

या, लेकिन घटना के तीन दिन के बाद उन का वर्णन आ रहा है। यह तो कुकिंग अप हो रहा है।

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पूना) : अगर उस को मुअनिल या ट्रामफर कर दिया जाय, तो वह प्रेस में अपनी बात कह सकता है। लेकिन अपने पद पर बने रह कर उस को इस तरह के वक्तव्य देने का क्या अधिकार है ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I would like to make one point very clear. You have raised the question of the officers who were directly concerned with the lathi charge etc. I think the District Magistrate is not directly concerned with lathi charge. He is not. So, on the question of the transfer of the officers who are directly concerned with the lathi charge, who gave orders of lathi charge etc. I have told you that I will look into this matter. I am looking into this matter.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : How long will you take? In the mean while, the officers may commit mischief.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I can understand the worry and anxiety of the hon. Members in this matter. But as long as the judge who will be asked to look into this matter will be an objective serving High Court Judge and I do not think we should have any reason to suspect anything.

MR. SPEAKER: So far as the motion of privilege and the letter the about somebody lobbying for the Prime Minister are concerned, they came to me only this morning.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : What about our privilege motion ?

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot give any ruling on it. They came to me while I was sitting here. Every paper comes to me while I am sitting here.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : What about my privilege motion which I gave yesterday ?

MR. SPEAKER: There could not be two motions at one and the same time.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: That is why I am asking about it today. I gave notice yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not accept it.

13.21 Hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
NOTIFICATION REG. MANAGEMENT OF THE
BENGAL NAGPUR COTTON MILLS AND
ANNUAL REPORT OF TEA BOARD

बंदेशिक व्यापार मंत्रालय में उप-मंत्री (श्री राम सेवक) : मैं निम्नलिखित पत्र सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ—

(1) उद्योग (विकास तथा विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1951 की धारा 18-क की उप-धारा (2) के अन्तर्गत बंगाल नागपुर काटन मिल्स लिमिटेड, राजनन्दगांव, के प्रबन्ध के बारे में अधिसूचना संख्या एस० ओ० 1098 (हिन्दी तथा अंग्रेजी संस्करण) की एक प्रति, जो दिनांक 17 मार्च, 1970 के भारत के राज-पत्र में प्रकाशित हुई थी। [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3129/70]

(2) वर्ष 1968-69 के लिए चाय बोर्ड के वार्षिक प्रशासनिक प्रतिवेदन की एक प्रति। [Placed in Library See. No. LT-3130/70]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
NINTH-FIFTY REPORT

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सीमा-शुल्क तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पादन-शुल्क से सम्बद्ध लोक लेखा समिति के 72 वें प्रतिवेदन में दर्ज सिफारिशों पर सरकार द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के बारे में समिति का 95 वां प्रतिवेदन प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

13.22 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch: third minutes past fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at thirty four minutes past Fourteen of Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]
*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1970-71—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.
MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri S. M. Joshi.

The Minister will reply roundabout 4 O'Clock.

*Moved with the recommendation of this president.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पूना) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, सदन के सामने विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगों के लिए जो प्रस्ताव है उसके बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारी जो विदेश नीति है उसको ले करके अभी तक सब वक्ताओं ने बहुत कुछ कहा है। परन्तु मैं एक बात ज्यादा कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो वास्तविकता है उसको हम लोग नजरान्दाज न करें। जहाँतक हमारी गैर-जानिवदारी, तटस्थता की नीति का सम्बन्ध है, उसको भी बहुत सारे लोगों ने उसूलन मान लिया है। मैं बहुत ही गौर से सुन रहा था, लोग तो यह कहते थे कि आपकी तटस्थता की नीति से हमें कोई विरोध नहीं है लेकिन यह तटस्थता की नीति सही मायनों में तटस्थता की नीति नहीं है। मुझे यह कहना है और मुझे खुशी है कि लोगों ने इस चीज को मान लिया है कि उस नीति में सिद्धान्ततः कोई दोष नहीं है लेकिन उनका कहना है कि आप इस तरफ लीनिंग कर रहे हो। मैं कहूंगा कि यह नीति कोई आज की नहीं बनी है। जब हम आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ते थे तभी से यह नीति चल रही है। मुझे याद है कि हमारे नेता डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया, ए० आई० सी० सी० की जो फारेन अफेयर्स कमिटी हुआ करती थी, उसमें वे काम करते थे, उन दिनों से यह नीति चल रही है। उन दिनों हम लोग खुद अपने को आजाद करने की कोशिश करते थे, साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ हमारी लड़ाई थी, साम्राज्यवाद की तरफ से और मुल्कों पर अपना क्लेम बनाते हुए जो हमले होते थे और उन मुल्कों की तरफ से जो आजादी की लड़ाई चलती थी उसमें हम न सिर्फ सहानुभूति ही देते थे बल्कि जहाँतक हो सकता था, हम उनकी मदद भी करने की कोशिश करते थे। उसके बाद जब हम आजाद हो गए तो यही नीति चली : वैसे तो हम लोगों को समझ लेना चाहिए कि मानवता का एक तकाजा है—वह तकाजा कभी कभी जोर पकड़ता है और कभी कमजोर पड़ जाता है—जब एक महायुद्ध हो जाता है तो दुनिया के लोग सोचने लगते हैं कि युद्ध अच्छा नहीं है और फिर युद्ध को रोकने

के लिये कुछ न कुछ तरीके ढूँढ़े जाते हैं। पहला महायुद्ध खत्म हुआ तब यही प्रेसीडेंट विलसन ने कहा :

we have to make the world safe for democracy.

फिर लीग आफ नेशन्स बनी जोकि कुछ दिनों के लिए चली। उसके बाद फिर आपस की लड़ाई और ननाव शुरू हो गया और आगे चलकर फिर दूसरा महायुद्ध हुआ। दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद रुजवेल्ट जैसे बड़े लोगों ने यह कहा कि दुनिया में फिर से लड़ाई नहीं होनी चाहिए। हितलर ने कहा था कि मेरी जीत हो जाये तो एक हजार साल के लिए दुनिया को शांत कर दूंगा लेकिन उसके बाद वह जीत नहीं पाया, डिमोक्रेसी को ही जीत मिली। फिर लोगों ने सोचा कि अब-युद्ध नहीं होना चाहिए, और हम भी समझते थे कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स आर्गनाइजेशन के द्वारा कोई ठोस कदम उठाया जायेगा, परन्तु आहिस्ता आहिस्ता दुनिया का बटवारा फिर पावर गुटों में हो गया—एक तरफ एक पावर का गुट रहा और दूसरी तरफ दूसरी पावर का गुट रहा। ऐसी हालत में जब हम आजाद हो गए तो यह सवाल पँटा हुआ कि हमारी क्या नीति होनी चाहिये—हम इस गुट में जायें या उस गुट में जायें और क्या उससे दुनिया में शांति हो सकती है तो हम लोगों ने कह दिया कि हम गुटनिर्पक्षता की नीति को अपनायेंगे यानी हम किसी भी गुट में नहीं जायेंगे। हम लोगों का खयाल था कि गुट-निर्पक्षता के माने यह नहीं है कि हम कोई वाइलेट्रल एग्रीमन्ट नहीं करेंगे लेकिन जो ब्लाक बनते हैं उनमें से किसी भी ब्लाक में हम नहीं जायेंगे। इसके अलावा जो छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र हैं उनके लिए और दूसरी नीति भी क्या हो सकती है ? जैसे यूगोस्लाविया, सीलोन और बर्मा हैं, वे बड़े बड़े राक्षसों का सामना कैसे कर सकते हैं ? उनकी अपनी जो आइडेंटिटी और प्रतिभा है उसके अनुसार वे अपना विकास कैसे कर सकते हैं ? यह तभी सम्भव है जबकि दुनिया में अमन कायम रहे और उसी को कायम रखने के लिए हमने गुटनिर्पक्षता की नीति को अपनाया। लेकिन सबाल यह है कि हमारी यह गुट

निर्पक्षता की नीति कहां तक चली ? जब तिब्बत का मामला आया तो हमारी गुटनिर्पक्षता की नीति में जरा अन्तर पड़ गया । वैसे तो हमारे नेता डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने उसी वक्त कहा था कि तिब्बत के ऊपर चाइना की सूज़रेन्टी को हमने कबूल कर लिया, यह एक बड़ा खतरा हो गया और आखिर में वह चीज नहीं बनी । आहिस्ता आहिस्ता आप जानते हैं कि सन् 1962 में हमारे ऊपर चीन के द्वारा हमला हुआ । और हम के दौरान हम लोग समझते थे, शायद पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू भी समझते थे, जब जनरल अयूब खान ने यह कहा कि हम डिफेंस पैक्ट करें । तब पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने पूछा था डिफेंस किम के खिलाफ ? कौन अटैक करेगा ? और उस वक्त ऐसा खयाल था कि चीन वाले, हम वाले हमारे साथी हैं, हम एक ही गुट के हैं, समाजवादी हैं । लेकिन चीन के हमले के बाद पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कहा कि I was living in an unreal world. उन्होंने ने अपनी पोलिसी को तबदील किया । तब से कुछ नया दौर शुरू हो गया । जब हम लोग यहां बात करते हैं, और कभी कभी मुझे हंसी आती है कि हम लोग कितनी लम्बी चौड़ी बातें करते हैं, हमारी शक्ति आज क्या है ? 1962 में चीन के हमले से पूर्व हमारी दुनिया में जो इज्जत थी क्या वही इज्जत आज है ? नहीं है । कारण क्या है ? कारण यह है कि हम लोगों ने, इनने दिनों में जो तरक्की करनी चाहिये थी, वह नहीं कर पाये, इसलिये वास्तविकता को हमें मान लेना चाहिये । इसलिये जब यह वास्तविकता है तो डींग मारने से क्या फायदा । मैं ने कई लोगों को आज ही सुना जब यह बताया गया कि सोवियट रूस ने पाकिस्तान को टैंक दिये । सोवियट यूनिन, जो हमारा मित्र है उस ने आखिर क्यों हाथियार पाकिस्तान को दिये ? हम को सोचना पड़ेगा कि क्या वज्रह है जो उस ने पाकिस्तान को मिलिटरी सहायता दी । हम को देखना चाहिये कि सोवियट वालों को भी अपनी नेशनल और इंटरनेशनल पोलिसी है । हम किसी गुट में नहीं हैं, तो भी हम वाले अपनी नीति चलाते हैं । जैसे यहां चर्चा

चल रही है, प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि वहां वैकुअम नहीं होगा । मगर न कहने से होता क्या है ? जब अमरीका वाले बिद्वा करेंगे तो वैकुअम तो होगा ही । हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि वैकुअम नहीं होगा । हम को उस वैकुअम को भरना चाहिये । और अगर नहीं भरेंगे तो दूसरा अवश्य भरेगा और भर रहा है । इसलिये छोटे छोटे राष्ट्रों की हिफाजत करने के लिये हम में अगर ताकत होती तो यह चीज हम सोचने की वैकुअम को भरा जाय । मगर वास्तविकता यह है कि आज हम में वह ताकत नहीं है । और रूस वाले सोचते हैं कि जब अमरीका वाले निकल जायेंगे तो यहां कौन रहेगा ? क्यों कि चीन का झगड़ा उन के साथ बढ़ रहा है । इसलिये वाइलेटरली वह आप के साथ और पाकिस्तान के साथ भी बातचीत करेंगे । आज बड़े शिखर वालों की नीति चल रही है कि नीचे झगड़ा न हो । आज अमरीका और रूस वाले नज़दीक आ रहे हैं । इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि हम को वास्तविकता को नहीं भूलना चाहिये ।

हुकूमत को बार बार कहा जाता है, माननीय स्वर्ण सिंह से हम से लड़ाई चलती है मजदूरों के क्षेत्र में, मगर जब बार बार पूछा जाता है कि उतना सामान उन के पास है और आप की स्थिति क्या है, तो मंत्री महोदय कहेंगे कि हम तैयार हैं लड़ने के लिये । न भी हो तो भी उन को कहना पड़ेगा । कैसे कहेंगे कि हम तैयार नहीं हैं । तो मुझे एक मुझाब देना है कि यह जो हमारा फ़ौरेन अफ़ेयर्स का मामला है उस में आप की कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी की चीज नहीं चलनी चाहिये । हम समझते हैं कि आप को नेताओं की एक कमेटी बनानी चाहिये जिस में जो ऐसी बातें हैं, जिन की चर्चा मदन में नहीं होनी चाहिये, उन के बारे में आप उन से विचार विमर्श करें । जैसे कि ताशकन्द ऐग्रीमेंट है, यहां कहा जाता है ताशकन्द स्पिरिट का पालन कराया जाय । मगर ताशकन्द स्पिरिट हम क्यों दोहराते हैं ? मैं भी ताशकन्द ऐग्रीमेंट का समर्थक था, और आज भी समझता हूँ कि नीति की दृष्टि से उस का समर्थन करना चाहिये । कारण क्या है ? कारण यह है कि आप जानते

[श्री एस० एम० जोशी]

हैं कि घरेलू मामलों में हमारी स्थिति क्या है ? जैसे कि हमारे डिप्टी मिनिस्टर ने बताया कि हमारी डोमेस्टिक स्थिति का रिफ्लेक्शन क्रौरेन में रहेगा । आज हमारी स्थिति आहिस्ता आहिस्ता सुधर जाय तो अच्छा है । लेकिन अगर सुधरेगी नहीं तब हमारी क्या स्थिति होगी, इसकी कल्पना आप स्वयं कर सकते हैं । जब घरेलू मामलों को ठीक करते हैं तो विदेशी मामलों पर भी उस का असर पड़ना स्वाभाविक है, क्यों कि उस का ताल्लुक विदेशी मामलों से भी रहता है । जैसे कश्मीर का मामला है । कश्मीर वाले कहते हैं कि हमारे साथ न्याय नहीं हो रहा है । और इसलिये वह कहते हैं कि हम लोगों को चाहिये कि पूरे भारत में शांति रहे और जब शान्ति होगी तभी लोगों को ऐह-साम होगा कि पाकिस्तान वाले हम पर हमला नहीं करेंगे । लेकिन अगर उन को डर है, देश की आन्तरिक स्थिति को देखते हुए, तो आप को शिकायत करने का कोई मौका नहीं है । इसलिये हम को कहना होगा कि तुम को हम शान्ति देने की कोशिश करेंगे । लेकिन शान्ति कैसे देंगे जब पाकिस्तान हम से लड़ने के लिये तैयार है ? ऐसी हालत में शान्ति कैसे रहेगी ? पाकिस्तान के साथ जब हम बातचीत की पहल करते हैं तो कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि यह हमारा डरपोकपन है । मैं इस को नहीं मानता । हम को लोगों को बताना होगा कि हम तो बात-चीत में पहल करना चाहते हैं, और करते भी हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान नहीं करना चाहता । तो हम को वास्तविकता के खयाल से अपनी तैयारी रखनी चाहिये । अगर हम पर कोई हमला करता है तो अपनी तैयारी पूरी करनी चाहिये । लड़ने की नौबत आती है तो जरूर लड़ेंगे । मगर शान्ति के लिये भी हमारी दूरगाम, कोशिश और नीति होनी चाहिये । लेकिन नज़दीक के लिये हम को व्यवहार भी देखना पड़ेगा, और व्यवहार की दृष्टि से, वास्तविकता का खयाल रखते हुए, हम अगर कोशिश करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उस से हम को लाभ होने वाला । मैं विदेश मंत्री से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि,

वहाँ चाहे श्री अयूब की सरकार हो या जनरल यहिया खां की हो, हमारा वास्ता वहाँ की जनता से है । पीपुल टु पीपुल हम लोगों के ताल्लुकात अच्छे होने चाहिये और इस के लिये पूरी कोशिश होनी चाहिये । जैसे खान अब्दुल गफ़्फ़ार खां आये, कई लोग कहते हैं कि उन से क्या फायदा हुआ ? लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि फायदा हुआ, और वह यह कि कम से कम पाकिस्तान में जा कर वह बतलायेंगे कि हमारी दृष्टि रखने वाले भी भारत में कार्रवाई हैं । इसलिये हमारी कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान के लोगों के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे बनें ।

इस देश में पूरा काम करने के लिये, जैसा मैं ने मुझाव रखा, अगर आप कोई पैनल बनायेंगे तो उस से भी फायदा हो सकता है ।

आप ने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया इस के लिये आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ ।

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Sir, this report is a departure from the ones in the previous years. This report indicates the attitude and approach of the Government to certain basic problems. What is the analysis made with regard to basic problems ? The analysis is made in a veiled manner and the confusions that confront this ministry are niden. For example, from this report you will find that a number of visits were made by foreign dignitaries. There were about 43 such visits. On page 34 of this report it is stated:

"Our extremely friendly relations with Bhutan were highlighted by the visit of the Royal Mothers of Bhutan...".

These visits by foreign dignitaries to our country were about 42 in the last year. This report may not indicate how and from where does this friendship come from. This is a fact. Whatever that may be, there is a basic confusion in the Ministry. And Shri Dinesh Singh who presides over this vast empire of this ministry does not take any interest in the working of it for he knows that he is going to be eased out of this office after the budget session of Parliament. He knows that.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAJEE (Balrampur) : How do you know this ?

SHRI HEM BARUA : I know it. I also know how this delegation to the Conference at Rabat was constituted. And everybody knows it. Behind his back that was constituted and it is everybody's knowledge. Everybody knows who telephoned whom in the ministry and who went from pillar to post in the embassies of the countries in Delhi wanting invitations for India to attend that Conference. That is everybody's knowledge and I do not want to dilate on that.

Then, Sir, we have our Ambassador in Moscow. Moscow is one of the most expensive Embassies. But what about the ambassador there? He spends most of his time in Srinagar taking interest in the political developments in his State rather than in his post in Moscow. Who foots the bill for his journeys to Srinagar and back to Moscow? The point is that at this critical time of history, we want our ambassadors at their posts. If they are absent from their posts, there are difficulties no doubt.

I have already said that Shri Dinesh Singh is not taking any interest in the working of his Ministry. Ambassadors are appointed over his head. Except for three rooms in the Vigyan Bhavan Annexe, Jawaharlal Nehru University does not exist. It is still in embryo. But you have a Vice-Chancellor there all right. He is a retired official of the Ministry of External Affairs who goes on advising the Prime Minister unofficially over the head of Shri Dinesh Singh. He is able to do it because he has no work as Vice-Chancellor of a University in its embryonic stage.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandi, wash) : Better utilisation of capacity.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Yes.

In the report, there is a reference to Vietnam. It is a major issue that confronts not only this country but the world as such. In this report, there is no elaborate analysis of the attitude of Government towards the Vietnam problem. When the Paris talks took place, prospects of a solution for the Vietnam situation seemed to brighten up. But with the collapse of the talks, the war has escalated into Vietnam again. Should India be a silent spectator of this ugly scene? Why cannot India ask for the withdrawal of all foreign troops and armies from there, whether American or Chinese?

We are going to raise the level of our diplomatic representation in Hanoi to that of ambassador. But there is opposition from South Vietnam, because there are 4,000 Indians living in South Vietnam whereas Indians living in North Vietnam can be counted on one's fingers. This is what is happening.

About the Plain of Jars, the Russians have said that the Americans should stop bombing it. At the same time, they should also have said that there should be withdrawal of all foreign troops from there. But that they have not said. Why cannot India say it? We must be able to.

The conquest of the Moon has brought certain hopes in the mind of man. But I would say that it has only narrowed the gap between the earth and the moon; it has not affected the political thinking of the world.

About Cambodia, whether it is right or left, whoever is in power there, whether it is a people's regime or not, we have to analyse it. If it is a people's regime there, we have to support it. Prince Sihanouk has lost his seat even in his homeland and is cooling his heels in Peking. Let him. He is a Prince and can afford to go about the world and cool his limbs anywhere he likes.—Shri Dinesh Singh can also do that, because he too is a prince.

The report says that there is no doctrinaire approach in our foreign policy. That is a good thing. At the same time, our foreign policy must not also suffer from any emotional or psychological bias towards this or that bloc. If American intervention in Vietnam is reprehensible, which it is, the rape of Czechoslovakia by Russia and the other Warsaw Pact countries is equally condemnable. But what happens? We condemn the one and condone the other. This bespeaks of an emotional bias in our foreign policy. Our foreign policy should really be non-aligned and neutral. This is what I feel. There is an atmosphere of racial violence in Rhodesia. Whoever is opposed to Mr. Ian Smith's illegal regime in Rhodesia is hanged. It is no use saying in the abstract that we are opposed to racial discrimination; we must do something so that the world is rid of this racial discrimination. What about Prime Minister Harold Wilson? Cannot he tell Rhodesia: if you do not liquidate yourself, we are going to apply physical force? Cannot our Prime Minister say to Mr. Wilson: If you do not apply physical force to bring down the

[Shri Hem Barua]

illegal regime in Rhodesia, we are going to walk out of the Commonwealth. What is there in the Commonwealth and how is India gaining by association with the Commonwealth? There is nothing common in it; even the wealth is not common. What have we gained by our association with the Commonwealth? The report expresses a noble sentiment here when it says that the victor must not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of aggression. This is in relation to Arab-Israeli conflict. At the same time, what about the fruits of aggression enjoyed by China and Pakistan? China has occupied 14,500 sq. miles of our precious territory and we have allowed China to enjoy the fruits of aggression whereas we want fruits of aggression to be liquidated in other places? This is double thinking in foreign policy and this is not going to pay. When our interests are involved I do not want India to look on as an umpire in a cricket match. India should take interest when her own interests are involved. The foreign policy must be part and parcel of our national interests. That is what Shri Surendra Pal Singh also said yesterday. It is a very good idea.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI HEM BARUA: About the Chinese, we know how intransigent they are. They are feeding the Naga hostiles with arms and ammunitions. The captured general Mau and his cohorts returned from China with arms and ammunitions from China.

It only goes to confirm what I have said. It is a confirmation of this fact. I do not want to dilate on this for a long time; because there is no time. China has built a military road connecting Sinkiang with Gilgit in Pakistan occupied Kashmir. China has also built another military road across Aksai China area connecting Ladakh. Now it has become very easy for Pakistan to attack India in a pincer movement because of these two roads.

Pakistan is also intransigent. I do not want to dilate on that. There are many things to be said. We have been very kind to Pakistan. Over and above the fact that we have given our dues to Pakistan according to the Indus Water Treaty, we are ready to give 2 million acre feet of water to Pakistan. What do we get in return—blows, ingratitude. There are persons in this country who think that once the

Kashmir problem is solved, there will be a rainbow of peace reaching from the Pakistani sky to the Indian sky. Even if Kashmir is offered to Pakistan wrapped up like an Easter egg, Pakistani hunger would not come to an end; it will continue.

There are persons who say that the Tashkent Declaration has opened a new chapter of peaceful relations between these two countries. We have been implementing the provisions of the Tashkent agreements with all faith and caution and in minute details. Pakistan has been violating it. Whenever we bring this to the notice of Mr. Kosygin who presided over that conference, there is no reply from him. Can there be unilateral implementation of a bilateral agreement which the Tashkent agreement is. We are unilaterally implementing it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI HEM BARUA: I sit down; I had a few more things to say.

15 hrs.

श्री चन्द्रजित यादव (आजमगढ़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी विदेश नीति के ऊपर जब कभी भी इस सदन में चर्चा होती है तो मुख्य रूप से दो तीन विषयों के इर्दगिर्द सारी चर्चा घूमती रहती है। पहली बात तो यह कि हमारी तटस्थता की नीति कहां तक सही मानों में तटस्थता की नीति है, दूसरी बात यह कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति में अपने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ या, ऐसे देशों के साथ, जिन के साथ हमारे मंत्री और सहयोग के सम्बन्ध रहे हैं, कहां तक पहल ले कर उस को और आगे मजबूत बनाते हैं, तीसरी बात यह कि हमारा सम्बन्ध विशेष रूप से पाकिस्तान और चीन के प्रति किस प्रकार का है और उस में हमारी सरकार की नीति कहां तक सफल या असफल है।

मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि इस वर्ष विदेश नीति की चर्चा में मुख्य रूप से चारों तरफ से सदन में इस बात को महसूस किया गया है कि भारत सरकार को निरन्तर इस बात का प्रयास करना चाहिये कि हमारे जो पड़ोसी देश हैं उन के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हों, ज्यादा मजबूत

वर्षों और भविष्य में उन के और हमारे बीच में ज्यादा सहयोग बढ़े। मुझे इस बात की भी खुशी है कि पिछले एक या डेढ़ साल में विशेष रूप से भारत सरकार ने इस बात का प्रयास किया कि जो हमारे एशिया के पड़ोसी मित्र हैं उन के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध निरन्तर अच्छे बनते जायें आज भले ही इस बात की आलोचना की जाय कि नेपाल एक छोटा सा देश है, और हम ने उस को क्यों इतना महत्व दिया। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सही है कि चाहे देश छोटा हो या बड़ा हो, हम ने सिद्धान्त रूप से इस बात को स्वीकार किया है दुनिया में कि दुनिया का कोई देश अपनी जन-संख्या और अपने क्षेत्र के आधार पर छोटा या बड़ा नहीं समझा जाना चाहिये। दुनिया के हर देश का जो प्रभु सत्ता सम्पन्न है, बराबरी का महत्व है और उस देश के साथ हम दोस्ती और मैत्री का सम्बन्ध रखना चाहते हैं। हम ने अपनी यही नीति छोटे नेपाल के साथ अपनाई है, उस के साथ हम अपने संबंध अच्छे बनाना चाहते हैं, लंका के साथ हम अपने संबंध अच्छे बनाना चाहते हैं, भूटान के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध को और अधिक सुदृढ़ बनाना चाहते हैं, बर्मा और दूसरे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हम अपने सम्बन्ध को बेहतर बनाना चाहते हैं। निरन्तर यह बात हमारे ध्यान में रहती है कि देश चाहे जितना भी छोटा हो, हमारा पड़ोसी देश है और उस का अपना महत्व है, उस के साथ हम बराबरी का और मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध निरन्तर कायम रखना चाहते हैं। इस बात की ओर जो हमारा प्रयास विशेष रूप से दो दस साल में रहा है वह सराहनीय है।

दूसरी बात जो विशेष रूप से चर्चा का विषय बनी है वह है पाकिस्तान और चीन के साथ सम्बन्ध जो हमारे लिये चिन्ता का कारण बने हुए हैं। हमारी सरकार ने निरन्तर इस बात को कहा है कि हमें इस बात का दुःख है कि चीन के साथ हम ने मैत्री का सम्बन्ध स्थापित किया, हम ने इस महत्व को समझा की चीन के साथ हमारे ऐतिहासिक सम्बन्ध हैं, चीन हमारा पड़ोसी

मित्र है, चीन की विश्व में अपनी महत्वपूर्ण राजनीतिक भूमिका हो सकती है और इस लिये हम ने उस के साथ शुरू से मैत्री सम्बन्ध बनाने की कोशिश की, लेकिन चीन का जो मौजूदा नेतृत्व है उस ने एक गलत पृष्ठभूमि में अपनी राजनीति को शुरू किया। उस ने भारत के साथ अमैत्री की नीति अख्यार की, उस ने हमारे देश के ऊपर आक्रमण किया और आज भी हमारे देश की भूमि का एक अंग चीन के अधिकार में है। लेकिन इस के बावजूद भी हम ने यह नहीं कहा कि हम चीन के साथ कोई मैत्री सम्बन्ध नहीं रखना चाहते हैं या चीन के साथ हम बात चीत नहीं करना चाहते हैं। इस बारे में भी हमारा एक सैद्धान्तिक स्टैण्ड शुरू से रहा है कि अगर दो देशों के बीच में कोई सरहद का झगड़ा हो या किसी प्रकार का और कोई झगड़ा हो तो उस को हम बात चीत के जरिये शांतिपूर्ण तरीके में हल करना चाहते हैं। आज भी चीन के सम्बन्ध में हमारी यही नीति है। प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री ने निरन्तर इस बात को कहा है कि हमारे दरवाजे खुले हुए हैं, अगर चीन का नेतृत्व हम से बात करना चाहता है, तो हम इस का स्वागत करते हैं। लेकिन हमें दुःख है कि चीन ने इस तरह का कोई प्रयोजन अब तक नहीं दिया है, चीन का रख इस सम्बन्ध में अच्छा नहीं रहा है। मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि श्री अशोक मेहता ने इस बात को विशेष रूप से महत्व दिया है। मैं जानना हूँ कि चीन और हिन्दुस्तान जैसे बड़े देश, जिन की आबादी इतनी बड़ी है, एशिया और अफ्रीका के देशों में बहुत बड़ी भूमिका अदा कर सकते हैं। हम सदैव दुश्मन बन कर नहीं रह सकते हैं। लगातार इस बात पर इस सदन में जोर दिया गया है यह स्वागत की बात है और मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत सरकार इस सदन की इस राय को जानने के बाद इस सम्बन्ध में और अधिक प्रभावशाली कदम उठायेगी। अगर चीन हमारे इस कदम को उठाने के बाद भी इस तरह की बात करता है तो चीन की निन्दा दुनिया के अन्दर होगी।

[श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव]

चीन की अलगाव नीति से अशांति फलेंगी लेकिन हमें कोई दोषी नहीं ठहरायेगा ।

हम ने निरन्तर इस बात की कोशिश की है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हों । अभी श्री जोशी ने सही बात कही कि जब तक जो हमारा पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान है उस के साथ शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से मसले हल नहीं हो जाते हमारे देश की काश्मीर समस्या संसार का ध्यान खींचती रहेगी । हमें इस बात की आशा है कि इस बारे में भी सरकार ने जो कदम उठाये हैं उन से पाकिस्तान का नेतृत्व भी वास्तविकता को पहचानेगा । पाकिस्तान का नेतृत्व भी इस बात को समझेगा कि भारत जैसे विशाल पड़ोसी देशों के साथ सदैव शत्रुतापूर्ण व्यवहार रख कर पाकिस्तान अपने राष्ट्र और अपनी जनता का भविष्य अच्छा नहीं बना सकता । मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरफ और बड़े तथा सुदृढ़ कदम उठाये जायेंगे ।

इस के बाद जिस बात की तरफ मैं सरकार का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि पूर्व एशिया और दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया के कुछ देशों में इस समय जो घटनायें हो रही हैं वह बड़ी चिन्ताजनक हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि संसार में तीन ऐसे स्थान हैं जो विश्वयुद्ध का कारण बन सकते हैं । इस समय कम्बोडिया में जो कुछ हो रहा है, वियटनाम में जो कुछ हो रहा है या लाओस में जो कुछ हो रहा है उस को देखते हुए कहा जा सकता है कि यह ऐसा क्षेत्र है जो एक्सप्लोसिव बन गया है सारे संसार की राजनीति में । मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत सरकार को इस ओर मजबूती से कदम उठाना चाहिये ।

भारत सरकार ने रूस द्वारा प्रस्तावित एशिया की कलेक्टिव सिक्योरिटी और एकानमिक कोआपरेशन की बात का स्वागत किया है । मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में और ज्यादा दिलचस्पी लेने की ज़रूरत है । अगर योरोपियन सिक्योरिटी के लिये फ्रिनलैंड जैसा छोटा देश योरोप के तमाम देशों का सम्मेलन निमन्त्रित

कर सकता है और उस पर विचार कर सकता है तथा उस के महत्व को सारे योरोप के देशों को बतला सकता है तो क्या केवल भारत जैसे विशाल देश के, जिस का दुनिया में स्थान है, उस का स्वागत करने से काम नहीं चलेगा ? मेरा सरकार को सुझाव है कि भारत को सारे एशिया के देशों का एक सम्मेलन दिल्ली के अन्दर बुलाना चाहिये जो इस समय दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया में जो स्थिति पैदा हो रही है उस पर विचार करे और निश्चित रूप से घोषणा कर के कहे कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ अपनी 25वीं सालगिरह के अवसर पर, जिस के लिये प्रधान मंत्री ने वहाँ जा कर कहा था कि सारे संसार में यह शांति का साल मनाया जाना चाहिये, सारी दुनिया के देश संयुक्त राष्ट्र के माध्यम से घोषणा करें कि दुनिया के किसी भी देश की फौज दूसरे देश में नहीं रहेगी, दूसरे देशों की फौजें फौरन वापस बुलाई जायेंगी । जब तक एक देश दूसरे देश के अन्दर अपनी फौजें भेजेगा, दूसरे देश के आन्तरिक मसलों में हस्तक्षेप करेगा, दुनिया में किसी तरह से शांति कायम नहीं रह सकती ।

इस के बाद वियटनाम का सवाल आता है । मैं इस बात का स्वागत करते हुए बधाई देता हूँ विदेश मंत्री को कि उन्होंने स्थिति को दिमाग में रख कर दक्षिण वियटनाम के अन्दर जो वहाँ की अस्थायी सरकार के विदेश मंत्री हैं उन को निमन्त्रित किया । वहाँ एक जन-आन्दोलन चल रहा है, वहाँ की जनता अपनी आजादी के लिये लड़ रही है । मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वास्तविकता को पहचाना गया है । इस को ध्यान में रख कर हमें अपने सम्बन्ध को अच्छा बनाना चाहिये, और वियटनाम में हम लोगों को अपना राजदूत भेज कर पूर्ण रूप से दौत्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना चाहिये ।

इस सदन में लगातार पूर्वी जर्मनी को रिक-न्नाइज करने, उस को मान्यता देने की बात उठाई गई है, सदन के सारे दलों ने एक राय से पिछले डेढ़ साल से बार बार इस बात के ऊपर जोर दिया है कि पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता प्रदान

की जाय, हम वहां अपना व्यापारिक प्रतिनिधि भेजें, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि आज तक हम ने अपने दौत्य सम्बन्ध उस के साथ स्थापित नहीं किये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जल्दी से जल्दी विदेश मंत्री इस बारे में सही तौर पर घोषणा करें।

अन्त में एक चीज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, और वह यह कि संदन में रूस से मैत्री के ऊपर हमारी बड़ी आलोचना की जाती है। यह आलोचना करने वाले वही व्यक्ति हैं जो देश के हर प्रगतिशील कदम का विरोध करते हैं। वही हिन्दुस्तान और रूस के मैत्री सम्बन्ध का भी विरोध करते हैं। यह हमारे देश की आन्तरिक राजनीति के अन्दर एक राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण का परिचायक है। जो ताकतें नहीं चाहतीं कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर समाजवादी शक्तियां बढ़ें, देश के अन्दर प्रगति की शक्तियां बढ़ें, हिन्दुस्तान आत्म-निर्भरता की तरफ बढ़े, वही शक्तियां हैं जो भारत और रूस के सम्बन्धों को बिगाड़ना चाहती हैं। भारत और रूस के सम्बन्ध पिछले बीस साल से मैत्री के सम्बन्ध रहे हैं। भारत और रूस के बीच मैत्री के सम्बन्ध बने रहना, इन दोनों देशों के हित में ही नहीं है बल्कि दुनिया के हित में भी है। हमारी पर-राष्ट्र नीति जो भी बनी है वह केवल राष्ट्रीय हितों का ध्यान में रख कर नहीं बनी है बल्कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय हितों को भी ध्यान में रख कर बनी है। इसके पीछे एक परम्परा है। यह नीति आजादी के बाद ही नहीं बनी है। राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के जमाने से हमारी यह परम्परा चली आ रही है कि दुनिया के अन्दर जहां कहीं भी साम्राज्यवाद ने सिर उठाया है जहां कहीं अर्ध साम्राज्यवाद ने सिर उठाया है, जहां भी दूसरों को पराजित करने की कोशिश की गई है, हमने उसके खिलाफ आवाज उठाई है, महात्मा गांधी के माध्यम से उठाई है, पंडित नेहरू के माध्यम से उठाई है और अपने देश के राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के माध्यम से उठाई है। आज भी दुनिया के कुछ भागों में साम्राज्यवादी और अर्ध साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियां सिर उठा रही हैं, छोटे छोटे

देशों की आजादी को, उनके आर्थिक विकास को खतरे में डालने की कोशिश कर रही हैं और हम को सजग रहना होगा। जो दूसरों को पराजित करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, उनके खिलाफ हम को आवाज उठानी होगी। यह हमारे स्वाभिमान, हमारे गौरव और हमारी राष्ट्रीय परम्पराओं के अनुकूल होगा अगर हमने ऐसा किया। भारत एक विशाल देश है, उसका महत्व कम नहीं है, आने वाले संसार में, आने वाले जमाने में उसको और भी महत्वपूर्ण रोल अदा करना है और उसका महत्व बढ़ेगा। हम को राष्ट्रीय नीति को मजबूती से आगे बढ़ाना होगा। ऐसी शक्तियां जो हमारी मैत्री के सम्बन्ध को, दोस्ती के सम्बन्ध को बिगाड़ने की कोशिश करना चाहती हैं, उनका हम को मुकाबला करना होगा। मुझे आशा है कि इस साल इस विचार-विमर्श के बाद हमारी विदेशी नीति और भी ज्यादा प्रभावशाली बनेगी और 25वीं वर्षगांठ जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की मनाई जा रही है उसके अन्दर भारत विष्व शान्ति के लिए, दूसरे देशों से मैत्री के सम्बन्ध बनाये रखने के लिए, निःशस्त्रीकरण लाने के लिए और भी ज्यादा प्रभावशाली ढंग से योगदान करेगा और बड़ी ताकतों का हस्तक्षेप दूसरे छोटे देशों के आन्तरिक मामलों में न हो और वह बन्द हो, इसके ऊपर और भी ज्यादा प्रभावशाली ढंग से अपना रोल अदा करेगा।

श्री अब्दुल गनी डार (गुड़गांव) : जब मुल्क के दो हिस्से हुए और हम आजाद हुए उसके बाद पंडित जी ने देहरादून में आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी के इजलास में कामनवैल्य में शिरकत का प्रस्ताव पेश किया। मैं जानता था कि यह जहर का प्याला है लेकिन चूँकि इसको हमारे अपने लीडर ने पेश किया था इस वास्ते मैंने समझा कि इसको अमृत समझ कर पी लो। मैंने सोचा राम जाते जाते जायेगा और रहीम आते आते आणगा, इस वास्ते उसको मान लिया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन उसके बाद ज्यों ही तिब्बत को उन्होंने माओ त्से तुंग को दिया तब मेरे दिमाग में एक और खतरा पैदा हुआ।

[श्री अब्दुल गनी डार]

मैं सोचने लग गया कि पंडित जी किस तरफ जा रहे हैं। हम नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी पर चलते आ रहे हैं और इसकी मैं बड़ी तारीफ भी करता हूँ। लेकिन एक तरफ जब कामन-वैल्य में जाने का फैसला किया और दूसरी तरफ तिब्बत जैसे गरीब मुल्क को माओ त्से तुंग को बरफ दिया तो मुझे खतरा पैदा हुआ। उसके बाद पंडित जी बदस्तूर इस पालिसी पर चलते रहे कि हम को प्रोग्रेसिव ताकतों के साथ जाना चाहिये। लेकिन उसके साथ साथ मुझे माफ किया जाए अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि उनके दिमाग में यह नक्शा भी था कि गुट निरपेक्ष देश जो हैं, उनका एक संगठन बनाया जाए और उसका नेता बनने का शर्क पंडित जी को हासिल हो।

एक जमाना था जब अंग्रेजों का यहाँ राज था तब श्रीमती सरोजिनी नायडू की सदारत में 80 मुल्कों के नेता यहाँ आए थे और उन में बहुत ज्यादा तादाद में मुस्लिम मुल्क थे और उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को अपना नेता माना था। उस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान एक था। पाकिस्तान तब बना नहीं था। लेकिन आज आपकी गुट निरपेक्षता की नीति कैसी है? इस नीति को आपने बार बार दोहराया है। वियतनाम में जब अमरीकी फौजों ने वहशियाना हमला किया, तो हमने अमरीका को कंडम किया, हमने उसकी निन्दा की। लेकिन हंगरी में रूस ने जब वहशियाना हमला किया तो पंडित जी की जबान पर ताला लगा रहा, हिन्दुस्तान की जबान पर ताला लगा रहा क्योंकि तब हिन्दुस्तान नेहरू थे और नेहरू हिन्दुस्तानी थे। इसी तरह से चैकोस्लोवाकिया जो एक आजाद मुल्क है उस पर रूस ने हमला किया तो हमने उसकी चिन्ता नहीं की। हमारी जबान पर ताला लगा रहा। उस वक्त पंडित जी नहीं मरि बहन यहाँ थीं प्राइम मिनिस्टर।

श्री हिरेन मुखर्जी तकरीर कर रहे थे। मुझे खुशी हुई उनकी बात को सुनकर। मैं भी चाहता हूँ कि आप कुछ अपना मन बनाओ।

पाकिस्तान किसने बनाया इस झगड़े में मैं नहीं पढ़ना चाहता। इसके बारे में अब इनकी पालिसी क्या करेगी? लेकिन एक बात साफ है। चाहे ईस्ट पाकिस्तान हो या वेस्ट पाकिस्तान हो, वहाँ नब्बे परसेंट लोग हमारे बुजुर्गों की औलाद हैं, वे हमारे बच्चे हैं, नालायक हों तो और अगर आप से ज्यादा अकलमन्द हों तो। इससे मुझे कोई बहस नहीं लेकिन एक बात मैं निडरता से कहता हूँ, आप से भी, देशवासियों से भी और अपने नेताओं से भी। मैंने एक चिट्ठी कायदे आजम को लिखी थी, नवाब ममदोन को भी लिखी थी और उस में मैंने कहा था कि रावलपिन्डी में जो सिख बहन बेटियों पर जुल्म डूण हैं अगर इसी तरह से वे होते रहे तो ईस्ट पंजाब में, बस्ती हिन्दुस्तान में तथा दूसरे हिस्सों में मुसलमानों की इज्जत को कोई बचा नहीं सकेगा। मैंने मौलाना आजाद को भी कहा कि लाखों का कत्ल हो जाएगा। लेकिन मेरा मज़ाक उड़ाया गया था। लेकिन आज एक बात मैं आपसे कहता हूँ। चीन पाकिस्तान के इशारे पर या पाकिस्तान चीन के इशारे पर चल रहा हो लेकिन ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में क्या हो रहा है इसका आपको कुछ पता नहीं है। वहाँ वही हो रहा है जो ज्योति बसु माहब वेस्ट बंगाल में कर रहे हैं। मजीबुल रहमान और भाशानी वही भाषा बोल रहे हैं जो यहाँ ज्योति बसु बोलते हैं या हिरेन मुखर्जी बोलते हैं। अगर आपकी यही पालिसी रही तो पता नहीं क्या होने वाला है। भगवान राम चौदह माल के बाद जब बनवास में लौटे तो उन्होंने देखा कि कुछ लोग बैठे हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि मैंने तो कहा था कि सब चले जायें, तुम यहाँ क्यों बैठे हो। जबवा मिला कि आपने तो कहा था कि स्त्री और पुरुष चले जायें लेकिन जो न तो स्त्री हैं और न पुरुष वे कहां चले जायें। अगर नान एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी का यही मतलब है कि दोनों बंगाल मिल कर एक आजाद हकूमत बने, चीन पाकिस्तान का पूरा फायदा उठा कर दोनों काश्मीरों को एक आजाद इस्लामिक स्टेट बना दे, अगर नान एलाइनमेंट का यही मतलब है कि पाकि-

स्तान का चीन इस्तेमाल करके एक सिख स्टेट बना दे, तो यह पालिसी आपको मुबारिक. मुझे नहीं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब चीन ने एग्जेशन किया तो नान एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी मानने वाले किस देश ने कहा कि उसने एग्जेशन किया है ? जब पाकिस्तान ने एग्जेशन किया तो किस देश ने कहा कि उसने एग्जेशन किया है ?

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मेरी आंखें नहीं। मैं अंधा हूँ। लेकिन मेरे दिल और दिमाग की आंखें खुली हुई हैं। जो होने वाला है उसको मैं देख सकता हूँ। आप देखोगे तो कहोगे कि एक गरीब चपड़ासी के बट ने, एक कमजोर आदमी ने पाकिस्तान के बारे में नहीं हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में कहा था कि भारत जैसे विशाल देश, भगवान राम और कृष्ण के देश की अक्ल पर ताला लग गया है और वह अंधा हो गया है और यह भी देखना नहीं चाहता कि देश में क्या होने जा रहा है। खाली यह हो कि चीन पाकिस्तान का इस्तेमाल करे, यह मैं समझ सकता हूँ। लेकिन चीन हमारे वैस्ट बंगाल का इस्तेमाल करे, यह समझ से बाहर की बात है।

मुझे खुशी है कि रूस ने मेरी बहन को प्रधान मंत्री बनाने में मदद की। मुझे खुशी है कि वी० वी० गिरि साहब को कामयाब बनाने में रूस ने मदद की। लेकिन आप इतना तो करो कि रूस से ही पक्की दोस्ती कर लो ताकि कम्युनिस्ट भाई तो तुम्हारे हो जायें, कोई तो तुम्हारा हो जाए। अमरीका से आपकी दोस्ती होती नहीं, चीन से दोस्ती होती नहीं चाहे आप कहते रहें कि हमारी उनके साथ दोस्ती है।

आज मैं क्या देखता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान में अंग्रेज को देख कर जबर के जज्बात पैदा नहीं होते जितने मुसलमान को देख कर पैदा होते हैं। क्यों ? क्योंकि मुसलमान इन लोगों की औलाद थे और वे अलग हो गये। मैं जो बात आज कह रहा हूँ, वही बात होने वाली है। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस सरकार के अपने ही दोस्तों, श्री मधु लिमये, श्री राज नारायण और जार्ज फ्रनेन्डीज पर, जो इन्तहापसन्द हैं, मोशलिस्ट हैं, समाजवाद के हामी हैं, लाठी-

चार्ज क्यों हुआ, उन को यह सजा क्यों मिली। इस लिए कि कम्युनिस्टों और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने रूस के कहने पर इस बारे में फ्रंसला कर लिया था। श्री चव्हाण को इस बारे में कुछ भी पता नहीं था (व्यवधान) जब इसरायल और अरबों के मामले पर यहाँ बहस होती थी, तो मैं ने श्री मोरारजी देसाई को कहा था कि वह अन्दरूनी बात को नहीं जानते हैं, क्योंकि वह मुफ्रीम कमांड में नहीं हैं, वह राजगद्दी के नजदीक नहीं हैं। श्री मोरारजी देसाई इस बात से नाराज हो गये थे। मैं ने उस वक्त यह भी कहा था : "मुंडे-कुड़ियां दा झुंड यारो कट्टा हो गया, हुकूमत दा चलाना ही ठट्टा हो गया।" (व्यवधान)

जिस तरह उस वक्त श्री मोरारजी देसाई मुझ से नाराज हो गये थे, उसी तरह शायद श्री चव्हाण भी मेरे इस बात से नाराज होंगे। क्या यह सच्चाई नहीं है कि कम्युनिस्टों और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने मिल कर श्री जार्ज फ्रनेन्डीज, श्री मधु लिमये और श्री राज नारायण और उन के दूसरे साथियों को... (व्यवधान)... जैसे उस वक्त श्री मोरारजी देसाई को कुछ मालूम नहीं था, वैसे ही आज श्री चव्हाण को भी इस मामले के बारे में कुछ भी मालूम नहीं है।... (व्यवधान)... यह सरकार की गलत फारेन पालिसी का ही नतीजा है कि रशा ने हमारे इनटर्नल मामलात में दखल देना शुरू कर दिया है।... (व्यवधान)... यह हमारी कमजोर पालिसी का ही नतीजा है कि जिस मुल्क को हम अपना दोस्त बनाने की कोशिश करते हैं, वह हर रोज हम को गाली देता है। (व्यवधान)... आज श्री चव्हाण को कुछ भी पता नहीं है कि यहाँ क्या हो रहा है, क्या नहीं हो रहा है।... (व्यवधान)... श्री दिनेश सिंह को भी कुछ पता नहीं है कि फ्रारेन एफेंयर्ज किस को कहते हैं।... (व्यवधान) वह श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की गुड बुक्स में नहीं हैं। (व्यवधान)... रशा में बैठे हुए श्री डी० पी० धर रशा की हुकूमत और वहाँ के स्टेट्समैन का जो भी पैगाम भेजते हैं, वह सीधा

شری ہرین مکرچی تقریباً کر رہے تھے۔ مجھے خوشی ہوئی ان کی بات سن کر۔ میں بھی چاہتا ہوں کہ آپ کچھ ایسا من بناؤ۔ پاکستان کس نے بنایا۔ اس جنگڑے میں میں نہیں پڑنا چاہتا۔ اس کے بارے میں اب انکی پالیسی کیا کریگی۔ لیکن ایک بات صاف ہے۔ چاہے ایسٹ پاکستان ہو یا ویسٹ پاکستان ہو۔ وہاں نوے پرنسٹن لوگ ہمارے بزرگوں کی اولاد ہیں۔ وہ ہمارے بچے ہیں۔ نالائق ہوں تو اور لائق ہوں تو۔ اس سے مجھے کوئی بھگت نہیں۔ لیکن ایک بات میں ندرتاً سے کہتا ہوں۔ آپ سے۔ دیش واسیوں سے بھی اور اپنے نیتاؤں سے بھی۔ میں نے ایک چٹھی قائداعظم کو لکھی تھی۔ نواب مسدوت کو لکھی تھی اور اس میں میں نے کہا تھا کہ راولپنڈی میں سکھ بہن بیٹیوں پر ظلم ہوئے ہیں اور اس طرح سے یہ ہوتے رہے تو ایسٹ پنجاب میں۔ وسطی ہندوستان میں تقرباً دوسرے حصوں میں مسلمانوں کی عزت کو کوئی بچتا نہیں سکے گا۔ میں نے مولانا آزاد کو بھی کہا کہ لاکھوں کا قتل ہو جائے گا۔ لیکن میرا مزاق اڑایا گیا تھا۔ لیکن آج ایک بات میں آپ سے کہتا ہوں۔ چین پاکستان کے اشارے پر یا پاکستان چین کے اشارے پر چل رہا ہو لیکن ایسٹ پاکستان میں کہا ہو رہا ہے اسکا آپ کو کچھ پتہ نہیں ہے۔ وہاں وہی ہو رہا ہے جو جیوتی پسو صاحب ویسٹ بنگال میں کر رہے ہیں۔ متجیب الرحمان اور بہاشانی وہی بہاشا بول رہے ہیں جو وہاں جیوتی پسو بولتے ہیں یا ہرین مکرچی

بولتے ہیں۔ اگر آپکی یہی پالیسی وہی تو پتہ نہیں کیا ہونے والا ہے۔ بہگوان رام چودہ سال کے بعد جب بلواس سے لوٹے تو انہوں نے دیکھا کہ کچھ لوگ بیٹھے ہیں۔ انہوں نے کہا کہ میں نے تو کہا تھا کہ سب چلے جائیں۔ تم یہاں کیوں بیٹھے ہو۔ چراغ ملے آپ نے تو کہا تھا کہ استری اور پورے چلے جائیں لیکن جو نہ تو استری ہیں اور نہ پورے وہ کہاں چلے جائیں۔ اگر نان الاٹمنٹ کی پالیسی کا یہی مطلب ہے کہ دونوں بنگال مل کر ایک آزاد حکومت بنے۔ چین پاکستان کا پورا فائدہ اٹھا کر دونوں کشمیروں کو ایک آزاد اسلامک اسٹیٹ بنا دے۔ اگر نان الاٹمنٹ کا یہی مطلب ہے کہ پاکستان کا چین استعمال کر کے ایک سکھ سٹیٹ بنا دے۔ تو یہ پالیسی آپکو مبارک۔ مجھے نہیں۔ میں پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب چین نے اگريشن کیا تو نان الاٹمنٹ کی پالیسی ماننے والے کس دیش نے کہا کہ اس نے اگريشن کیا ہے۔ جب پاکستان نے اگريشن کیا تو کس دیش نے کہا کہ اس نے اگريشن کیا ہے۔ دہلی سہیکر صاحب میری آنکھیں نہیں۔ میں اندھا ہوں۔ لیکن مرے دل اور دماغ کی آنکھیں کھلی ہوئی ہیں۔ جو ہرنے والا ہے اسکر میں دیکھ سکتا ہوں۔ آپ دیکھو گے تو کہو گے کہ ایک غریب چھڑاسی کے بیٹے نے۔ ایک کمزور آدمی نے پاکستان کے بارے میں نہیں ہندوستان کے بارے میں کہا تھا کہ بھارت جیسے وشال دیش۔ بہگوان رام اور کرشن کے دیش کی عقل پر تالا لگ گیا ہے اور وہ اندھا ہو گیا ہے اور یہ بھی دیکھنا نہیں چاہتا کہ دیش میں کیا

[شری عبدالغنی قاز]

ہونے جا رہا ہے - خالی یہ ہو کہ چین پاکستان کا استعمال کرے - یہ میں سمجھ سکتا ہوں - لیکن چین ہمارے ویسٹ بنگال کا استعمال کرے یہ سمجھ سے باہر کی بات ہے -

مجھے خوشی ہے کہ روس نے میری بہن کو پردھان منتری بنانے میں مدد کی - مجھے خوشی ہے کہ وی وی گری صاحب کو کامیاب بنانے میں روس نے مدد کی - لیکن آپ اتنا تو کر کہ روس سے ہی پکی دوستی کر لو تاکہ کمیونسٹ بھائی تو تمہارے ہو جائیں - کوئی تو تمہارا ہو جائے - امریکہ سے آپکی دوستی ہوتی نہیں - چین سے دوستی ہوتی نہیں چاہے آپ کہتے رہیں کہ ہماری انکے ساتھ دوستی ہے -

آج میں کیا دیکھتا ہوں - ہندوستان میں انگریز کو دیکھ کر جبر کے جذبات پیدا نہیں ہوتے جتنے مسلمان کو دیکھ کر ہوتے ہیں - کیوں - کیونکہ مسلمان ان لوگوں کی اولاد تھے اور وہ الگ ہو گئے - جو کی بات میں آج کہہ رہا ہوں - وہی بات ہونے والی ہے - میں سرکار سے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس سرکار کے اپنے ہی دوستوں - شری مدھو لہے - شری راج نارائن - اور شری چارج فرنانڈیز پر - جو انتہا پسند ہیں - سوشلسٹ ہیں ساج واد کے حامی ہیں - لاکھی چارج کیوں ہوا - ان کو یہ سزا کیوں ملی - اس لئے کہ کمیونسٹوں اور شریمنٹی اندرا گاندھی نے روس کے کہنے پر اس بارے میں فیصلہ کر لیا تھا - شری چوہان کو اس بارے میں کچھ بھی پتہ نہیں تھا - (ویو دھان) جب اسرائیل

اور عربوں کے معاملے پر یہاں بحث ہوتی تھی - تو میں نے شری مرارجی ڈیسائی کو کہا تھا کہ وہ اندرونی بات کو نہیں جانتے ہیں - کیونکہ وہ سوہم کمانڈ میں نہیں ہیں - وہ راج گدی کے نزدیک نہیں ہیں - شری مرارجی ڈیسائی اس بات سے ناراض ہو گئے تھے - میں نے اس وقت یہ بھی کہا تھا - ,, منڈے کوپیاں دا چہنڈ پارو کٹھا ہو گیا - حکومت دا چلانا تھٹھا ہو گیا - ,, (ویو دھان)

جس طرح اس وقت شری مرارجی ڈیسائی مجھ سے ناراض ہو گئے تھے - اس طرح شاید شری چوہان بھی میری اس بات سے ناراض ہونگے - کیا یہ سچائی نہیں ہے کہ کمیونسٹوں اور شریمنٹی اندرا گاندھی نے مل کر شری چارج فرنانڈیز - شری مدھو لہے اور شری راج نارائن اور ان کے دوسرے ساتھیوں کو - - - (ویو دھان) جیسے اس وقت شری مرارجی ڈیسائی کو کچھ معلوم نہیں تھا - ویسے ہی آج شری چوہان کو بھی اس معاملے کے بارے میں کچھ بھی معلوم نہیں ہے - (ویو دھان) بہ سرکار کی غلط فارین پالیسی کا ہی نتیجہ ہے کہ رشا نے ہمارے انٹرنل معاملات میں دخل دینا شروع کر دیا ہے - (ویو دھان) یہ ہماری کمزور پالیسی کا ہی نتیجہ ہے کہ جس ملک کو ہم اپنا دوست بنانے کی کوشش کرتے ہیں - وہ ہر روز ہم کو گالی دیتا ہے - (ویو دھان) آج شری چوہان کو کچھ بھی پتہ نہیں ہے کہ یہاں کیا ہو رہا ہے - کیا نہیں ہو رہا ہے - (ویو دھان) شری دینیس سنگھ کو بھی کچھ پتہ نہیں ہے کہ فارین ایغورز کس کو کہتے ہیں - (ویو دھان) وہ شریمنٹی اندرا

گندھی کی گڈ بکس میں نہیں ہیں۔
(وہودھان) رشا میں بیٹھے ہوئے
شری تری-بی-د-ر رشا کی حکومت
اور وہاں کے اسٹیٹ منٹس کا جو بھی پیغام
دیتے بھیجتے ہیں۔ وہ سیدھا شری متی
اندیرا گاندھی کے پاس جاتا ہے۔ شری
دہلیس سلگھ کے پاس نہیں جاتا ہے۔

श्री योगेश्वर शर्मा : क्या माननीय सदस्य उस
पैगाम का टेप-रिकार्डिंग करते हैं ?

श्री एडल गनी दार : میں نے کہا
ہے کہ اس گورنمنٹ کی غلط پالیسیوں کا
ہی نتیجہ ہے کہ روس اور دوسرے ملک
ہمارے ملک کے اندرونی - معاملات میں
داخل دیتے ہیں، چاینا پاکستان کے
ذریعہ ایسٹ بلگال اور ویسٹ بلگال
کو ملا کر ایک کمونسٹ اسٹیٹ
بنانے جا رہا ہے، ایک سکھ اسٹیٹ بننے
جا رہی ہے اور آزاد کشمیر اور ہمارے
کشمیر کو ملا کر ایک اسلامی اسٹیٹ
بننے جا رہی ہے۔

یہ سرکار ہمت کر کے کسی کے ساتھ ہو
جائے۔ بھشک وہ رشا کے ساتھ ہو
جائے، مجھے اس سے کوئی زنج یا
تکلیف نہیں ہے، لیکن وہ کسی کے
ساتھ ہو تو سہی، ورنہ "نمباری داستان
بھی نہ ہوگی داستانوں میں۔"

SHRI KRISHNA MENON (Midnapore):
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is neither
appropriate nor sensible, or purposeful,
for a back bencher in a Parliament, during
a general debate on Foreign Affairs,
to attempt to traverse the whole field and
philosophy of foreign policy, or to deal with
every possible problem, or all that is
raised in the Government's Report or
in the debate.

I want, however, to say, at this stage,
that we cannot, irrespective of the content
of the Report made or not made, ignore
facts and problems of actual or possible

conflict in the world, nor the movements
and ideas that affect our own future.

The most important of the incidents
that have occurred in the recent days is
the *coup d'etat* in Cambodia, engineered
by the United States, and master-minded
by the C.I.A. We have so lacked appreciation
of the problem and even given an
impression to others, I say, a quite un-
warranted one, perhaps, that we are
likely to 'play' with the new regime. If
we do so, then we shall do great damage
to ourselves, because we shall be siding
with imperialism against every body
else. It would be a great error. I do not
for a moment say that the Foreign Minister
contemplates this. I have not heard so
from him or any one else. There is also
no reason for me to think that. If in
respect of the new situation in Cambodia
we try to play political gymnastics and
strike a pseudo-legalistic posture and
say that it is a "legal" change, we shall
be grievously wrong. Most or all *coup
de'etats* are legal! When Cromwell ordered
Colonel Pride to purge Parliament of
all but 65 of its members, and the life
of Parliament became extended in con-
sequence to 20 years, that was also legal.
We may seek to argue that we are sup-
posed to follow the British example when
there is none else! All *coup de'etats* are
then legal. Thus argued, are we, therefore,
to support the displacement of Prince
Sihanouk and play with the new Govern-
ment there? If we do so, that will be a
very dangerous mistake. There is an
impression abroad that we are likely
to play ducks and drakes with this business
and find ourselves on the wrong side, as
we have done to an extent both in Laos
and Vietnam.

I also want to say that the responsibility
that we carry in Indo-China is not the
responsibility to be neutral against inter-
ventionism. Neutrality does not mean
being mute witnesses of horror. The
late Prime Minister Panditji used to say
and said in this House so many times,
that neutrality does not mean that we shall
sit quiet when there is genocide and when
there is suppression of human rights.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not allow
myself to stray too far into past history.
But this country, some 40 years ago,
on the banks of Ravi, in her declaration
of independence proclaimed, that "Free-
dom is the birthright of the Indian people

[Shri Krishna Menon]

as of any other people'. That was a declaration of policy and ideology. It was a commitment. We may not have always followed or kept it but it was the faith of this Nation that we solemnly proclaimed. It was a commitment for Human rights and for the liberty of those who stand for or fight for freedom. That is why we speak about Cambodia and speak about the United Arab Republic and so on, not because we are more interested in other peoples' affairs than our own. It is our obligation, to stand by the side of those who are suppressed or threatened by imperialism. Running through almost the whole course of this debate, it seems that as though it is believed and taken for a fact that there is a kind of rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the United States and, therefore the whole policy of non-alignment has gone by the board. I may be very ignorant about this matter. Perhaps I am. I have not seen in the last 15 years any basic changes in this respect to warrant this belief. It has been said that there have been conferences recently between the two superpowers. There have been conference in the past too e.g. at Dumbarton Oaks, and at Camp David. There was a conference at Vienna. There have always been conferences between great powers and there have been deadlocks and little others result. No conflicts have been really resolved. It is useful for us to understand things in their reality and that we get over the superstition that this is all an "ideological" conflict. It is not an ideological conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. The real difference is that the United States empire is always on the side of those who stand against revolutions and social changes. They are also seeking sources for cheap or key raw material as well as markets and are highly dominated by what President Eisenhower called "Industrial Military Complex". The 500 armament makers in their World decide the policy, not the politicians, the Ministers who spend time at International Conferences, it is this domination of profit-makers that is responsible for international tension. Only this morning, the Defence Minister said here, that any country will sell arms to any other. It is true, that not only we ourselves get arms from every country—now from Soviet Union and others also. This is the part of the real crux of World politics. Stated briefly, U.S. foreign policy is dominated by what has been

called the Truman doctrine. This doctrine may be interpreted as an ideological conflict too, which the United States postures as its mission to force on other. He spoke of "our way of life". In early presidential days he sent for Mr. Molotov and talked down to him. Mr. Molotov said 'I have never been spoken to in this way'. Truman's reply was, 'You behave yourself' Here there is no question of rapport, negotiation or anything of that kind. The theory propounded by this doctrine is that the business of the United States is to rule the world as the British ruled in those days when they said 'God created the Englishmen to police the world'. That situation has disappeared but imperialist strategy and attitudes play the same roles. Like the British Imperialist in his day to day, the United States is willing to forgive those whom they have wronged'. This is the meaning of the newly discovered basis of reciprocity about which the U.S. speaks at Paris, willing to forgive those whom you have wronged. They tell the Vietnamese 'You do this if we are to do something. You withdraw your men from Vietnam, then we withdraw our people from your country'. How can a country that is aggressed withdraw from its own soil and be reciprocal in this way?

Therefore, briefly I think our policy whether we are able to implement it or not, should be one that calls on the United States and her allies to stop all aggression against the Indo-China territory by land, sea or air and by propaganda also, and that we should adhere to the principles of integrity, sovereignty of other states and non-interference in other's affairs. The United States must respect the liberty of Indo-China States and their neutrality.

Secondly, it is necessary that the International Commission in Indo-China instead of trying to find some way to get into the Cambodian tangle by some body's permission or otherwise or even by calling a meeting in Delhi, should proclaim to the world, in true accordance with what is their real purpose as a commission. That is, to tell the world who is committing aggression and who is continuing the conflict. If they so find that North Vietnamese personnel had aggressed in the South, let them say that. Let them say also that more people have been killed in the Vietnamese territory by air-bombing

by the United States than the whole numbers of Germans killed in the second World War. Nearly half a million children have been killed in Vietnam alone by bombing from the air. The United States has invaded Vietnam. Instead of telling the world this we strike posture of uncommitted and they are mute witnesses to invasion, war crimes and atrocities.

There is no sufficient sense of commitment in or by our country. It would be untrue if I say, that we have changed our policy in this matter or our international outlook. We still call ourselves non-aligned and other also call us that too. We are still supporting the neutrality of Indo-China States but there is far less sense of commitment, to peace and freedom and less emphasis on them. There is a recession in the dynamism of our policy. This kind of thing has occurred in the history of almost every country; and it is not carping criticism or one of an irresponsible kind, what I seek to do is to draw attention of the House and the Government to the pathetic, but nevertheless true and continuing factors which should concern us all.

The other area which concerns us the Middle East, as it is called. This area was first so named by an American navigator, some 300 years ago. It is of course not the Middle East for us. Here the position is simple enough. It is not a question whether we like the Arabs or we don't like them. We should at least have a care about our own skins! It is our security that is in jeopardy, as well as the independence of Arab States. The Middle East, since the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century has been the pathway of the Empire to the East. In two World Wars the Indian Army stood guard in the Middle East to guard the Empire. Such liberty and Statehood as came to this area was used by the British Empire for buttressing its own strength, to create that block house of Empire called Israel which is in Arab territory. It is Arab territory. The Arabs never gave it away and Israel even as 'created' by the United Nations by the partition of Palestine never existed even for a day, because the day after it was proclaimed the Jewish section took Tel Aviv and other places occupied and annexed them and called the new area a State and Isreal. The United Nations never created Israel. There can be no peace unless this and later and continuing

agressions are ended. The aggressor will vacate only when Imperialism no longer gives support to it and Isreal is not part of the Imperialists' strategy.

In the days when Ben Gurion was ruling Isreal, 20 million dollars of deficit in the States' Annual Budget was made up by the United States and the rest the support for her came from private subscriptions. That is to say, the State was not only motivated but worked from outside, in order to fulfill the purposes of Zionist Imperialism. In the Middle East, as in the other places we are opposing Imperialism, we are fighting against Empire, for our own survival, this is our position. That is how we came into existence as a nation by shaking a mighty Empire to its foundations and establishing our liberty in our land. So long as Empire exists, we have no hope of survival in independent and self respecting Nationhood. We should deal with this problem and its world aspect. But it is more than what can be compressed in the intervention in this Debate.

The third aspect is this. Some one else referred yesterday, to the question of European Security. The matter was sought to be ridiculed. It was implied that we were playing about with a new found toy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, two great world wars have originated in this Century in Europe. European security has become more important to-day because, contrary to what we may hope and imagine, a world war is not, either so improbable or as remote or not as far away from our generation or from our lives as we may like to think.

Therefore, the question calls for seeking out ways of the avoidance of the causes that can make small wars into larger wars. Aggression some where tends to become aggression everywhere. World Peace depends not a little, and not in remote way upon stability in Europe. This stability cannot be brought about either by the Soviet Union or by the Western powers, along but only by their joint endeavours and initiatives. This is the main factor at present and of immediate importance is the inclusion of what is known by the name of the German Democratic Republic in the comity of the World Nations. Here again, it is not merely a sentimental or even a logical analysis

[Shri Krishna Menon]

The German Democratic Republic has done one thing if nothing else. It has broken the power of the Junkers who made the wars in the past.

Their power was broken by the economic and social transformations that have taken place in East Germany. Junkerism is no longer possible in that part of the world.

The other and contrary aspect is what is not perhaps so well known *viz.*, that half the NATO armies of occupation in Europe are to-day officered and maintained by West Germany. The Germany which was defeated in the last war, to-day is calling the tune. The British are to-day not in a position or able to finance the luxury of occupation. Somebody else has to pay. Germany is affluent. She is militarising herself and is encouraged to do by the United States.

The other aspect of West Germany being rich is that She is again seeking to be a Military and Naval power. She is becoming armed. The placing of Nuclear Weapons in the hands of Germany is no longer a remote issue. They are struggling very hard to obtain at once both potency and significant share in nuclear Arms location and control in Europe. Once Germany has Nuclear Weapons, European security is no longer practical. The balance of power approach which dominates world politics today can neither bring disarmament nor peace. It is the way to War.

I want to speak about the African people now. This is not a colour question as often spoken of. It is a colour question too in the sense that in modern times, that is for about 400 to 500 years or perhaps for more years, all the big wars of aggression have taken place against the non-European races. To-day, in the south of the copper belt, in South and South-West Africa—I have forgotten the new name of the place formerly called South West Africa, Rhodesia, all colonial and former territories in Africa where the Black people the Negro population—who are the indigenous population are not only dispossessed, but are proscribed from having any civic rights, let alone the fuller paraphernalia of citizenship. South Africa and South West Africa have diamonds. The diamond and the

copper controlled by vested interests in imperialist Countries, be it the Oppenheims of Africa or the Beits the Millionaires who control the Arms Industry or the United Fruit Corporation. In Mozambique, thousands of the African population are being slaughtered, tortured enslaved, segregated, starved and suppressed. There was resistance to the policy of the United States both in the United Nations, in the Congo, in the later years of the United Nations Interventions. The policy there proved to be mixture, on the one hand of playing with Imperialism and on the other of supporting the independence of the African peoples. Anyway in Africa—in the whole of Africa—the situation was such that the continent is in ferment and conflict. On the one hand, there is tribalism which is coming into a new stage making a new nation unstable. This is not something about which we or any outside country can do anything.

On the phenomenon of the return of the empires, I have said in this House before, that empires do not really change. They may not come to-day by the front door, but they try to and indeed do come by the back door. They try to get into the entrails of a people and their cultures. This is what is happening everywhere. This is what the Africans call Neo-colonialism, although there is little that new about it. It is Colonialism and realism knit large. I will say, if I may, so without prejudice, refer to this subject, this country can, never, become really a non-aligned country, so long it begs for food, for clothes, for reputation and it goes round the world begging for everything.

A few years ago, when I was in Amsterdam, there were three thousand young children walking up and down the streets collecting pennies for "feeding the poor Indians". No propaganda, no glossy paper pamphlets and no speeches by the Foreign Minister and no successful visit by him or anybody else will make amend for this country when it displays or exhibits lack of self respect and dignity. We have no self respect we cannot expect respect from others. If we cannot respect ourselves, how can the other people respect us? Has at any time PL 480 aid or whatever it may be helped this country to be free from food shortages or helped to prevent their accentuation or helped and remove their causes. We have scar-

city of every kind despite massive aid. This however is another problem. I am not going to deal with these here to-day. Our self respect and our non-dependence are what are basic to non-alignment.

While I am on this subject I may say that there has been a lot of criticism about, and denigration of non-alignment. Most of it is by way of ridicule. I am sorry to say that some times our Foreign Minister—his won party or his own leaders say that it is an 'out-of-date doctrine'. Foreign policy the world over has to be flexible. if it is to be dynamic no one questions that. But flexibility is the essence of non-alignment. Non-alignment is not something which you can take or we have taken out from a book. Even the nomenclature itself came only long after our policies began to take shape. When we started practising it, we were chided by the Americans, that we were being neutral, that we were sitting on the fence and trying to get money from both sides. But we said that we were not sitting on no fence. We were on the move, dynamic and seeking progress. We did not want however to be precommitted to war blocs. We did not want our policies to be defended on the banks of Potamac or on the banks of the Volga, but on the banks of the Jumna. Non-Alignment in international affairs is but a projection on our national outlook, and policy. True Nationalism is of a constructive and dynamic character. This country took this decision on its (Non-alignment) own. Following Lord Salisbury, we could well have said that we had no permanent friends and we had no permanent enemies but we have had only permanent interests. It those "permanent interest" are pursued in the way that modern Nations should, then they should not lead to greet tensions or war. Therefore, while attacking non-alignment in these debates or elsewhere, no one should forget that whether one Government or another is in office, for a debate on foreign affairs in this House, there is a far vaster audience than that covered by the attendance in this chamber. The whole world listens. if I may say so, to what is being said here. Therefore, when we throw bricks or flowers against each other or at any foreign personality or country or anybody in the world outside, it should be understood what its impacts are upon an audience much farther and vaster than ourselves. It is not for me however, to lecture about this. I do not presume

to do so. It is for all of us to realize that in dealing with our relations with another country, or other countries there is not only ourselves but the other country and of ten world opinion involved. The consequences are far greater and often far reaching.

To take an example from outside Mr. Brezhnev made a speech about collective security in Asia. He himself has said that his observations were not exactly as were reported in the press. It was also an observation at the end of long address on world matters. But it became one of the major issues of speculation, suspension or hope and defeat. Everybody talks about it. So if our Foreign Minister makes a speech and use a phrase of any kind the rest of world picks it up for its own use, either for fear or out of apprehension or hope or for whatever purpose required. It would to so often, irrespective of the context and emphasis in the original.

I would, therefore, say that on matters as Indo-China we have to declare our position with full commitment and not get involved in or on Indo-China in a way that we find ourselves on the side of Empire. I have no doubt. Speaking for myself, that Prince Sihanouk is not merely regarded as person who is eccentric or otherwise he is the head of the nation and the State. After reuouncing his royal office he, was elected to presidency by the referendum or the people. Where then lies the right for any Parliament or anybody to throw him out? It is legal let alone propriety or decency, for the C.I.A. to interfere in the matter.

It is the same with Israel so far interference and master minding is concerned. The United Nations voted on the partition of Palestine one morning or the previous afternoon, Trueman recognised it as the State of Israel in a few hours. Here in Cambodia there was a *coup d'etat* in the morning; in the afternoon, the U. S. Department of State recognises the new regime. Yet, we are asked to believe that there is no causal connection between the two. The whole thing was obviously arranged beforehand, engineered and masterminded by the United States.

The Foreign Minister requires no reference or compliments from me. I have the good fortune to see people in other countries and capitals. In the last few years and recently more increasingly, there has been greater attention paid than in the less recent past what is done here and

[Shri Krishna Menon]

what is spoken, and the impression that our representatives make when they go abroad. The Foreign Minister I am glad to say, has himself made mentionable contribution to this.

Our foreign service or any service for that matter could be better than it is. We could ourselves be better than we are. But it would be a great mistake in Parliament, pick on individuals who are our Ambassadors abroad. I would, however, say that Government should pay greater attention to the countries where some of our people are regarded as having acted as "brown imperialists". In British days, that is to say where we or some of our inations have played second fiddle to the British Empire in certain African areas, and are not well liked or quite welcome for that reason. It is necessary that some of the best of our representations go to such places to bring down the prejudices of which we are the inheritors, even though we have been and are victims also. We speak of the colour bar as though somebody practices it against us and there it begins and ends. But can we conscientiously and honestly say that we are ourselves not guilty of discrimination against others.

The position in Africa calls for the best attention and understanding that we can bestow. Some of our best people would have to go to the African countries and understand the changing conditions. There is nothing incongruous in the African wanting to run his own country. May be that we or some of our people suffer by it. I suppose the British would say that they lost business by going out of here. But that is a concomittant of Empire at its demise.

We should also not take for granted "doctrines" so, called. facile inferences from other peoples prejudices on the bases of their pleas and arguments. The particular pieces of philosophy of the doctrine, of avertments of ideological virtue in justification of ideological issues is often doled out to us. I will take you to the instance of Doctrines. We were always treated to these doctrines. When certain countries want to do something it should not do, either it revoked a religious test or maxim as in the old days. Now it propounds a "doctrine". It may be the Monroe Doctrine, the Eisenhower Doctrine, or the Truman Doctrine or the Great Society of the New Frontier. All

there means is this actualities : suppress revolutions, suppress liberation movements, support reaction and vested interests and spread the frontiers of entire Economic or Political Diem who was the creature of the United States in Vietnam, an American puppet, was refused 30 million dollars while asked for it, to introduce land reforms. The U.S. Government at that time, though Diem was their puppet said, 'No money for land reforms'. I am not saying that the reforms could or should have been carried on with American or foreign money. But only that that the money was not available, for such purpose. Imperialist are, not interested in land reforms.

This is a conflict rooted in economic factors and not merely of a legal or political character. It is for the sustenance, continuance and advancement of private property, of vested interests, of what have often been called monopolies, for concentration of power and for the facility for a few people to dominate a country or a majority in a country or two countries or five countries along with others to dominate the bulk of people. This is made possible by the inherent character of the acquisitive society, that initiates promotes, and sustains expansionism and exploitation. This is the crux of the problem. Therefore, our internal policies of social advance naturally have obstacles and pressures. If foreign interests are allowed to penetrate or dominate our lives and our countries, we are less able, my less willing offer, to resist them.

With regard to the German Democratic Republic, perhaps the Foreign Minister would tell us what precedent or justifications, he has in international law for not recognizing that State. The United States is the one country in the world which has helped to lay down definitely the principle of recognition of State and set historic example. The theory of recognition is simple. The State to be recognised must have territory; it must have a Government; that Government must command habitual obedience from its inhabitants and must be able to carry out obligations under International Law. Here, East Germany has a Government and Territory. We trade with the German Democratic Republic. Our mutual trade extends to Rs. 50 crores a year and it has increased by more than 17 percent this year than the previous year. We have very considerable credit in regard to the supply of ships; I do not know how much; the

Minister of Transport can tell us how much; we have also considerable credit also in regard to the supply of agricultural machinery. Apart from all sentimental, ethical considerations or even legal considerations is it in the interest of our country to be tied up to significant extents in economic relationships without having diplomatic exchanges? It will lead to difficulties if you get involved in credit, other money deals and collaboration and so on with other countries and at the same time cannot use the machinery of diplomatic conciliation, diplomatic pressures and so on. We will be at a disadvantage. The whole world knows that the reason why we do not recognize the G.D.R. is that we subscribe or even if we do not do so, we submit to the Holstein Doctrine. The Holstein Doctrine is just this; we are rich and we have paid you so much; you will do what we say. That is what it means; other countries may not have regard for the Holstein Doctrine but we have, whether the Minister admits or not submitted to the Holstein Doctrine. For us, it should be matter of profound humiliation, that a country like ours should have to trim its soils, because we have borrowed too much money or we have received too much aid. Even in regard to the United States we had not submitted in this way. Certainly not even after long years of aid relationship. The German are to a certain extent perhaps more rigid the Holstein Doctrine is invoked; or it bangs over us like the sword of Damocles: it is neither wise nor dignified, nor it is a sign of firmness of policy to send State Trading Corporation officials and let them function willy-nilly as Trade Commissioners and then send Trade Commissioners and let them function consider officers. Instead we should establish Diplomatic Relations with the G.D.R. and take it the good and bad as we do with equal and sovereign States. Here is a country which has been responsive to the need of peace. In her consultation the G. D. R. declares that it will not take to clear weapons; it will not take to war; it will do nothing to endanger the security of Europe. European security is a vital matter for us. The G. D. R. is among our best allies in the promotion of world peace, by contributing, to security in Europe.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : I want to conclude by saying that it would be wrong for us as responsible parties and

individuals in Parliament to be unduly critical of our Government in regard to foreign affairs. Whether they say so or do not, foreign policy is regarded in many countries as bi-partisan. Others held this country in high esteem because the people outside know that irrespective of our party affiliations, behind the policy which Pandit Nehru with his unique personality was able to adumbrate, were the mass of our people.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please conclude your remarks.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : The world knew that we then stood against the kind of terror, the reign of terror let loose in Vietnam. Are we to be least concerned when the imperialists interventions in Vietnam take to slitting open the middles of women to taking out the bodies of unborn infants and exposing them in public places in order to strike terror, in the hearts of the people? Terror is the symbol, is the weapon of a defeatist and defeated nation. Americans have been beaten to a standstill in Vietnam. It would be to our good if we stood with the Vietnamese people. I say without any reservation that their heroism; their ingenuity, their stubbornness is unparalleled in human annals. They are fighting the war of human liberation and Asian self-respect. For a thousand years, from 113 B. C. to 960 A. D. they fought the Chinese Empire of that day, when the latter invaded Vietnam in that early millennium. If the Americans may fight for thousand years the Vietnamese will continue their resistance and fight for liberation. We should take an honest and courageous position and call upon the International Commission to proclaim to the world what the facts are and not be mute witnesses to crime and horror. Neither the Co-Chairman, nor anybody else has got the role to do this. We have a duty to tell the world and not be silent in the presence of violence and crime, to expose the fact that not only is this war criminal, but it is waged by methods which are war crimes. The six articles of Nuremberg are defied every day. From Okinawa and other places every morning a 52 bombers go and bom Vietnam area. Children are killed everyday in this way. There is violation even of the articles of warfare. It is a war crime to practice genocide to destroy sources of livelihood and practice atrocities. Those articles of Nuremberg have been made part of the Municipal law of America. I think we can

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Play a useful part, if we as a State ask for the examination of the charges of genocide against American soldiers involved by the World Court.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch-Bihar): Sir, no Member from the UIPG has so far spoken.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I know; but the time is up.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY: Please give us at least five minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right; five minutes.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I do not like to comment on the foreign policy of this Government within a short span of time. As said in the report, the Government never pursued a doctrinaire policy. It cannot but be so as suggested now by our senior colleague, Mr. Krishna Menon. As a matter of fact, the foreign policy is a projection of the national policy and unless we are self-sufficient and self-reliant, there would be no effective foreign policy. As my time is short, I would like to leave out many other points and only refer to certain very important things.

In regard to Pakistan and in the policy of our government towards Pakistan the Ministry's report has shown a certain complacency: that the relations are better and better. Even yesterday, the hon. Deputy Minister has stated that despite Pakistan's membership of the SEATO CENTO and NATO, Pakistan is coming closer to the non-aligned countries and so it is a step forward for successful persuasion of a non-aligned policy.

Leaving aside, and leaving apart, all other aspects, I would like to draw the attention of the External Affairs Minister to certain basic facts. What is the basic policy of the Government of India? It is here that I would like to submit that this is really to be treated as an act of criminality on the part of the Government of India for not going into seriously about the exact boundary of the country. In this connection, we should go back to 1947, the year of partition. At the of time partition of the country certain areas were demarcated by the Radcliffe and Bagge Award. I would like to point out to the hon.

Minister, as he himself has stated, we have certain boundary disputes regarding Tripura and East Pakistan, Assam and East Pakistan, and on the West Bengal border. But I would ask Sir, whether the Government considered this Boundary Commission Award—the Commission known as the Radcliffe Commission, regarding the demarcation of the boundaries between Assam on the one side and the Sylhet district, now included in Pakistan, on the other? It has been clearly laid down here that out of the 35 thanas or police stations in the entire Sylhet district, eight thanas are mostly inhabited by Hindus; known as Hindu majority area. Out of these eight police stations, six, according to the Boundary Commission, award, have been given to Assam, not Pakistan.

Let me, in this connection, quote from the judgement, the award given by Sir Cyril Radcliffe. He said:

"In those circumstances, I think that some exchange of territories must be effected if a workable division is to result. Some of the non Muslim thanas must go to East Bengal and some Muslim territory and Hailakandi must be retained by Assam. Accordingly I decide and award as follows:

A line shall be drawn from the point where the boundary between the thanas of Patharkandi and Kulaura meets the frontier of Tripura State and shall run north along the boundary between those thanas, then along the boundary between the thanas of Patharkandi and Berlekha, then along the boundary between the thanas of Karimganj and Barlekha, and then along the boundary between the thanas of Karimganj and Beani Bazar to the point where the boundary meets the river Kusiyara ..."

Sir, I would not like to take the time of the House, and I would certainly like the hon. Minister to go through this award given by Radcliffe. In the end, it has been stated:

"For purposes of illustration, a map marked A is attached on which the line is delineated. In the event of any divergence between the line as delineated on the map and as described in paragraph 13, the written description is to prevail."

I would like to request the Minister to devote his undivided attention to this very important fact.

The map has been given, and also the description of the Award. The eight thanas in the Sylhet district are: Sulla, Ajmirganj, Srimangal, Kamalganj, Kalaura, Barlekha, Patharkandi and Ratabari. Out of these, six thanas should be included in the Indian territory. In view of the fact that our border with East Pakistan-West Bengal and East Pakistan-Assam, has not yet been properly demarcated, there is scope to re-view the whole position in the light of the Radcliffe Award.

I am certain Sir, on a proper examination of the Award of about one thousand signatories of the awards would come to India. It may be argued by some that it is already a dead issue. But I would remind the Minister to look at the Pakistan's foreign policy. They seem to be very clever. Even after 18 years of partition, they were in a position to take the case of the Rann of Kutch to the International Court for arbitration and proper award. So, what is wrong on behalf of our Government to raise this matter before the International Court to have a correct interpretation of this award?

About the policy towards minorities in East Pakistan, several times this question was raised and the minister simply stated, "We have the agreement with the Government of Pakistan of 1950, the Tashkent Declaration" and so on and so forth. I would like to quote from Lok Sabha Debates Vol. XXIX, 3rd to 8th April 1964. On 20th March and 3rd April, a resolution was discussed in this House which was unanimously adopted. The resolution was moved by our hon. colleague, Mr. Tridib Kumar Chaudhary, while Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri was there as a member of the Cabinet. He accepted the resolution with amendment which was adopted on 3rd April 1964 reads thus:

"This House is of the opinion that in view of the insecurity of the life, property and honour of the minority communities living in the Eastern Wing of Pakistan and general denial of all human rights to them in that part of Pakistan, the Government of India should in addition to relaxing restrictions in migration of people belonging to the minority communities from East Pakistan to Indian Union also consider steps for enlisting world opinion."

In view of this specific resolution which was adopted in 1964, what has the Government of India done for the last 6 or 7 years to enlist world opinion about the pitiable

condition of minority communities in East Pakistan? If the Government were to say that they have taken certain measures, I would request the minister to tell the House what specific measures he has taken or his predecessors, whether he has submitted a memorandum to the Human Rights Commission under the UN Charter and taken other measures? Whenever the question of minority communities from East Pakistan is raised here the Government have always said simply, "We have our High Commission and they are issuing migration certificates." But these migration certificates have been issued under certain conditions. They are issued only when they swear by affidavit that on reaching the Indian soil, they will not ask for any help from the Government of India. These restrictions are imposed.

About the properties taken over by Pakistan in the 1965 conflict, these were regarded as enemy property. When the Tashkent Declaration was signed in January 1966, article 8 of that declaration stated that there will be restoration of those properties. But since then in 1968, in 1969 and still the other day, the minister has been saying, "we are pursuing the matter". From time to time, the Government was putting forward the plea that we have these agreements and we cannot go beyond these agreements and do anything else, as if the agreements have the status of sanctity or of being sacrosanct. In fact, there are not so.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had stated in the course of the debate regarding the Nehru Liaquat Ali pact, 1950 that:

"...the Agreement is not a law which cannot be touched".

He had explained that the terms of the agreement cannot be treated as law. It is not a law. Even if it is accepted as law, I would request the hon. Minister to explain this point in the light of international law. Is it not an accepted maxim in international law that all treaties and agreements are dissipated by the first attack of hostility? So, is this to be regarded as law, as sacrosanct when the hostilities came in 1965? So I would recommend to this government to take all possible measures to secure the position of the minorities in East Pakistan.

16 Hrs.

I would also like to know whether this Government will be prepared to pay adequate compensation, as the hon. Minister

[Shri B. K. Daschowdhury]

has assured us on various occasions, for the properties taken over by Pakistan as enemy property and also for the properties left behind by displaced persons in East Pakistan. He has stated to me by a letter of 3rd July :

"However, we are keeping the issue".

(...he was referring to the payment of compensation for the displaced persons from East Pakistan for the properties left there and also for the properties taken up by Pakistan under the garb of enemy property...)

"under review and shall do our best to see that the legitimate claims of the people who have come from East Pakistan are not lost."

Then, the hon. Minister wrote to me in his letter dated 31st December:

"I should like to assure you that the matters regarding compensation are kept under constant review of the Government."

I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has any plan or policy regarding the East Pakistan minorities for their proper rehabilitation and compensation of properties left behind.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DINESH SINGH) :

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who participated in the debate on the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs for the frank and forthright manner in which they have put forward their views and the analysis they have presented of the international situation. As I listened to the debate, it did appear to me that while a number of controversial issues were mentioned, a broad measure of consensus has emerged regarding the approach to foreign relations. Some doubts continued to linger in the minds; some of them it is possible to clarify by discussions here in the House and other committees of the House; some, of course, remain as basic points of approach, of internal thinking, of policies at home, which continue to be reflected in international relations because, after all, foreign affairs is only an extension of the hopes and aspirations abroad of the various people in the country. But there is, I am glad to say, a growing acceptance of India's policy of peaceful coexistence, non-alignment and international co-operation which is the only answer to the conflicts that we have seen from time to time.

Since I had the privilege to put forward the budget of the Ministry last year, there has been a further movement forward in the discussions between the Super Powers. They have continued their discussions in areas which have concerned them primarily, whether it is the SALT, the agreement on outer space or the discussions regarding keeping the sea bed free of nuclear weapons. But we have not seen an equal measure of cooperation in resolving either the political or the economic problems that face the world as a whole. There has been, what one may call, a certain measure of vertical discussion and understanding but what we need is not a vertical understanding between the super powers or a group of powers but horizontal understanding between the sovereign nations of the world. It is this that we have to continue to attempt.

In a world in which we have seen conflicts come up from time to time—some conflicts engulf all countries while other minor conflicts affect an area or certain countries—the only answer lies in building up a system of cooperation based on the equality of all nations, the recognition of their sovereignty, the recognition of their territorial integrity and the giving up of the use of force to settle all differences.

In the year of the centenary of the Father of our Nation, we made every effort to highlight this issue before the world forum, in the United Nations and outside, and all over the world people had an opportunity to listen to the teachings of the Father of the Nation and to see in photographs his work not only for his own country but for humanity as a whole. Although one cannot say that we have made a landmark in the solution of problems of the world, I would say that there is a growing acceptance of the need to forge closer cooperation as the only possible alternative to war in this world.

My hon. friend, Shri Pillo Mody, presented to the House our relations with the countries of the world with all the theatricals at his command but I may submit to the House that they are based on these principles that I attempted to enumerate. I am sorry, Shri Mody is not here. One can understand that he is not here; he always tries to read out his statements and then disappear. This is the third time, I think, when we are in this position.

It is a measure of the reflection of the success of our efforts that we have been able to maintain good friendly relations, relations of close cooperation, with large number of countries which enabled him to spend quite a lot of his time during his speech here; otherwise, he would have been totally at a loss to know what to say.

The main effort that we have made during the year is in Asia. We have attached very great importance to the strengthening of our relations with Asian countries. India, situated as it is in a strategic centre, the southern part of Asia, it is only natural that we would wish to have friends both on the western side as well as on the eastern and northern sides of Asia.

Shri Piloo Mody was rather distressed; he said that we had accepted the Soviet Union as an Asian power. He may be able to stand and block part of a map but I cannot change the geography of the world. When more than two-thirds of the Soviet Union is situated in Asia, can we say in all sincerity that the Soviet Union is not in Asia? If the capital is in Europe, that does not mean that large parts of the territory and the citizens of the Soviet Union are not Asians or that they have nothing to do with Asia. But Mr. Piloo Mody sees red as soon as anything concerning Soviet Union is presented and that is something which I cannot help. He has himself to re-orient his thinking to bring it in line with what is happening in the world today.

In this respect, a number of references were made by some hon. Members about the need for us to pay attention to our neighbours, that we have neglected them and that we have not paid sufficient attention to them. Sir, I would like, with your permission to read out a brief quotation from what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said in the Constituent Assembly as early as 8th March, 1949. He said, I quote :

"Asia today is primarily concerned with what may be called the immediate human problems. In each country of Asia, these main problem is the problem of food, of clothing, of education and of help. We are concerned with these problems. We are not directly concerned with the problems of power politics. The countries of Asia may have quarrels with each other here and there. But there is no basic legacy of conflict such as the countries of Europe possess."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru felt that India can play a big part and an effective part in helping to avoid war in Asia. It was his hope that Asia would succeed in safeguarding itself from the sources that seek to inject war into our part of the world. I cannot say that we have wholly succeeded in keeping war of the Asian land. In fact, we have not succeeded in ending war in Asia . . .

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : Are these words of Mr. Nehru or of Mr. Dinesh Singh? Is this a part of the quotation or the quotation ends there?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : If it leaves any measure of doubt whether these are words from Panditji or from me, personally, it will be a very great honour for me.

Sir, we have not been able to prevent war. But we are trying to build peace which will keep wars out. We are trying to build in this area the bonds that united us, the links that were destroyed by hundreds of years of colonialism, which had carved out Asia to be linked with their own economy to feed their own people. We have now to make efforts again to re-establish these bonds between the Asian countries.

It has been our feeling that this can best be done by establishing close economic cooperation between the Asian countries. Our concept of cooperation between the Asian countries is not limited to expansion of trade although, for a long time, the developed countries kept on harping that the economies of the developing countries in Asia being parallel, there was no possibility of greater expansion of trade.

What we have been attempting under the Asian Council of Ministers is a much deeper economic co-operation between the Asian countries. I should like to say that the efforts that were made about a year ago to forge closer economic cooperation between the Asian countries are beginning to bear fruit. The tasks that were assigned by the Asian Council of Ministers to the Working Group that had been set up are nearing completion. I think, by the end of summer or early autumn, and then we shall have an opportunity to meet in the Asian Council of Ministers towards the end of the year to take stock of the various studies that have been going on and how we can ourselves establish closer bonds between the countries of Asia.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

In trying to establish close multi-lateral collaborations between the Asian countries, we have not neglected our bilateral contacts. The economic co-operation that we have established with Ceylon and with Iran are examples of close bilateral collaborations which are not only for the promotion of trade but also for encouraging economic activity in the two countries and other prospects of multi-lateralism. My hon. friend, Shri S. K. Tapuriah finds it a little difficult to understand because it does not give money quickly but very soon he will appreciate...

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : He is no longer the Commerce Minister; he is speaking only about economics and all that. If he wants to go, that is a different thing.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The difficulty is that such economics takes away the attempted monopoly that he makes and therefore, he fears that even if I am not the Commerce Minister I continue to trouble him. I can assure him that it is not my intention.

It is my intention to forge closer economic cooperation in Asia.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Dabhoi) : Are you reading his thoughts? Is there mental telepathy going on?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Although he sits close to you... (*Interruptions*)

I am putting forward the economic aspects. We have not neglected the political aspects. I was trying to say that in Asia it is necessary to reforge the links that were snapped away and the economic links are of vital interest to all countries in Asia because problems of Asia are the problems of developments and unless we can find quick answers to give to the peoples in all countries of Asia, a better life and unless we can give them the prospect of close identity for development in their own countries and in Asia as a whole, the position of instability will continue. There will always be risks of domination. Whether it comes in terms of foreign aid or whether it comes in some other forms of military pacts or other system, it is domination because the Asian countries have not been enabled so stand on their own feet. That is why one hears of all kinds of pacts, influences, and unless we go to the root of it,

it is difficult to find an answer. As mentioned it has not been limited to the efforts that we have made in the economic field.

The Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi put forward a positive proposal in 1967 to forge close Asian identity. The Prime Minister suggested the idea of having a convention among the nations of Asia ensuring respect for independence and sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of the region and neutrality of all countries which wish to remain neutral. Such a convention should be signed not only by all countries of the region but also by the great powers. It should incorporate into it the five principles of peaceful co-existence and the concept of economic, cultural, scientific and technical co-operation. I hope the concerned countries will give consideration to this suggestion made three years ago and that it will form the basis of promoting peace, security, stability and progress in Asia.

The hon. Member had said that we had talked of the European security system, and that we have welcomed what they are doing in Europe. I am now trying to give them an idea of what we are doing in Asia and perhaps it hurts them because they know that we are making a positive contribution forges closer Asian co-operation and they are only trying to build up an image of our not having been able to do so. So, I can understand the small irritations but the facts cannot be rubbed out by small jibes here and there.

When I talk of the Asian co-operation there has been a certain measure of, if I may say so, a deliberate attempt to confuse what is called the Brezhnev proposal with Asian co-operation. I read out the proposal that the Prime Minister of India had made in March, 1967. It was three years ago. The proposal that has been put forward by Mr. Brezhnev is very much more recent. Yet, there is an attempt to try to say that whatever comes from Moscow, we attach more importance to it. This is born out of an inferiority complex on the part of some of our friends on that side who always look to Washington, London and other places. So it is absolutely necessary for us to look to what is happening in New Delhi, not Washington or Moscow or London. (*Interruptions*). If they do so, they will find for themselves a place of dignity and honour.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : This is the first policy pronouncement in his speech. He says, look at New Delhi and not towards Moscow. I am really happy today at this change. I hope he keeps looking towards Delhi.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : If the hon. Member likes to go to Washington he can go there now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I should like to say that the ideas put forward as the Brezhnev proposal are in many ways what the Prime Minister has said 3 years ago; we cannot condemn them because they have come from Moscow. If they coincide with our ideas we must welcome them.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : How is Mr. Brezhnev's health today ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I have no doubt that if the proceedings of the House are known outside, Mr. Brezhnev will be deeply touched by the concern the hon. Member has expressed.

Now, some Members made an insinuation that we were recognising the Soviet Union as an Asian power only to enable the Soviet Union to bring its navy to the Indian Ocean as if we could keep out navies of other countries, as if the American navy is not present, as if the British navy is not here even when they are not Asian powers in any way. But that does not hold, I am amazed that they felt it was a sort of security and the going away of the British navy has now created a vacuum. And I have said in this House repeatedly that we welcome the withdrawal of the British navy. It was a symbol of domination in Asia and never a symbol of progress in Asia, and I am surprised and in many ways humiliated when my countrymen say, what will happen if the British go away. Asians will have to fight for their independence, not the British. And, it is time that we realised that we are not going to depend on others either for our defence or for our progress or for development, that we have the resources here, we have the technical know-how and we have got to prepare ourselves to meet the challenges that come and it can be done only with a measure of self-respect, dignity and self-reliance and not looking to Washington or Moscow.

Some hon. Members referred to our relations with China. That is not a new situation. The House is aware of the efforts that we have made over the last two decades to forge close friendship with

China. It has not been always appreciated; we have received many setbacks. And, we have got to look at the situation as it has emerged today. In China itself many changes are afoot. They have had three revolutions and they are still trying to settle down and build for their people a new life. This is what we are doing also in India as in other countries of Asia. We have got to take therefore the situation, not of the past, not of what happened, but what is happening today and what may happen tomorrow. And we have made it known to the House. It had been said by us, by the Prime Minister, and sometimes I have also said, that we are willing to discuss our differences with China taking into account our national honour and our national interest.

And that situation remains. We shall continue to watch the prospects that there may be to find a peaceful solution to our differences with China.

Some hon. Members suggested that we should exchange Ambassadors with China. The very idea of exchange of Ambassadors implies action on the part of the two countries—China and India. China must be willing to send an Ambassador to India and we must be willing to send an Ambassador to China. May I say that it is not a matter to which we have closed our minds? We are willing and at an appropriate time we will see how we can establish closer dialogue with China. This would be one of the things and I would like to assure the House that while we may not have an Ambassador in China we have a Senior Diplomat of the status of an Ambassador-charge-d'affaires—and the diplomatic contacts between the two countries are not suffering on account of the lack of the presence of an Ambassador.

Some hon. Members had also raised the issue of Tibet. I would not like to go into it because our position is well known and has been stated again and again in this House, that we have recognised that Tibet is part of China. And it remains as part of China.

Then some hon. Members have raised the question of Indo-China. I must say that we have been deeply distressed and pained to see extension of hostilities in Indo-China. About a year ago, when I had the opportunity to discuss this matter when we presented the budget last year there were some signs building up which could give an indication that we would be able to find ultimately a peaceful solution. The Paris talks began.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

There were hopes that they may be able to produce some workable arrangement. In the year that has gone by, the situation has deteriorated. Although the U.S. has expressed its desire to withdraw the American forces from South Viet-Nam, and we have welcomed this, there has been, on the other hand, a certain measure of escalation in Laos and in Cambodia. It is rather a complex situation. It is easier for Members to express their opinions on what is happening there. In their position I would also be able to express an opinion. One makes an assessment by the events from newspapers. But we have a very complex situation in Indo-China.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I said about Cambodia last year. But the Prime Minister blamed that Jan Sangh discovered Cambodia, and you shared that attitude. You are not different from her. For about one year what did you do ? Did you pay a visit to Cambodia? Did you give up your sleep?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I am glad that the hon. Member in his enthusiasm and the manner in which he addresses us from time to time has indicated giving up of sleep as a means for finding a solution. If that finds a solution I am sure that this will be a new political instrument. So far, we have seen fasts, dharna and gheraos. Now, giving up our sleep will also be used as an instrument. I wish that the leader of his party takes note of it.

So far as I am concerned, I would rather give the matter serious thought than lose my sleep at night. So far as Indo-China is concerned, the House has been kept informed of the developments as they have taken place in Laos. We have now certain proposals made by the Pathet-Lao which are under the consideration of the Laotian Government. We hope that after a dead-lock they will ultimately find a peaceful solution out of the difficulty in which Laos finds itself.

To-day certain developments are taking place which we have again brought before this House. We have to watch this situation very carefully. It is very easy for the hon. member to say that Government does not have a policy and why does not Government say so. But that is not the way in which diplomacy is conducted. I did point out even then to the hon. member that at that time apart from one particular country, no

other had expressed any views one way or the other. Now I can understand the hon. member may say that this Government is mum, it does not say anything; but when 99 per cent of the world governments had not said anything, then I think that keeping quiet was the correct thing to do.

As for the reconvening of the ICSC, we must quite clearly see what is the role of the ICSC, what it can do and how it can be reconvened. So far as Cambodia is concerned, the Commission for Cambodia continues. But it had to withdraw from Cambodia because of lack of funds and facilities. Today if we wish to take the Commission back to Cambodia, we would naturally have to consult with the supervisory powers.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Why ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Because they constitute the Commission. Just Shri Sondhi or I going there will not constitute the Commission. Much as we would like to think that we represent everybody, we do not.

SHRI KAMALNAYAN BAJAJ (Wardha) : If Shri Sondhi were there, he would do a better job of it.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We did try and ascertain from the other supervisory powers whether they thought this would be the appropriate time for us to try to go back to Cambodia and the response has been negative. We are now trying to engage ourselves in a dialogue not on behalf of the Commission, but with the three countries constituting the Commission. We are trying to see whether we cannot meet again, not as a Commission but as representatives of the three countries to see what needs to be done in Cambodia.

But I would say that the situation as it is developing in Vietnam is again a reflection of the constant interference by foreign powers in the domestic affairs of others and the only way we can find a peaceful solution—and there can be no other solution because other solutions have been tried out—is to assert and be able to get implemented the withdrawal of all foreign forces from all the three countries of what was called Indo-China. Once foreign forces are withdrawn, the peoples in these countries would be able to find a way of their own to sort out their differences. It is this effort we have been making.

Some hon. members asked me what we had done about strengthening our relations with DRVN. I should like to tell them that it would be not only in our interest, not only in the interest of DRVN but in the interest of peace in Asia to have with DRVN closer relations. If DRVN is isolated, she will certainly face greater difficulties and the prospects of greater influence from others. It is the DRVN's functioning in the Asian community which will enable her, South Vietnam and the other countries of Indo-China to gradually work a way out of the difficulties into which others have landed them, for we must not forget that it is not the Indo-Chinese or the Vietnamese or the Cambodians or Laotians who created them. They inherited this situation. It can be worked out only by close co-operation between and with them. It is our hope that we shall be able to strengthen contacts and relations with DRVN and that DRVN will play a positive role in finding a peaceful solution.

Some hon. members referred to our relations with Pakistan. Prof. Mukerjee asked me why we are shy of a Ministers' meeting on Farraka. I can assure him that the minister of Irrigation and Power is always willing to meet with his colleague not only from Pakistan but from all other countries to exchange views on these matters. But the point here is entirely different.

Talks were started between India and Pakistan to assess the requirements of Pakistan, the surpluses if any of the waters and how we can make sure that Farraka barrage that we were building would not in any way come against the interests of the people in East Pakistan. We have satisfied in every possible way that building of Farraka will not in any way affect adversely the position of the people in East Pakistan. But the Pakistan Government has been trying to present a picture in which its demands for water have been rising constantly and therefore we continued with officials meeting to get some agreed data, some basis on which the ministers can meet and settle the matter. If we do not have the basic data, what will the Ministers decide? Because, from the political point of view we have assured ourselves that Farraka will not adversely affect East Pakistan. There is a problem of drainage and ours is shortage of water and therefore building Farraka will not harm them. We are willing to discuss with Pakistan and draw up arrangements to see how we can be of assistance to them.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : Do I take it from the Minister that in view of the larger interest involved and in the interest of friendship between the two countries and also technical possibility of a much bigger scheme where the Ganga-Brahmaputra region could be tackled at least a beginning could be made in the process of improving Indo-Pak relations? Do we take it that in the context of these things Government are ready to have ministerial level talks and not insist on purely secretary-level discussions to continue from time to time?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I tried to explain to the hon. Member that unless they had the basis statistics the Ministers cannot by themselves meet and agree on anything. The hon. Member knows it well and he has been to many international meetings, that in any international meeting it is customary to arrange for discussions at technical levels in which groundwork is prepared over which the ministers could be in a position to take political decisions. In the absence of technical data, it would not be possible to take political decisions.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Does it not amount to a denial of discussions at a level where basic decisions in the matter could be taken and not merely limited discussions on technological factors?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : No, Sir, not at all. On the other hand it shows lack of desire on the part of Pakistan to enter into meaningful discussions. They do not want discussions to be meaningful. Even if you hold meetings at the level of ministers or the Prime Minister they cannot decide things unless there are certain basic statistics and data to go by.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : You can still make an imaginative approach and appeal to the people of Pakistan over the head of their Government making this gesture?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We have tried to make this known to the people in Pakistan. Even in the Government of Pakistan, I should like to inform the Professor, there is better appreciation now that if they keep away this data from us it will be difficult to have meaningful discussions and at meetings more and more data are provided and we hope that if at all Pakistan is sincere on this matter it will not be difficult to reach a satisfactory agreement.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

I should also like to assure Prof. Mukerjee that it is our desire to forge close links with Pakistan on the basis of the Tashkent declaration and to have Pakistan as a partner in Asian co-operation which is being attempted. So far the response from Pakistan has been negative. Pakistan is going through a process of political and constitutional change and may be at the end of it. It will be possible to review the position between the two countries. We shall certainly be ready to do so at any time when Pakistan is willing.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : ताशकंद डिक्लेरेसन की घर्षजयां उड़ गई हैं। कहां है ताशकंद डिक्लेरेसन ? हम समझते के लिए तैयार हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान तैयार नहीं है। बाइज्रत बातचीत होनी चाहिए।

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Is it not a fact that Pakistan wants to keep Farraka issue alive as a political level, counterpart to Kashmir because Kashmir does not appeal to the emotions of East Pakistan and therefore Farraka has been brought in to appeal to their emotions and keep up the tensions?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Well, the hon. Member has made his points already.

Now, there was another small point raised by Prof. Mukerjee about Pakistan's membership of the non-aligned conference. I would like to assure him also that it is not our desire to keep Pakistan out of the non-aligned conference. I have said that we shall be not only the first to welcome it but we shall be glad to sponsor Pakistan into the non-aligned conference provided Pakistan becomes non-aligned. You cannot have a country which is both aligned and non-aligned at the same time. Let Pakistan become non-aligned. Let it give up the pacts. Don't, Mr. Mukerjee, support Pakistan holding on to these pacts and coming into the non-aligned conference.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : If it can come into the bandwagon it is better.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : We are not considering the non-aligned conference as a bandwagon. It is a conference of serious-minded sovereign countries working in the interests of the world community.

Certain references were made to our relations with Nepal. I would like the House to bear in mind that our relations with Nepal go back deep into the history and tradition, that there has been a developing situation, and that it has been our constant desire to maintain these very close political, economic and cultural relations with Nepal. In fact, Nepal is the only country with which we have an open border. In many ways, many other relations exist between Nepal and India. But we should not get too concerned by what some newspapers or some individuals, even if they are in authority, say about our relations. We have got to go on persevering in offering our co-operation to Nepal and not getting into a position in which our Co-operation is misunderstood for any kind of domination or anything being taken for granted. It is this that we are pursuing with Nepal. We are willing to assist and to co-operate and are willing to have the closest possible relations with Nepal. That must be on the basis of recognition that it is necessary for both the countries and that it would not be in the interest of the country to play one country against the other. India's friendship with Nepal, its open border and its thousand years of historical contact cannot be compared to Nepal's relations with any other country. Therefore, we shall continue to recognise Nepal as a sovereign country, fully sovereign, and it would not be our desire to interfere in their internal affairs. We wish to co-operate with them and, to the extent that they would wish, also in international affairs.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय का जो कहना है, वह ठीक है मैं उस को मानता हूँ, लेकिन राजा महेन्द्र की तरफ से इन को क्या रेषोंस मिलता है ? इन की जो सद्-इच्छायें हैं, उन के प्रति राजा महेन्द्र की तरफ से क्या जवाब मिलता है—क्या इस के बारे में मंत्री महोदय बतलायेंगे ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : All these matters have been discussed in a number of questions and answers. If the House wishes to spend more time, I am willing to go into them again, but you are regulating the time and I leave it to you to decide whether we should go into them or we should move on.

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा (जयनगर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, नेपाल के साथ हमारा एक सहोदर का

रिश्ता रहा है, लेकिन हमारे मंत्री महोदय के वैदेशिक मंत्री के काल में एक झंझट खड़ा हो गया है—मुस्ता के एक गांव का। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस के लिये इन्होंने क्या प्रयास किया है? क्या वह हमारे गृह मंत्रालय के सचिव को इस मामले को तय करने के लिये भेज रहे हैं? क्या पश्चिमी कोसी नहर का मामला इसी की वजह से नहीं लटका हुआ है?

श्री विनेश सिंह : माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि मुस्ता का मामला मेरे कार्यकाल में शुरू हुआ है, यह तो सैंकड़ों साल का मामला है, इस का क्रेडिट मैं कैसे ले सकता हूँ कि यह मेरे वक्त में शुरू हुआ है।...

श्री रवि राय : यह डिस्क्रेडिट है।

श्री विनेश सिंह : जहाँ तक मुस्ता का मामला है, उस के बारे में कई मर्तबा यहाँ पर हम बात कर चुके हैं।...

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा : मैं ने पूछा है, उस के लिये आप क्या प्रयास कर रहे हैं।

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the House is aware of the complex situation that is continuing to exist in West Asia. Time and again we have discussed this matter in the House and expressed our deep concern not only at what has happened in West Asia but the continuing deteriorating situation there. We hear more and more chances of further escalation of conflict in that area.

I should like to say in West Asia also, we have a situation in which many factors from outside have tended to complicate the situation and we hope that all countries will make a firm resolve to implement the UN Resolution of 22nd November, 1967. That alone offers the possibility of reduction of tension in that area, which can make a beginning to the peaceful efforts there.

The House is aware of our very deep relations with the Arab countries and we have continued to maintain them. I think Mr. Asoka Mehta had very rightly raised the issue of Pan Islamism. It is one of the most dangerous thoughts that has been prevailing in that part of the world, in many ways encouraged by certain vested interests from

outside from time to time. It is the mixing up of religion with politics and the creation of a Pan Islamic Bloc. It constitutes a danger not only for us in India but for other countries in Asia, Africa and the world as a whole if you now think in the 1970s in the form of building religious blocs. The whole problem that West Asia was facing was the problem that Israel was tending to mix politics with religion. Now a bigger effort is being made to do the same. How can it be justified? It is one of the most amazing situations where a certain completely antiluvian out of date idea is given encouragement by some countries for their own national needs to create in that area a situation which will not only affect the area adversely but can create certain difficulties for the Arab cause. We are glad to see that a number of countries which take a more progressive outlook in international relations have condemned the idea of institutionalising this arrangement and setting up a secretariat. It is a matter of regret that not all Arab countries have been able to see the dangers that are inherent in this situation. But as days go by, it will become more and more apparent and countries which are going out of the way to forge this kind of religious combinations based on religious hatred, which we have seen being practised on our sub-continent, will realise that it can present a similarly dangerous situation in other parts of West Asia and North Africa. I should like the House to know that it is a matter in which we have been deeply concerned.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH (Khalilabad) : With the Chinese still in occupation of our territory, our Government is ready to hold a dialogue with them. Would they advise their intimate, personal and private friend, Mr. Nasser, also to hold a dialogue bilaterally with the Israelis?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The hon. member is free to send his suggestion. Certain questions were raised about our relationship with Africa. A feeling is sought to be created that our relations with Africa are weakening. I should like to dispel this feeling that is tended to be created. We had very close cooperation with the liberation movements in Africa when they were fighting for their independence. That stage is over. These countries are independent. The cooperation that we can give them now is not in terms of fighting for independence which has been realised but for consolidating that independence, for having closer economic

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

cooperation with them, and closer political identity, whether it is in non-aligned conferences or somewhere else. This continues to go on. The House has been presented with facts and figures by my colleague, the Minister for Foreign Trade, to prove the close joint collaboration schemes that have emerged between African countries and India. We are also providing facilities for training for a number of students who are coming here. In this connection, I would like to say that our assistance to the liberation movement in Africa continues. Though it is not a matter for us to advertize, in what manner and how closely we are in contact with them, we have continued to render assistance to them. The hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta, is the President of an organisation that has played a fairly active role in building close relations with African countries. So, he should know how closely we are continuing to work with African countries.

But the chronic problem of Africa still remains. Racial discrimination, as it is practised in South Africa, South West Africa and now in Rhodesia, is not only a crime against the people against whom it is practised but it is against the conscience of humanity as a whole. And again and again the international community as a whole has tried to find an answer. The answer is there, but there is not as yet enough will to implement it. The countries whose cooperation in enforcing the economic sanctions against these countries could be the deciding factor have not made up their mind to give this assistance to the international community. They continue to trade with Africa they continue to accept them in many ways. Unless we can bring about a situation where these countries will conform to the will of the international community, it will be difficult to seek a peaceful solution, and I hope that this House, by expression of its wishes, will contribute in gradually persuading these countries to implement the wishes of the United Nations.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : What about the nuclear policy?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : The hon. Member, whose speech I listened to with great attention, and the hon. Member, Shri Sondhi, raised the question of the nuclear policy. They are fully aware that it is not within the purview of the Ministry of External Affairs. Only this

morning they had an opportunity to discuss this matter and a categorical statement has been made about Government of India's nuclear weapon policy.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Sir, it is a categorical evasion; it is a categorical misstatement, if anything. All that we have said is lost. It is an insult to the intelligence of us, of the House and of the country. On the question of the nuclear policy Shrimati Satpathy's statement was like one of the novels or short stories; her recitation was absolutely of that quality; it has some lyrical quality about it, some literary quality about it but no nuclear quality about it. How can we have a foreign affairs debate without a statement on nuclear policy? It is a contradiction in terms. I do not mind his sticking to his policy, ignoring the wishes of 90 per cent of the Indian people, if he wants, but let him not insult us, let him not provoke us. Sir, I crave your indulgence; I am not going to accept this. I feel it is an important matter. We may ignore other issues, but the nuclear policy is an important issue.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I did not want to provoke the hon. Member. . . .

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Let him reply to it. If he does not agree with us, let him say so, but let him not take shelter behind Satpathy.

श्री रवि राय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स की कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में न्यूक्लियर पालिसी पर बहस होती है फिर उसको मंत्री महोदय यहां पर कैसे मना कर सकते हैं ?

श्री विनय सिंह : रवी राय जी पता नहीं कौन सी कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी अटेंड करते हैं जहां पर कि न्यूक्लियर पालिसी पर डिस्कशन होता है। एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स की कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में इस पर डिस्कशन नहीं हुआ है, यह मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूँ।

So far as the nuclear policy is concerned . . . (Interruptions) The hon. Member must learn to listen quietly. We have listened to him. He should behave himself instead of shouting . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : You know, Sir, a bomb had been dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This Government will be held responsible if it places India under the danger of a nuclear bomb. Tomorrow when a bomb is dropped

on India, what will happen? Let him give an answer. I made a very serious suggestion and other Members made suggestions. You gauge the sense of the House. I will yield to you. I would like to know your views.

SHRI SONAVANE (Pandharpur) : Sir, there should be some discipline in the House... (Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : When a nuclear bomb drops on his worthy head, then he should ask about discipline. What is going on in his political party? I am making a serious point. The whole world is concerned about the nuclear policy... (Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I share Shri Sondhi's views that the nuclear policy is a very important subject but it is not properly the subject of the External Affairs Ministry. Please do not insist on it now.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : Already the non-proliferation treaty has been signed. India took a definite attitude at the time of signing the non-proliferation treaty and did not sign it. After the treaty has been signed, India has to take some attitude *vis-a-vis* the non-proliferation treaty. We would like to be enlightened as to what exactly is the attitude of India *vis-a-vis* the treaty because many countries have signed the non-proliferation treaty. They have put certain conditions. In those conditions what exactly is likely to happen in case such a situation comes on our border that the nuclear menace increases? Will he please clarify?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : So far as the nuclear non-proliferation treaty is concerned, nothing new has taken place since then. We have already stated our views in the House that we are against signing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty because it places unequal obligations as between members which possess the nuclear bomb and which do not possess it. We are not willing to accept such unequal arrangements.

Regarding the nuclear policy as a whole it has been amply clarified that we propose to use the atom for peaceful purposes. The only thing is that we do not wish to manufacture nuclear weapons.

Hon. Members had referred to the situation in Europe. I had said that we had welcomed the efforts that were being

made by the European countries to establish a dialogue between themselves, to get together to try to solve their problems peacefully. We had welcomed this because this is exactly what we were attempting to do ourselves in Asia. In fact, this is the only answer that we see for all countries of the world, namely, to try to solve their disputes peacefully and to try to enter into meaningful cooperation with one another.

The questions of our relations with GDR was raised by the hon. Member, Shri Krishna Menon, Professor Mukerjee and others. I should like to say that we have said on several occasions in this House that our relations with GDR are continuing to grow and we shall take up the institution of formal arrangements in keeping with the developing relations. As the need increases for us to have different arrangements with the G.D.R., we shall not fight shy of them. We are not dictated by the HALLSTEIN doctrine or by any other doctrine. It is purely in our own national interest and it will be our endeavour to continue to strengthen our economic and political arrangements with the G.D.R.

17 hrs.

Just a word about the foreign service. The members of the Foreign Service, scattered as they are all over the world, have a difficult task to perform because of limitation that we have on our finances, the shortage of time, the two decades in which the Service has come up and has to take responsibility on terms of equality with nations which have had traditions of this Service going back to several countries. May I say it has been a matter not only of pleasure but of pride for me to see members of the Foreign Service work in different parts of the world and to command the respect and cooperation that they do? It should be a matter of very great satisfaction to this House that India's Foreign Service is rated as one of the best Foreign Service in the world. We are trying to strengthen any institutional weaknesses that there may be. We are trying to develop better expertises, to have better system of their transfers and postings and the working conditions in which they will have a greater sense of security in participation.

In the field of External Publicity, we are trying now, gradually, to give greater emphasis to public relations rather than to dissemination of news under External Publicity and with the changes that we are thinking, I hope, we will be able to

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

project a more accurate picture of what is happening in India and what our achievements are in this country.

May I, in conclusion, say that in reviewing the international situation and outlining the major elements of our foreign policy, I have, inevitably, had to mention our efforts at enlarging the area of cooperation and collaboration both in the political and economic sense. I have been encouraged to believe, and there is a broad consensus in the House and in the country at large, that the ends of our security cannot be maintained against the background of isolation in scientific technological, industrial, economic or political fields. For a country of our size and of our resources, there is no other way. In pursuing this policy, we are merely re-affirming Gandhiji's belief which he expressed in these words, I quote:

"My nationalism is fierce but not exclusive and not devised to hurt any nation or individual. India's freedom, as conceived by me, can never be a menace to the world. The whole of my country may die so that the human race may live."

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, there are a number of cut motions. May I put them together?

SHRI G. VISHWANATHAN : I want to have a clarification from the hon. Minister...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, please we have already taken such a long time. You should have asked him while he was replying.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : Only those who shout get an opportunity... (Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I had allowed many Members to put questions.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : I want to get only a clarification...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No please, if I allow you, I will have to allow others also.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : Do you want us to shout? Those who shout get a chance...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If the whole House agrees to open the debate all over again, I am in the hands of the House.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secundrabad) : You asked us not to disturb him.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Kindly listen to me. If I allow one Member to put a question, I must allow others also. Therefore, I request you not to press for that. We have already exceeded our time allotted for this Ministry. I would humbly request the hon. Member, Shri Viswanathan, to kindly cooperate.

Now I will put all the cut motions to vote.

*All the cut motions were put and negatived**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now 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, 1971, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 12 and 13 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

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

DEMAND NO. 12—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,10,97,000 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, 1971, in respect of 'External Affairs.'"

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,01,35,000 be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs.'"

17.06 hrs.

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now take up discussion and voting on demand Nos. 64 to 66, 125 and 126 relating to the Ministry of Irrigation and Power for which four hours have been allotted.