resist pressure and their capacity to steadfast to the cherished principles. It is the totality of each country's national life that is relevant today. A new generation of Indians is now on the move. Born and nurtured in an independent India they are all exercising their franchise and taking responsibilities in all fields of our national life. Their lives are far more affected by the results of our foreign policy, by the efforts to build the bridges of friendship, than those of their fathers and their grandfathers. This was also reflected in this House in that we heard younger voices taking part in the debate on external affairs. I welcome this growing interest that is being taken in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

The hon. Member, Shri Siloo Mody talked of the high place of honour and prestige attained by India in foreign countries. I am happy that a spokesman of the Swatantra Party has made a candid statement of fact. After the entry into the comity of nations as an independent country India has made a mark for itself not on the basis of its military strength or even its economic

power but on the basis of its initiative to strengthen peace to promote international understanding and to champion the cause of the under-privileged who constitute the overwhelming majority of population in the world. If one man can be singled out from amongst his countrymen to receive this honour for the conduct of our foreign policy it can be none other than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru the founder of our foreign policy. And yet, he was reflecting the values cherished by our people and the principles which have deep roots in our history and our tradition. Gandhiji's dream of cooperation between man and man irrespective of his nationality, his teachings of peaceful persuasion as opposed to subjugation by force and his concern for the downtrodden are all part of our national life and tenets of our international behaviour. We continue to be guided by them.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I must confess that I was amazed by the statements made by some of the hon. Members from the other side, that we do not have a foreign policy. As I listened to them attentively I could not grasp what they were putting forward as an alternative to our foreign policy.

SHRI SWELL : Pragmatism.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Nor do I find it in the policy pronouncements of the spokesmen of different parties that are represented here. I appreciate that if some hon. Members are not conscious of the need for a foreign policy they will have difficulty in understanding ours. Our policy is directed to serve our national interest within the community of nations.

AN HON. MEMBER : Is it so ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : That is what I said, that some people will have difficulty in understanding. I said that in the beginning itself. We have consistently worked to preserve peace because we are convinced that our own development can take place only in an atmosphere of peace. History has taught us that peace cannot co-exist with political domination. We are opposed to all kinds of colonial

domination and racial discrimination. Having suffered under foreign rule and having waged a struggle for independence, it was only natural for us to extend full support for the liberation of people under foreign domination.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : What about Czechoslovakia and Mr. Dubcek ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : On some other suitable occasion I shall be very glad to discuss with Shri Sondhi and perhaps try to enlighten him about foreign domination.

Whether it is the question of the independence of Angola, or Mozambique, or South West Africa or any other colonial territory, it will be our endeavour to direct our foreign policy to achieve their liberation, to accelerate the peace of decolonisation. It is equally our belief that all people must enjoy equality irrespective of their race. Ever before our independence we raised our voice against the inhuman policies of *apartheid* practised by the Government of South Africa. We shall continue to support moves in the United Nations and elsewhere against racial discrimination in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia or wherever else it may exist

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : **

श्री विनेश सिंह : मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि आपने एक तो अच्छी किताब पढ़ी है।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : * *

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We are equally convinced that there could be no lasting peace in the world unless there is equitable sharing of prosperity. Wide disparities between the rich and the poor will inevitably lead a tension and conflict. We are assisting in the crystallization of the idea that it is equally in the interest of the rich countries to assist in the economic development of the poor. When the first UNCTAD met in 1964 the member-States expressed their deter-

**Not recorded as ordered by the Chair, *vide* col. 213.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

mination to seek a better and more effective system of international economic co-operation whereby the division of the world into areas of poverty and plenty may be banished and prosperity achieved for all. We cannot say that in the years that followed the world community was able to translate these ideas into action. After 45 sessions of the Economic and Social Council and two sessions of UNCTAD and despite all the promises that were held out in the United Nations development decade, the developing countries are normally expected to take, according to projections made, more than a century and a half to double their *per capita* income. After 150 years this will mean no more than four rupees per day. In my report to the United Nations General Assembly in my capacity as President of the Second UNCTAD, I had pointed out that the countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia had missed the industrial revolution through no fault of theirs and they are now asserting their rights to alter the socio-economic situation they inherited from their colonial past.

While matters of interest to developed countries have been tackled through multilateral negotiations, measures in support of the social and economic efforts of the developing countries have eluded agreement. In fact, the greater the effort made by the developing countries to improve their lot, the more numerous constraints they have had to encounter.

To my mind, economic co-operation between nations is not merely a matter of transfer of goods and services, nor a sacrifice on the part of one and gain to the other. It is an expression of the convergence of interests of both the rich and the poor. It is time we recognised that in most cases what is commonly known as aid today is hardly anything more than export promotion scheme of the donor countries, although it may be necessary for our development.

While success has been limited so far, it will be our sincere endeavour to seek international co-operation for rapid development of developing countries. We shall render all assistance in the formulation of

the programmes of the next development decade so that it does not meet with same fate as the first one which turned out to be a decade of development for the developed.

International economic co-operation is an important aspect of our foreign policy. Such co-operation helps us to consolidate peace, to provide economic content to the struggle for decolonisation, to reinforce in particular the national independence of countries recently freed from colonial yoke, to build on old foundations new strands of friendship based on mutual interest and thus to transform the confrontation between power blocs into a worldwide effort to build a new world order capable of helping each member-state of the comity of nations to realise for its citizens the fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Bilaterally too we have strengthened our relations with Asian countries, specially our neighbours. With Ceylon we have concluded an agreement for economic co-operation which envisages the participation in it of other developing countries of this region.

Some hon. Member asked me this morning and I should like to say that I shall be going to Iran early next month to explore the possibility of closer co-operation with that country.

It is my intention to infuse greater economic content in the conduct of our foreign policy. We have in the Ministry an Economic Division which is paying special attention to the problem of our economic relations with other countries. We have been assisted in this by other Economic Ministries of the Government of India and it will be our effort now to strengthen this division to undertake the new tasks that are being assigned to us.

It is our fortune that we find ourselves in a position to share with our friends in developing countries the experience we have acquired in applying modern science, technology and management to the social and economic problems bequeathed by colonialism. Our trained manpower is

already taking part in the development of many developing countries and it will be our endeavour to try to offer as much assistance as we can release from our own economic development.

Each nation, we are convinced, is in a position to receive and transmit growth impulses. It is the task of the international community to weave them into a developmental cycle so that national endeavours are co-ordinated to provide for maximum advantage to member-states and also the world community as a whole.

I was particularly gratified to notice the deep interest that hon. Members had taken in the various aspects of our foreign policy and I had attempted to note down some of the important matters that they had raised. But looking at the watch I doubt very much if you will permit me even to get through half of them. I would like, therefore, to assure hon. Members that all the points that they have raised will receive our utmost consideration and that even if I am not able to refer to the hon. Members by name or to the individual matters they have mentioned, it will still have been noticed and that we shall take action as we consider necessary. I shall, therefore, not refer to many bilateral issues but to the important issues which have been mentioned by Members and which interest us tremendously.

There has been an effort to say that our foreign policy has failed in having friends abroad.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is admitted by all.

SHRI SWELL: We have patrons abroad, not friends.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The hon. Member, Shri Sondhi, made a passionate plea yesterday for our effort in the Indian Ocean. He asked me to pronounce a grand design of Central Asia, to force a settlement in South-east Asia, in Vietnam and to proclaim various other things. Some hon. Member asked him, "What is your solution for all these problems?" and he said at the end that we must increase our naval force. I am entirely with him that we should, as far

as possible, strengthen our defences and that they should be adequate to meet our requirements. But it is certainly not a subject which is relevant in today's context...

SHRI M. L. Sondhi : On a point of order, Sir. When we are speaking, in this way, we assume that this Government is a united Government and is not made up of several parts which do not cooperate with each other. I can understand his difficulty; I sympathise with him.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am glad the hon. Member sympathises. I was not leaving out any responsibility or passing it on to another colleague. I was saying there is a feeling in this House on the other side—some sections, not all—that because Britain is withdrawing from the area of South-East Asia and as Britain withdraws, India must rush to take the position that was occupied by Britain. I thought it was the entire negation of our policy. Here, we are not suggesting that one power should replace another. The whole concept by which there was a thinking that it was necessary for Britain to be present in South-East Asia is no longer valid. There was a theory that Britain's presence in India was necessary for the stability of Central Asia and of South-East Asia. Twenty years of Independence of this country, the moving away and Britain from this region has established that Britain's Presence was not necessary for the stability of this area. What matters today is not the replacement of Britain's naval power in this area but sufficient support to these countries to build up their economies in which their independence can have a real meaning to the overwhelming population of these countries. It is not going to be met by force of arms but by our policy to develop sufficient resources to resist aggression from outside.

The hon. Member accused us yesterday saying that we are suffering from an inferiority complex towards Great Britain. I could not have thought of a better example to quote his own inferiority complex towards United Kingdom to build in South-East Asia, in 1969 a naval power. What we need to build is the economies of these countries to be able to resist aggression and not to plant a few ships here and there to

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

be able to say that we also have a presence. Of course, we have a presence in Indian Ocean and we are vitally interested in the preservation of peace in Indian Ocean. But that is to be preserved by the national effort at home in developing countries and not by putting a few ships here and there.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : But your economic growth has been, more or less lowest in Asia.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : You must help us to increase that now. Many hon. Members referred to Pakistan. The hon. Member, Mr. Swell, said that there was nothing about sending our good wishes to the people of Pakistan. Only the other day, in this House, I made a statement, I have it here. If you wish, I shall have it sent to Mr. Swell. I had said very clearly, in unmistakable terms, that there has been in Pakistan widespread expression of democratic urges and the people of Pakistan have been demanding changes in the political system which would result in greater popular participation in the Government of the country. I had also said that with the people of Pakistan we have ties of history and culture and that we are close neighbours that we are naturally interested in stability, peace and progress of Pakistan and that we wish Pakistani people well.

Now, some hon. Members feel that, because as a Government, because of the limitations placed on us to function in a certain responsible manner, because we are unable to come and say many things, we do not know or feel about them. That is totally wrong. The hon. Member Mr. Sondhi mentioned to me to propound many theories, I could do so sometime, perhaps, when we are alone, if he promises not to divulge them outside. But as the Minister of External Affairs of this country, it is not possible for me to lay down, in this House, the grand design that we wish to follow. These are concepts of not only last century but of many centuries ago. What matters is not hot words exchanged here but the concrete action that is taken. And it is concrete action we have taken that has placed us in a position of importance in the comity of nations. Therefore, I would beg of the hon. members to find something new

to say about Government if they have to, but not go on.....

SHRI SWELL : I said some thing new about the possibility of 20 millions of people from East Pakistan coming over to this country irrespective of religion. Have you thought about it ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : My difficulty is this. The hon. Member has mentioned something and he has felt that perhaps we are not conscious of it. But if we are conscious of it, if we are doing something, would the hon. Member himself say that I am in a position to say something about it.

SHRI SWELL : You are thinking about it. That is alright.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Does the grand design of yours include at least allowing the sikhs to leave the Commonwealth if they want to ? If you do not want to leave, allow the sikhs to leave.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Such grand designs can be discussed in a lighter mood in the Central Hall.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : They are our citizens. The contribution of the sikhs to the national movement has second to none.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Please have patience. We shall discuss that also when the time comes.

Much has been said about Soviet arms supply to Pakistan. I thought that, on a number of occasions, we had made it quite clear that we had spoken to the Government of Soviet Union that the arms support that they are giving to Pakistan beyond the normal requirements of defence of Pakistan could only create a mood in Pakistan which could make them more intransigent, which could create more difficulties for us here. I think, we have made our point quite clear to the Soviet Union. They are aware of it.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : **

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am answerable in this House to my actions and not the actions of other Governments. If the hon. Member would suggest that I take some other action.....

SARI SWELL : Yes; on this points we can.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : When the hon. Member suggests not in my time but in his time or writes to me, I shall be very glad to go into that.

May I say that we have been rather concerned about the arms position in Pakistan. The House is aware that, in Tashkent, when Pakistan declared that it would adopt an attitude of peaceful settlement of our differences, we had accepted that Pakistan had finally come to realise that use of arms would not produce any results for them, that they could not force a decision on us by use of arms and that it would be their desire now to normalise relations and engage in a peaceful dialogue in which we could try to find solutions to some of the differences. But, unfortunately, this has not been done by Pakistan. Despite the Tashkent Declaration, they have not attempted to normalise the relations in which it would have been possible for us to engage in a meaningful dialogue. It is our hope that the Pakistan Government will realise that it is not possible for them to force a settlement on us by use of arms and that they will, sooner rather than later, agree to discuss our differences in a peaceful manner, so that we can come to their solutions. And I can assure you and the House through you that it will be our sincere effort to find the solutions with Pakistan to problems that have worried us all these years.

Much has been said about China and also that there was perhaps some change of policy or there were differences; all sorts of insinuations were made. Therefore, I would like to take a little time of the House in saying a few words about China. Today all eyes are focussed on China. Big

internal changes are taking place there which are of tremendous interest to the world outside.

The Red Guard movement, the so-called Great Cultural Revolution and the struggle for power and succession have now culminated in the holding of the 9th Party Congress. We must await the news which will trickle down and will have to be pieced together to make our assessments.

However, our policy towards China is based on certain fundamental principles which have to be applied to situations as they arise and as they affect our national interests and the interest of peace in this region.

Our policy is based on friendship and cooperation. We do not wish to interfere in the internal affairs of others.

We are for rapid changes. China is for changes too. But she wants changes by violent methods. She does not exercise the restraint of not interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. She believes in a perpetual revolution and is committed to exporting such movements to other countries.

Here is the difference. Development and progress by peaceful methods or by violent methods, interference or non-interference willing co-operation or compulsion and regimentation.

We are convinced that the people not only in our country but in all other countries are with us. In our own country we are moving forward, perhaps to slowly at times. But in China revolution after revolution has become necessary to compel people to the dictates of the governing group. Party cadres have yielded to military organisations. And yet, uncertainty surrounds the future of their methods.

We have no enmity with the people of China. We wish them well. We also do not wish to interfere in China's internal affairs. But where China violates the recognised norms of international behaviour and threatens our security or when China attempts subversion in our country, we must be ready to meet them.

*Not recorded as ordered by the Chair, vide col. 213.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

China's recent attempts to prepare some of our misguided elements for subversion in the country such as the group of hostile Nagas that went to China for training, have been effectively met by us.

The policies of China will have to change one day. China is sailing against the winds of friendship and co-operation blowing all over the world. We cannot say when this will happen, but we can say that when it does happen we shall not be found wanting in responding to it adequately.

We believe that even the present rulers of China cannot ignore the feelings for national independence specially among the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. There attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of some countries have met with stiff opposition and rebuff.

We do not wish to adopt Chinese methods even in dealing with China. We have a long frontier with China. We would like to reduce tension along this frontier. But it cannot be at the cost of our national honour, prestige and integrity.

SHRI SWELL : Are you prepared to trade with China ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We would wish a peaceful solution of any difference with any country and are prepared to discuss any matter with China, including trade the hon. Member mentioned. But we must be equally prepared to defend our borders. Large Chinese forces are poised against us along the entire length of the frontier and we must be willing to bear the burden of having adequate military preparedness to meet them.

China is also developing nuclear capability. Her aggressiveness constitutes a threat to all countries along her borders. We cannot ignore this threat and it will be our endeavour to take necessary steps in the field of defence and foreign affairs to meet these challenges. In dealing with China it is necessary for us not to get involved in small irritations or verbal duels, but should maintain our unity and strength to act, not when and where the Chinese would wish us

to, but at our time and the place of choosing.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : **

श्री दिनेश सिंह : अगर माननीय सदस्य ने ध्यान से सुना होता कि मैंने क्या कहा था, तो यह सब बातें उसमें मौजूद हैं। अगर उन्होंने सुना होता तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सवाल करने की आवश्यकता उनको न पड़ती। इस पर काफी समय खर्च किया गया है और अब और समय खर्च करना ठीक नहीं।

Many hon. Members have raised the question of Sino Soviet clash. Some of them have also accused us for not having taken a forthright position. I am sorry that there has been some kind of doubt in the minds of hon. Members that we have been deliberately silent on this matter. I do not think that is at all our position. Our position is very well-known.

As the House is aware, the Sino-Soviet border has been the scene of thousands of violations during the last few years. On March 2nd, Soviet and Chinese troops clashed over the Demaski island in the Usuri river. Another clash occurred in the same area on the 15th of March. Judging by our own experience with China, we are not surprised that the Chinese Government is adopting similar postures towards the Soviet Union, the tactics of provoking border incidents in order to reopen the whole boundary question; and these are familiar to us. Our position is quite clear. We are not in favour of altering historically-established borders. Should some grave differences arise, they should be settled peacefully by bilateral discussions. We are against the use of force to change positions unilaterally.

We welcome the latest offer of the Soviet Government to the people's Republic of China to solve this particular dispute through peaceful negotiations. Against this background we support the Soviet stand for upholding respect for historically formed frontiers and for the non-use of force for

**Not recorded as ordered by the Chair, *vide* col. 213

settling bilateral questions. We had made similar offers to China in respect of incidents at Nathu La and Cho La in September and October, 1967. But, unfortunately, the Chinese Government did not make any positive response.

Hon. Members have raised questions about Tibet. They have given the impression that Tibet was ours to give or to keep. The situation is entirely different. May I remained hon. Members. that Tibet was considered a part of China by Britain as well as the United States before India became independent? We inherited a situation which we accepted ...

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : He is misleading the House. The question of *de facto* independence was there. Otherwise how can conflict arise? It is not registered there. How can you communicate anything?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : If my hon. friend wants to discuss the question of *de facto* and *de jure* recognition, I shall be very glad to discuss it with him. The facts cannot be changed. Some Hon. Members wanted to put the blame on the Government of India saying that that we gave away Tibet, I had clearly stated that it was never ours to give away or not to give away. It was a situation which we have inherited at the time of independence. And, if the hon. Member would allow me to proceed, perhaps he will understand the whole thing.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अंग्रेजों ने क्या किया, यह कहने की क्या जरूरत है? उससे हम बंधे हुए नहीं हैं।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : असल में बात यह है कि आप बारबार यह है कि हमने तिब्बत को किसी को दे दिया। हमने किसी को तिब्बत नहीं दिया। आप इस को कहना बन्द करें और फिर जो कुछ आपको कहना हो, कहें तिब्बत के बारे में और हम भी आप से बातें कर सकते हैं।

17 hrs.

We inherited a situation which we accepted. We had however hoped, as early as

early as 1950, that China would respect the autonomy of Tibet and that the people of Tibet will be able to lead their lives free from outside interference. It was our hope that the Government of China would settle the Tibetan question peacefully. However, our hopes were belied. The Chinese sent their troops into Tibet. A Seventeen-point agreement was entered into between the Dalai-Lama and the Chinese Government in May, 1951, according to which the Tibetan region of China was assured internal autonomy. As the years went by, the Chinese Government committed large-scale repression and atrocities on the defenceless and peace-loving people of Tibet. They desecrated the monasteries and suppressed human rights. The Dalai Lama and thousands of Tibetans have taken refuge in India and we gave them asylum. It is a matter of some satisfaction to us that India has done far more for the rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees who had to leave their homes and come away than any other country in the world. We have also supported the resolution against suppression of human rights inside the United Nations. However, we are disappointed that not many other countries have even done so. We had hoped that some countries would sponsor this item last year, but none came forward. Our policy is quite clear. We are against suppression of human rights any where in the world. We shall, therefore, consider taking up this question in the United Nations. So far as the question of supporting Tibet's right to independence is concerned...

श्री एस एम बोशी : आटोनोमी के बारे में बताइये।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : आप सुनने से पहले ही चाहते हैं कि मैं सब कुछ बता दूँ। मेरे पास कोई टिकिया तो है नहीं कि मैं उनको आपके सामने एक दम से रख दूँ।

So far as the question of supporting Tibet's right to independence is concerned, it would not be proper for us to encourage this from our soil because it would amount to interference in the internal affairs of another country....(Interruptions).

SARI M. L. SONDDHI : In the case of other countries it is not interference.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Why don't you listen to the whole thing....(*Interruptions*).

We are against such interference, although China has been interfering in our internal affairs. There is no reason why we should copy their method. We are for the preservation of the rights of the Tibetan people and as I said, we shall be very glad to support any move in this direction either in the United Nations or elsewhere.

Now, various questions have been raised about Vietnam, Laos...

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : (Nandyal) The Hon. Foreign Minister has told this House that we are treating this Tibetan issue as an issue of human rights and we have been supporting this along with other nations in the United Nations. With regard to the violation of the autonomy of Tibet, he said that it is an internal matter. I want to know from the Hon. Foreign Minister how could it be an internal matter when the autonomy of Tibet has been guaranteed by China. Whereas we are given to understand that its autonomy will be preserved, it has been violated. So, how can the Foreign Minister reconcile when he says that the issue of Tibet will be an internal affair.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The Hon. Member has raised a very pertinent point and I am glad that I have this opportunity to clarify the point. Autonomy of Tibet was guaranteed to the Tibetan people by China, not to India. Therefore, it is for the Tibetan people to take up this matter.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : He is misleading the House.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We can only support them in this matter. I have said it quite clearly.

Various matters have been raised, for instance, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. I would have liked very much to go into these in some detail and explain them. If Shri Vajpayee could give me some time from his time.

SARI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : May I know what became of Simla agreement in 1914? India had certain rights in Tibet. What happened to those rights? Why was suzerainty turned into sovereignty? We called Shri Dalai Lama as a ruler of an independent State in the Asiatic Conference....

AN HON. MEMBER : These are old stories.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : All these questions are relevant to the issue and to none of these any answer has been given. In 1954 we had a Treaty in which we did not even see that the traditional Mac Mohan line was respected. Even that we did not do. Did we give up the rights that we had acquired, in favour of Tibet or in favour of China? All these questions have got to be answered.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The points raised by Acharya Kripalaniji, I recollect, are the same points that he had raised even earlier and they had been replied to in great detail from the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. If there was time, I would have gone into them now also.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Then, better drop the subject.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : So far as I am concerned, I have finished on the subject.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : He can go for a holiday, Sir.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Now, Sir, there are certain very important matters about which I would like to say a few words even when the time is short.

There is the question is our relations with countries of South-East Asia and I have mentioned about the efforts that we are making in strengthening our relations on the economic field which will bring these countries very much closer together. In this connection, may I remind the House that I had informed the House earlier that at the end of last year we had succeeded in establishing a Council of Ministers for economic development of Asia. A beginning has been made by evolving an Asian

identity on matters of economic affairs and development, which I hope will strengthen and will enable the countries of Asia to get together and to work out their future without interference from outside.

The House has been naturally very much concerned about the situation in Viet Nam. The position has been explained to the House that talks are taking place in Paris and that we might await the results of these talks. May I say that what the matter of great satisfaction to us is that along with the political settlement there is also now a possibility of evolving a programme of development in Viet Nam, which alone to our mind will strengthen their independence. Neither the presence of foreign troops nor any kind of defence arrangement can strengthen any part of Asia; the countries of Asia can be strengthened only by economic development.

In this connection, the point was made that we should rush into a military alliance with the countries in South-East Asia. This is totally unacceptable to the Government and we feel that the real strength will come only through economic association and through economic development in respective countries, which alone will create the power of resistance to foreign aggression; rushing into a military alliance will create a false and unreal sense of security and may lead to inactivity also. (*Interruptions*)

I have no time for interruptions. I would now like to refer to West Asia. The House is aware of the conflict in West Asia and we are hoping that a solution will be possible on the lines of Security Council's Resolution—242 of the 22 November 67. The representatives of four permanent members of the Security Council have been meeting in New York and it is our hope that some arrangements would emerge which could be further discussed and a solution found out.

So far as we are concerned, there are two things which are very clear in our minds. One is that the fruits of aggression cannot be permitted to be retained by any country. At the same time, Israel as an independent country has the right to exist. Many hon. Members tried to indicate that we are hostile to Israel. That is totally wrong. We are not hostile to Israel. We recognise Israel as an independent country and we have dealings with Israel as an independent country. But we have not

thought it necessary to strengthen our bilateral relations because of the peculiarity of circumstances in West Asia and our sympathy with the Arabs on this issue.

SHRI M. L. SONDDHI : This is a fundamental point, Sir, if they want to play the role of a mediator on both the sides.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Every point is fundamental, but Shri Vajpayee is pressing for his time. What can I do ?

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : He might continue tomorrow.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I should, therefore, like to make it clear that we have no animosity towards Israel. At the same time, our sympathy is with the Arab countries, because we feel that they have been wronged. We have given every possible support to them in their struggle to strengthen their countries and preserve their national interests.

There is the question of not breaking with the Commonwealth. An impression has been given that the Commonwealth belongs to Britain and we are just a member of it to lend support to the UK. Nothing could be further removed from the truth than this thought. The hon. member would turn his mind back and think of the emergence of the new Commonwealth after the independence of the countries which were formerly colonies of the UK. This was an association, of free nations, a multinational multi-racial association, and we felt that such an association would bring benefit to the different member countries which were trying to build up their independence. There is nothing sacrosanct about the Commonwealth. The moment we feel that it is not in our national interest to stay on in the Commonwealth, we shall not hesitate to come out.

But the point the hon. member is missing is that it is not India which is weakening the Commonwealth; it is the action of the UK which is weakening the Commonwealth today. Because of the UK's own effort to look European, to move from the Commonwealth association towards a European association, they have been weakening it.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

It is not we who are in anyway doing that. We shall continue to be there.

SHRI RABI RAY (Puri) : We are humiliated.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : As I mentioned, there are certain groups of people who are in favour of liquidation. We are not in favour of liquidation (*Interruptions*). We are in favour of a useful association (*Interruptions*). Therefore, it will be our effort to try to work in the Commonwealth so long as it is compatible with our interests and our principles ; when it is not, hon. members will not have to remind me to come out of it.

Sardar Amar Singh Saigal had raised the question of the Sikh community in UK. With your permission, I would like to make a brief statement.

I should like to make it clear that we uphold the right of the Sikhs to maintain their religious practices according to their faith. I find the Wolverhampton Corporation is now the only local body in the UK which refused to allow Sikh bus conductors and drivers to wear turbans on duty. All other transport undertakings have agreed to allow Sikhs in their employment to wear turbans and keep beards. The British Government has also permitted them to do so while serving in their armed forces.

Our High Commission in London as well as the local Sikh leaders have taken up this matter of the Wolverhampton Corporation with the concerned officials of the Transport Workers' Union. The High Commissioner personally visited Wolverhampton. This matter was also raised by our High Commission with the British Government, and the Minister concerned wrote to the Cooperation recommending reconsideration of the decision. The Corporation has, however, remained adamant. We have informed the British High Commission here that we feel action should be taken as speedily as possible to remove the ban.

Bus transport in England was nationalised very recently (1st April 1969) and Regional Transport Authorities have come into existence on that date. The Wolverhampton transport system will come under the

management of the West Midland Regional Transport Authority. It will have an executive committee which is yet to start functioning. The British Government are in touch with this Authority. They are hoping to get the ban removed.

A delegation of representatives of the Akali Dal and the Gurudwara Prabhandhak Committee called on the British High Commissioner on 6th April, 1969. Officials of the British High Commission had explained to the delegation the effort that the British Government were making in this regard, and appealed to the delegation to request Mr. Jolly not to carry out his threat of self-immolation. According to the High Commissioner, the delegation appreciated the High Commission's appeal for avoiding extreme and rash acts which would only serve to inflame feelings making the solution more difficult. The delegation it is said, agreed to write to Shri Jolly about this matter.

The High Commissioner stressed the need to give more time to the British Government for resolving this issue. While it is the responsibility of the British Government to see that people in U.K. are permitted to practice their religion without let or hindrance, it is our hope that this matter will be resolved without further delay.

A delegation of Gurudwara Prabhandhak Committee met our Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs this morning. The Deputy Minister assured them that the Government of India fully sympathise with the feelings of the Sikh community in this matter and will continue to pursue this matter with the U.K. Government.

DR. RANEN SEN : What about recognition of G.D.R. ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Send a Sikh in place of Mr. Dhavan as High Commissioner to London.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Some hon. members raised the question of recognition of the German Democratic Republic. The House is aware of our growing trade relations with the German Democratic Republic

and we are very happy that our trade and commercial relations have now reached a stage when we feel it will be in our interest to establish an office on the German Democratic Republic an office which will be able to.....

श्री रवि राय : मान्यता के बारे में सवाल है ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : आप अगर सुनने की कोशिश करें तो सभी चीजों का जवाब आयेगा ।

The House is aware that we have in this country a representative of the German Democratic Republic as their trade representative. It is our intention to establish at a similar level a trade representation in the German Democratic Republic. (*Inter-ruptions*). Everybody is conditioned to his own reactions. If one is afraid, one thinks that others are also afraid.

Sir, almost a quarter of a century has gone by since the end of the Second World War. The arrangements made under the shadow of events immediately following the global conflict are no longer valid. Defence arrangements, power blocks, ideological associations have all undergone transformation. Old rigidities are gone. New patterns are emerging. Ideologies have not been able to submerge national interests. Narrow economic considerations have not given way to wider cooperation.

We are conscious of these charges, for they affect us constantly. We prepare ourselves to meet new situations as they arise. We cannot remain hide-bound. Ours must be a pragmatic approach taking into consideration our national interests and the interests of the world community as a whole.

It is against this background that the House has to assess our policies and achievements.

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

The cut motions were put and negated

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : 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, 1970, in respect of heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 12 and 13 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs and other Revenue Expenditure of 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. 12—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,54,73,000/- 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, 1970, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,86,07,000/- 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, 1970, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."