

make it in the afternoon or tomorrow.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): If you want, I can say something orally just now, but if you want it in writing, I shall give it in the afternoon....

Mr. Speaker: He may have the statement prepared, and the statement might be made.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I have already submitted a short notice question on this particular matter about his visit to Assam....

Mr. Speaker: Would the House like to take it up on a short notice question or would the House like a statement to be made?

Some hon. Members: Let a statement be made.

Mr. Speaker: By what time would the statement be ready? I think he might make it about 4 P.M.

An hon. Member: He may make it tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Very well; he might make that statement tomorrow after the Question Hour.

12.24 hrs.

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs. Now, Shri Krishna Menon.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): At what time would the hon. Minister reply?

Mr. Speaker: I am calling the hon. Minister after Shri Krishna Menon.

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is with a degree of reticence, but at the same time, with no sense of reservation, that I venture to intervene in this debate. Reticence, because factors that must determine the dimensions and the orientation of foreign policy have undergone certain changes in the world which in the course of things cannot receive consideration in an all-over debate of this kind.

I want to say at once that I have little doubt that the Minister of External Affairs at the head with all the expertise at his disposal as well as the staff of men who have the experience of having worked under one of the foremost statesmen of the world for over 15 years, would have looked into these matters in necessary detail and relevant contexts. But that does not absolve the responsibility of a Member of Parliament or even a member of the public examining these issues.

Therefore, reticence arises from the fact that there are so many things and their involvements are so many there is not the time to deal with them. I shall only touch them as I go on.

The second thing that I would like to say is this. I join in the tribute, the well-deserved tribute, that has been paid to the Prime Minister for her great personal success, and I join in the gratification that all of us feel on her debut in international affairs on her own. But policy at personal success is not the same as policy. This is in no way to denigrate from the assessments of or from the yet to come consequences of what she has accomplished.

Our Prime Minister would not be the first person to be in this position.

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Eisenhower and Khrushchev meeting at Camp David thought they had solved the problems of the world. And soon came the U-2. Kennedy went to Vienna, and despite the Bay of Pigs scored a personal success. But the position of the world in regard to the world deadlock continued to be unabated and severe. In the case of our Prime Minister, she has made it very clear before she went, during her stay in the United States, and afterwards, that she did not go there to discuss details of policy, of politics or economics or of aid, but it was really to promote good relationship, which some people imagined had undergone a change, between the United States and ourselves. And it would be not in our interest that issues of that kind should cloud the major questions, that is to say, whether the visit should have been cancelled, whether some one should have come here or we should have gone there. If those issues cloud the main factors, then the main factors do not come into light. Therefore, leaving these things aside, I shall deal with the questions of policy.

Policy issues cannot be separated from the Foreign Minister. I want to congratulate the Foreign Minister and express my appreciation on two matters. One is that he has said that he is not abandoning our policy of non-alignment. One might wonder why it is necessary to keep on repeating it every time. That in itself carries its own import. The second thing is that our policy in regard to Vietnam has not changed.

Now there are two difficulties which one encounters which I shall deal with afterwards, after dealing with the policy matters in reference to the Prime Minister's statements. First, I for one, as the rest of the country, would accept fully and with great respect the reassurances that she has thought fit to give to this land that there is no "sell-out" and that there are no fundamental and basic changes

in policy and so on. But there again, we have to look into the content of things as they are. First of all, it is not unusual, but it does create difficulties for those who have not been able to follow, when we read for the first time about changes in policy or decisions from the government of another country rather than from ours. Secondly, we also have had a full report of the Prime Minister's visit to the United States, and I have no reason to think she would keep anything important away from this House. Therefore, when equally well-placed statesmen in other parts of the world make statements of a diametrically opposite character, we are thrown into confusion.

We have had two or three instances of that kind. One is that of the Vice-President of the United States. While the Prime Minister assures us—as I said, I accept it without any reservation whatsoever—that there have been no discussions on our policy, our affairs are our own—she laid stress on this question of self-respect and self-sufficiency. But there is Mr. Hubert Humphrey making us rather nonplussed. It may be the impact that television makes on men before it. He said in regard to the discussions with the Government of India—not only with the Prime Minister that 'They had gone into the whole matter of development of the economy and the social and political structure'. These are not my words; they are in quotes. He said, 'They have gone into the whole matter of development of the economy and social and political structure'. There is no harm in discussing with a foreign government academically the political structure of any country, but if it means that that discussion is relevant to the relations that exist, then certain consequences follow.

Secondly, there appears a report in this morning's papers with regard to a gentleman, whose name is familiar, Mr. Eugene Black, a great man in his

own way, supposed to be the first diplomat in economic affairs of any dimension. He will come here, we are told not as part of the World Bank, but as one deputised to do so by the President of the United States. That rather lends colour to the fact that the World Bank is another name for the United States. He comes here as Deputy to the President of the United States for what purpose? In order to consider the questions of joint projects between Pakistan and ourselves. I am sorry my hon. friend Dr. Lohia has not been consulted on this matter. Joint projects between Pakistan and ourselves in regard to what? Not with regard to the withdrawal of troops from the Ichhogil Canal, but in regard to a Brahmaputra project which is to last for 15 years.

After all, the President of the United States is quite free to survey the world and to prescribe for it. But it is quite another matter whether we accept the prescription. What is the background of this matter? The Minister of Planning arrives in New York and soon afterwards there is an announcement by the World Bank that they would provide the money for these joint projects. There have been talks about it too, between the Bank President and the Minister. It is quite true that Mr. Asoka Mehta has said that the climate is not suitable. To my mind, the expression that the climate is not suitable is worse than not saying anything at all. That is to say, the difficulty is only of a temporary kind.

These are basic matters, that we should go into economic co-operative effort with our neighbour, Pakistan, who should have been a good neighbour but has not been. Until conditions change in the world we cannot contemplate being involved in oil and gas exploration in the Rajasthan and Punjab frontier, or become involved in power projects in the Brahmaputra valley. With the experience of what has happened in difficult times; these are things not only in themselves

causing consternation, but the idea that these things are discussed at great length, and decisions are reached and that we should come to know about it afterwards, is something that causes concern.

The House is bound to ask, entitled to ask, why one is so suspicious about them. In my limited experience, when we entered into the Indus Waters Treaty, this is how it began. There was not going to be an agreement, but we were just going to explore. This is what was said. But why should we explore what experience tells us would be a snare and a delusion?

Along with the announcement in the American newspapers that Mr. Black is coming here as Deputy of the President of the United States, there is a more or less inspired report. It says that the Prime Minister during her visit to the United States had already made a public offer for economic co-operation with Pakistan. And therefore, without being legalistic, one can say that if the Prime Minister has made an offer and the other side accepts, then it becomes a concluded contract. But what has happened? The Prime Minister made no offer. All she said was that we are always prepared to discuss economic affairs and settle them with Pakistan. That is not an offer about the Brahmaputra valley. That just shows that if people want to decide our affairs instead of their own, they can use any phraseology, anything that comes out in this way.

So, we are in a situation now that with regard to joint projects, Mr. Black is coming and then there is to be "exploration", exactly as happened to the Indus waters. We offered them water; we said we had no obligation to give them water, neither legal nor moral, but on humanitarian grounds we would store the water and then give it to Pakistan. They said they could not trust us. In the end,

[Shri Krishna Menon]

under the Indus Water Treaty on which we spent millions and millions of our dollars, it now transpires that ultimately one of its results has been the Ichchogil Canal.

Then we come to this much-debated problem about what is called the Indo-American Fund. It is said that money, wherever it comes from is money which is good enough. That is quite true up to a point, but leaving alone the ethics, morals and politics of it, we are concerned about this one issue. When the P.L. 480 agreement was made, there was no revelation of the details to this House. I do not know whether even the members of the Government at that time know of them, but the idea was that corresponding to the lease-lend arrangements, they would not come in the way of the currency position of this country or the constitutional laws of the United States. That is an arrangement whereby the moment an order is made for foodgrains or long staple cotton or whatever it is, the rupee content of it is paid into the Reserve Bank into the account of the Embassy, out of which 12½ per cent can be taken for the expenses of the Embassy and 8½ per cent for loans to private industry. The remainder was to be frozen money. That is to say, it will not interfere with the volume of our currency. If it adds to the volume of our currency, there will be inflation without our having to do anything with it. The control of the value of the money would thus be in foreign hands. But this understanding has suffered from breach now more than before. In the first year, Shri Morarji Bhai was there and he took out a few crores; last year Shri Krishnamachari took out Rs. 191 crores out of it and this year the Finance Minister has taken out Rs. 243 crores or so. It is a very subtle way to add to our revenue from American resources by private negotiation out of the finances of the U.S. Ambassador. That is the position. This is a

matter which should be discussed on the Finance Bill. That apart, if this money is to be frozen and should not be allowed to interfere with the standards of our life by the fall in value, it should not be used for any purpose. Even when it went into government securities, government securities do not sit idle; they are used in the economic development of the country. Over and above that, we go to the other aspect of it. I make no bones about this; I think it is as humiliating a proposition as the VOA. At the last moment, though the VOA business had gone very far, the first Prime Minister of India put his foot down and stopped it with the result that the cultural infiltration and the attempt to have a certain amount of control that way disappeared. It is wrong to say that there are other foundations. No doubt, there may be other foundations, Indian or otherwise. They have nothing to do with the government; they give money. But this is a semi-government foundation. I am not going into the details of the organisation; that can be done afterwards. I believe myself that this is an intrusion into the cultural and intellectual development of our country and highly resented by the people who have anything to do with education. It is no answer to say that you will have well-bound books, projectors or reactors or whatever they may be. The volume of this and is such and there is a case where quantity makes all the difference, more than quality itself. The volume of it is so much. The money put at the disposal of this fund is either almost as much or nearly as much as what is at the disposal of the University Grants Commission. If this was an entirely neutral kind of assistance, putting on one side the economic effects on the rupee, the proper thing would have been to hand it over to the UGC, a technical organisation or to the Education Minister or whatever it is and work under the laws of the country. These are the factors which one has to deal with regard to policy.

The Prime Minister also assured us that there was no question of foreign control whatsoever, that nothing would be done, nothing has been done and nothing will be done which impinges on our self-respect or our self-reliance. With regard to the first, I believe it is a case where there is no sense of collective responsibility because a senior member of this government has told this House that self-respect does not come into question on the procurement of food or other supplies. I suppose it is an internal matter in the Government to work it out for themselves; perhaps one could be self-respecting and the others not so, so that you can take a look on which side you are.

So far as self-reliance is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I will take it up here. There was a time when in this House, the Planning Commission for years said about the "take-off stage" and self-generating economy. These are all current coin. Now the reason for looking elsewhere for assistance is that we cannot take off by ourselves. Since the expression "take-off" comes from aviation, you cannot "take off" except against an adverse wind. If you take off with a favourable wind, you crash; the aeroplane goes the wrong way and turns round. Why? Because it wants wind to bite into it. Therefore, this idea that we can be depending for ten years is like a drinking man who says: let me drink for three days; after that I will give it up. That is the position. Our economy would become dependent. This is not the place for that, and I do not want to go into the details. The question is this. Do we want to become another Brazil or do we want to remain India? This is the question which we should ask for ourselves. I leave it there. I do not want to go into the details.

The Prime Minister rightly warned us against defeatism, against saying that things are bad, this, that and the other. Times without number in this House, people have been commenting

on our public relations. I was one of those people who have stood up and said that there is no use blaming public relations. There is nothing to be gained by blaming external publicity. Public relations are only the reflection of policy. In this matter, there is a different situation. Who is the one, who are the agents who are spreading defeatism, who are telling the world that we are suffering from famine, that the people are starving in the streets, who is it that spreads the information that led that 4,000 children parading the streets of Amsterdam to collect some money for us, poor Indians? Who asked President Johnson to say that 12 million children are starving? What are the real facts?

Who have been saying that the population is expanding at a rapid rate? I do not want to enter into any controversy about it. But I would say that the estimated population in the third Five Year Plan—I had occasion to study it—was about 491 millions. And our population has not increased to that proportion. I think it is time that we said that the increase in agricultural production in this country is far higher than the rise in population. On the one hand, it is said that there has been no attention paid to agriculture. But agriculture goes into motor-car production. Of course, motor-cars cannot be produced very easily. The whole description is given in the United Nations report, as to how agriculture is closely tied up with industry. It goes on to say that agriculture has been neglected. There has been a fall in production. The Prime Minister herself has contradicted these trends on the radio the other day. Now, the third Five Year Plan is over. What is the position? Our agricultural advance has been 75 per cent during these years, which is far more than the corresponding increase in production in any other country at a similar stage of development.

Our industrial development has been in the same way. It is quite

[Shri Krishna Menon]

true that, in industrial development, there are occasions when there are certain troughs in the general conveyor belt of production as such. Therefore, if there is any defeatism created, what is the use? The idea of famine reminds me of a book of Mr. Bowles where it is stated that somebody from some small republic in Europe went to the State Department of the United States and said that it wanted money. They asked him, "Have you got any communists?" He said "No, we are not communists; we are a catholic State." Then they said, "We cannot give you money as you have no communists to combat." He said, "What shall I do?" They told him, "You go to France. They may give you some communists." This is a story; I did not originate it. The poor man went to France, but they said, "We have not got enough of communists for ourselves." "So, we cannot give you any". So, this story of saying that the people are dying of famine, that the famine can be cured by fertilisers—which would not come on to the ground, for it takes seven years to come up—is a propaganda against ourselves by ourselves. We are always adepts at conveying other people's propaganda against us. Therefore, it is defeatism. The Government must take the responsibility. The Food Minister must take the main responsibility. Personally, I do not trust these figures because these figures are varied so many times. If the figures given by the Food Ministry are accurate, then there is enough food in this country mathematically for everybody, but probably it sticks somewhere. It is probably shared by the rats; the four-legged rats sharing it with the two-legged rats, and so we do not get it.

Now, I will come to the Foreign Minister. I share with the Foreign Minister and the Government in thinking that we have not departed from our policy of non-alignment and India's concept of non-alignment. But I believe myself that non-alignment

has unfortunately become a word of currency with people who would not look behind them. It means the maintenance of an independent foreign policy. In brief, it is this. There is no time for me to go into it in detail. So long as a country is economically dependent—economic dependence does not mean that we must go into a state of economic immaculate conceptin. It really means that our survival, our capacity to develop must not be called off by somebody as they were called off at the time of trouble with Pakistan—we would have been friends potentially, one with the other—if the calling off is by someone else, then we have no control over it. Therefore, so long as there is economic domination, so long as the means of production and distribution in the country, so long as the credit-worthiness of this country is also finally dependent upon somebody else, we suffer.

Then we are told about the World Bank. The World Bank is an international institution. That is why Mr. Black being sent by the President of the United States and not by the World Bank. The World Bank lends us money, and if a banker lends us money, then, we must listen to the banker. Here—we are in this House—and in the country generally, though there is no unanimity of opinion, there is a large preponderance of opinion, about community control of banks I do not want to use the word 'nationalisation' which upsets some people. Now, what would be the point in nationalising all banks and then handing over the whole thing to the World Bank? It would be very difficult. Therefore, the content of policy in economic terms—this is what is important.

Now, I would say that the day of imperialism is not over. The empire comes in by the back-door, by the front door and by the side door. We have only to take the instance of

Congo. Economic imperialism means the expansion of economic power, and though nobody in this House would accept it, people who know and have written about it have said that there is imbalance in the world. The richer nations are getting richer and the poorer nations are getting poorer, and so long as the particular imbalance continues, and it will continue because of this type of foreign aid. It will be difficult. It is not only a question of aid from the United States. Giving of money in this context is not a matter of philanthropy. Governments are not philanthropic. Governments are national corporations seeking to advance national interests. They have not got a body which you can kick nor a soul which you can damn. Therefore, they have no conscience in that way. It is never merely economic dependence: that is to say, unless we are able to provide the material that we require for keeping our machines going, certain other consequences follow. Therefore, the content of this non-alignment must be understood, as I just now read out from Vice-President Humphrey who said he discussed political institutions with the Government of India—political institutions in respect of export and import policies. We were told by the World Bank yesterday—not by Prof. Ranga, but by the World Bank—that controls on steel are not necessary. Who are they to say this? After all, the issue within a short time would not be between communists and non-communists, socialists and non-socialists, left and right, but it will be between nationalism and non-nationalism. Do we want to remain as Indians or do we want to be dominated? That is going back to 20 years. Now, the nations want to throw away colonialism: Africans call it neo-colonialism. I do not like it myself. But anyway, it intrudes in this way. The people who cannot control their own lives always want to control other people's lives! It proceeds in this fashion.

I will not take any more time on this. I only want to say this. While

we worship at the shrine of non-alignment, if we throw away the content of it, by enabling the man who calls the tune to pay the piper—the man who pays the piper calls the tune—then, there would be no non-alignment. We have the right to vote as we can, but we will not vote as we like. This has been the position. There were 23 Latin American States who were not independent for a long time. There was a time when these 23 states voted as one vote before some of them became affected by world and internal conditions.

What is more, let us come to the more cynical part of it. So far as the United States are concerned, you do not get any more money by being readily amenable. We only receive aid, if you take and if you assert yourself. That is the experience of Brazil and other countries. It has nothing to do with ideology as such.

Let me now turn to the question of Vietnam. I welcome the statement that there is no change in our policy in regard to Vietnam. But I think the Foreign Minister owes it to us to say, what is our policy in Vietnam. What is our policy in Vietnam? Ours is a country where the Government today is represented by a party: that was the national movement. In these days, when the interventionists were destroying the new Republic of Spain. We gave them whatever we could; it was only moral support at that time. We thought it right to do so at that time despite the consequences. Vietnam is not a nation which was born just yesterday. The Vietnamese have been a people for the past 2,300 years or so. The territory—which was then known as Nam Viet—was first conquered by the Chinese I believe in 110 B.C. It took the Vietnamese 900 years to throw off the Chinese. While I have no brief to speak for them, I might say that even if it took 9,000 years the Vietnamese will throw the present interventionists out. Because that is their history, their experience. So far as Vietnam is concerned, I would like to tell the Foreign

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Minister that this repetition of the phrase that we shall discharge our responsibility as Chairman of the Commission will not do. Our responsibilities as Chairman are not diplomatic. As Chairman of the Commission, we are disabled from bringing about diplomatic negotiations. But as a country, we are responsible. We have a duty to seek to try about peace. As Chairman of the Commission, we are not fulfilling our duties by not telling the world of the degree of foreign arms and intervention—Chinese or American—flowing in there. We are signatories to the Geneva Agreement. We accepted responsibilities of supervision and control in the Commission. Though we were not members of the Geneva conference, on our own volition, we added a corrigendum to the final Act in 1954, we have committed ourselves. Here is an Asian country, Mr. Speaker, where the Dulles' doctrine of Asians against Asians is fructifying itself. where innocent men, women and children are blown to smithereens day after day. At the same time these people without all the sophisticated arms that the interventionists have, have stood up to the mightiest military power of modern times and have stood. I think the largest volume of opinion against American intervention in Vietnam is in the United States itself. When there was a war in which a country is heavily involved no national would repudiate the Government *in toto*. That has been the experience of history. When you look at the public polls in the United States, you see that 54 per cent of the population support Johnson's policy, and this is often projected as widespread if not overwhelming support. What happens to the other 46 per cent. If the government can get only 54 per cent for waging war, it is not a war that has a nations full-fledged or preponderating support.

We are told by someone, whom I do not want to quote as authority, but it will be useful to know what he has said—I mean Mr. Galbraith, the for-

mer U.S. Ambassador in India who knew all about us, but very little about himself. He says, the U.S. apparently have no business to be in Vietnam. What is more, he says, the people fighting in Vietnam, meaning not the Americans, but the South Vietnamese, are fighting under the orders of an external agency. He does not mean China. Of course, it is not for us, as Mr. Frank Anthony was saying the other day, to be didactic about this, but we have a responsibility in this matter not only on account of the participation we took to terminate the war in Indo-China in 1954, when the guns were silenced for the first time on 11th August, 1955 after 25 years. It may be asked, how can you do it when the Russians do not want it, when Ho Chi-Minh does not want it and so on. But this was the position in Geneva in 1954 to begin with. The French did not want it. The British did not want it because the French did not want it. The Chinese did not want it. The North Vietnamese did not want it. But ultimately there came about a different situation. I cannot give you the figures of American forces there. Some people say it is 100,000 and some say it is quarter million, but that is considerable force is there. In that sense it is more serious than in 1954. Otherwise, from the diplomatic point of view it is no more impossible of solution now than it was before. To be active for peace in Vietnam is in our interest as well as that of Indo-American relations, in the long run.

Reference has been made to the Tashkent Declaration. To the extent possible, the Tashkent accord has been performed. The declaration does not refer to the situation in Kashmir. I have also heard from these benches constantly that the contours of world affairs have changed and the two blocs do not exist. There is no greater fallacy than this, in our approach to world affairs because today the world is still governed by the conflict between these blocs by bloc policy, by the policy of bases, i.e., encirclement

and all the rest. There was a meeting of the CENTO where the Foreign Minister of Iran pledged aid to Pakistan. Mr. Bhutto tells America and the world that their alliance with China has not in any way diminished their closeness to America. And, what is more, it has brought them closer! It looks as though there is some arrangement in this matter. Therefore where is the erosion of bloc policies and the balance of power?

A more sinister event recently is the emergence of what is called the Islamic Pact. We neglect at our peril our understanding—let alone our responsibilities of the position in the middle-east. I will not go into the historical background of this to the time of Alexander. But even from the time of the Ottoman Empire, the middle-east has been the gateway to India. It is so today irrespective of the fact that the Suez Canal is not as important to the west as it was a hundred years ago. This policy has expressed itself in many ways. There was the Fertile Crescent, the Jordan River Valley Scheme; there was what Dulles called the power vacuum that was Glub Pasha, that is the CENTO and there was the Bagdad Pact. There have been various other machinations. Again today there is emerging what is called the Islamic Conference or pact, Pakistan being one of the principal sponsors. Islamic Conference is only another name for CENTO. CENTO is in turn only another name for the western alliance. This western alliance is on the frontiers of India. We may not forget this. We are not up against Pakistan as she was, but we are up against Pakistan plus the West plus China. This is all one combination. If proof is required for it, we need only read the speech of Mr. McNamara, the strong man of the American Government—I mean no disrespect to Mr. Johnson. The latter perhaps thinks we are a body of workers of General Motors.

Mr. Speaker: He must conclude now.

Shri Krishna Menon: I am just finishing.

So far as American arms are concerned, the same theory comes back that they must treat Pakistan and India as two peas in a pod, i.e. with equality. India is to have earth-moving machinery while Pakistan is to have spares. I hope the spares will spare us. That is all I can say.

I now come to our inadequate appreciation of the importance of Afro-Asian relations. It is not sufficient to say we have our ambassadors. Afro-Asia is not a continent territorily. It is a continent in the sense of political geography as such, not geography of the ground territory. Our allies are there. We have to work until the time comes when India can be looked up to by them not as a leader—that would be a wrong thing for us to be—but as a source of strength and a fellow struggler in the way of emancipation from the scourges of ages. That is to say, we have to play our part in the resistance against imperialism, reaction, racism and for unity, peace and progress. It is not sufficient to say that we vote against colonial oppression and that kind of thing. We will be deluding ourselves if we think that we enjoy today the same regard and respect in the African nations as we did before. It is all due to our education. The time should come when our schools and colleges are able to recognise that the African is not just picked up by a missionary, washed and given tinned meat, but he represents an ancient civilisation who in their day carried such things as metallurgy to the far off South America and so on. Today we have also a situation where our relations with Africa are not of a character which gives strength to what is called the non-aligned group. If a country which has a place and prestige, if a country with significance, does not play that part, the world is the poorer for it. We hear less about these things. Even in this House, there are many who say that we should not have any military alliances. But in the next breath they say, we must

[Shri Krishna Menon]

have the atom bomb. How can we have an atom bomb and not have any military alliance? There is no way of doing it.

So far as our foreign policy is concerned, I will not be disrespectful to the Foreign Minister and say it is a drift, because a drift has at least got some direction. It is more true to speak of it as flotsam and jetsam. If there is direction, it appears to come by pressure or pulls from outside. I think it is time the country asserted itself, played its full part, pulled its full weight and instilled in all Afro-Asian nations and ourselves, not least the faith and feeling that we are not sitting back and watching and that China has not knocked us flat. China today, to us, is a military question and not one of world diplomacy. We may not like what Mr. Bhutto says. But Mr. Bhutto is the Foreign Minister of a great country. What he says, his voice, counts at the present time. Therefore, we cannot ignore it. When he turns round and says that their alliance with China has brought their closer to America, it is time for us to think.

13 hrs.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate on our Demands was spread over three days and speeches have been made on these three days covering several points. I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in the debate and have touched upon several useful and important aspects of international affairs. In the course of my reply, it will not be possible for me to reply to all the points that have been raised, and I will confine myself to certain important matters which are important from the point of view of discussion that has been raised and are also important from our national point of view.

Sir, the one subject which has, naturally, exercised the minds of hon. Members from both sides of the House

is our relationship with Pakistan. On this matter, it is not my intention to go over the whole area, but I would like to briefly recapitulate the events after the Tashkent Declaration. In the course of this Session itself there was a full-dress debate on the Tashkent Declaration, and it is not necessary for me to repeat the many things that had been said on that occasion and to give answers to several points of criticism or clarification about the Declaration. We have to see our relationship with Pakistan after the Tashkent Declaration. How has Pakistan conducted herself after signing the Tashkent Declaration? It is, no doubt, correct that for some weeks after the Tashkent Declaration the Pakistan leaders made speeches in their own country which were in support of the Tashkent Declaration, in support of the spirit of the Tashkent Declaration, in support of the common desire of both the countries to reverse the trends that unfortunately had bedevilled the relations between the two countries and to improve those relations. But I am sorry to inform the House that after about three or four weeks the Pakistan leaders started making public statements which were a complete reversal of the policy to which they had subscribed when they signed the Tashkent Declaration. I do not want to go into details, but it is a fact that Pakistan leaders had agreed when they signed the Tashkent Declaration that the Press, the radio and the public platform would be used in both the countries for improving the relations and not to heighten tension and animosity between the two countries. Anyone has to pick up the newspapers which are published in Pakistan—and I would like to add that there is a great deal of control, almost complete control over the Press by the Pakistan Government—to find out the exact position. The Pakistan Press could not adopt a hostile, anti-India attitude if it did not have the support of the Government of Pakistan.

Then, again, it had been agreed that the complications that had been caused by the conflict, the unfortunate conflict, between India and Pakistan, they would be undone as a result of discussions and agreement between the two countries. In earnest of our desire to implement the Tashkent Declaration, we, from the Indian side, proposed that there should be a meeting at ministerial level between India and Pakistan, and we took out to Rawalpindi some weeks ago one of the most high-powered delegations that had ever left this country to any other foreign country—we had three Cabinet Ministers, 5 Secretaries to Government and several other experts. We had gone there with the desire to settle all those points of difference which we had agreed to discuss according to the Tashkent Declaration and to initiate action to implement such agreements that might be arrived at. We noticed, however, when we went to Rawalpindi, that Pakistan leader and ministers were not at all interested in implementing the Tashkent Declaration, they were not prepared to honour the obligations that they had taken upon themselves under the Tashkent Declaration.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Power failure.

Shri Swaran Singh: All the time they were raising this point that Jammu and Kashmir is the only matter that requires discussions between the two countries, and unless this is discussed and some progress made there is no use of discussing any of the other matters.

13.07 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This, to say the least, was a complete disregard of Pakistan's obligations under the Tashkent Declaration. I would like to remind this hon. House of the very admirable speech by my hon. friend opposite, Shri Frank Anthony, when he pointed out that an analysis of the Tashkent Declaration shows that the two countries had never said that they will discuss

Kashmir as the only issue or as the important issue or as the first issue for improving relations between the two countries. In fact, all that was mentioned about Kashmir was that this matter was raised and both countries reiterated their well-known positions on Kashmir. And, our position on this question of Kashmir is well known, and I have reiterated more than once on the floor of the House that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India. In view of this, there was nothing new that could be discussed, after a lapse of four or five weeks, on Kashmir.

At Tashkent, the two countries had agreed to discuss, had agreed to settle several other matters including economic matters, confiscation of properties, resumption of normal communications, resumption of air flights between the two countries, and several other matters. It was a complete surprise to us to find the Pakistan leaders adamant, and we came back under this impression that they are not interested in honouring their obligations under the Tashkent Declaration.

Notwithstanding that, we did not want to close the door, and we said that we will be prepared to discuss these matters further and we had agreed to meet again. There has, after that, been no move from Pakistan side to indicate that they are prepared to come to Delhi for any further talks.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: They are moving militarily now.

Shri Swaran Singh: Not only that. The Pakistani leaders have been searching for some excuse to blame India for not honouring the Indian obligations under the Tashkent Declaration, and in this they have signally failed. The only thing that they have been able to point out is that India at one time did not vacate those 30 or 36 acres of land by the 25th of February as had been agreed upon between the two countries. Now, this position has been explained by the Defence Minister on the floor of

[Shri Swaran Singh]

his House. I am mentioning this only to point out that there could not be any more flimsy excuse for Pakistan to accuse India, that India was not honouring her obligations under the Tashkent Declaration. It is interesting that Pakistan has again reverted to its familiar theme of describing India as aggressor, knowing full well that it was Pakistan that had started the trouble by first sending armed infiltrators into Kashmir and then marching its armed forces with heavy armours in the area of Chhamb.

In this they are receiving encouragement from their new-found friend and ally, China. It is interesting that Tashkent Declaration was hailed as a positive contribution to peace by almost all countries of the world. This is one of those rare occasions when countries which are generally opposed to each other in their postures in international life have supported the Tashkent Declaration and described it as an act of statesmanship between two countries where a conflict had been resolved, and where they had expressed their determination in future to resolve all their differences and disputes by peaceful means. There was, however, one solitary exception to this, and it was the Government of the People's Republic of China, which described this agreement between India and Pakistan as having been brought about by compelling Pakistan. It is quite interesting to see the comments of China on that occasion. They used the phraseology with which we are all familiar, namely, that the United States' imperialists, combined with the revisionists of USSR, twisted the arm of Pakistan to make her bow before India. It is a strange description. This shows how adept they are in distortion while presenting their picture. But it was obviously done with a purpose. It was to create a feeling amongst Pakistanis that though they have signed the declaration, it is not something to which they need stick to. Therefore, in the

course of the last visit of the Chinese leaders, they projected the Chinese picture as the sole saviours of Pakistan.

It is for Pakistan to decide as to what type of relationship they want to have with the People's Republic of China, but it is amazing that Pakistan, which is a member of many defence pacts like SEATO and CENTO, should extend such inspired so-called people's response with all the fanfare of publicity and a large number of people turning out in the streets, and trying to create the impression amongst the people of Pakistan that the Chinese are their fast and steadfast friend and, perhaps, their only saviours.

The Chinese leaders have also used this occasion to make anti-Indian speeches. In the joint communiques and also in their statements in receptions they have again reverted to describing India as the aggressor. They have said that there are common links between Pakistan and China and that when one of those countries is faced with, what they describe as, aggression, both countries will help each other.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is there a new slogan in Pakistan, about which I have heard, *Pindi-Chini bhai bhai*?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not know. If that is there, I am sure after this mention by the hon. Member, probably they will give that up. Because, whatever we suggest or Shri Kamath suggests they are not likely to accept easily. Pakistan has unfortunately become a pathetic psychological case. If any suggestion is given to them with the best of intentions and with extreme good faith by India, somehow or other, they react rather in a very amateurish manner. This posture which borders almost to a sort of alliance—you may call it defence alliance; they have actually used such expressions which are generally found in certain pacts between countries which are described as defence pacts—does not leave any doubt in anybody's mind about Sino-Pakistan collusion.

These are important events which we cannot ignore, especially the hostility of China toward India, which they have shown in all parts of the world. The supply of military equipment by China to Pakistan and the public display of Chinese-built tanks and Chinese-built aircraft at the time of their parade in Pakistan, out and out support by China to Pakistan on their position on Jammu and Kashmir, all these are circumstances which some countries even now choose to soft-pedal or not take full note of, but we in India are fully convinced that these are unmistakable proofs of a deep conspiracy between China and Pakistan to the detriment of India. In this background, we have to view our relationship with both our neighbours in formulating our policies and postures towards both Pakistan and China.

We, on our side, are continuing to hope that Pakistan, even at this stage, would honour the obligations and commitments they have made under the Tashkent Declaration. We, on our side, have made the position clear. Our Prime Minister has made clear statements on many occasions that we adhere to the Tashkent Declaration in letter and in spirit. However, unilaterally we will not be able to make much advance unless there is response from Pakistan. We do continue to hope that, notwithstanding their internal difficulties, which Pakistan may be facing, or at any rate which some commentators have described as important considerations why Pakistan is adopting the present hate-India attitude....

Shri Kapur Singh: How do you propose to prevent a breakdown unilaterally?

Shri Swaran Singh: There may be some extrnal instigation and undoubtedly there is; I have referred to some of them in the remarks that I have already made. But it is our earnest hope that the people of Pakistan will realise the importance of having good-neighbourly relations with a country like India, because India has made the position quite clear that

India wants to develop friendly, good-neighbourly relations with Pakistan. We will persevere in our efforts to implement the Tashkent Declaration and to impress upon Pakistan the necessity and the desirability of doing the same. At the same time, we have to continue to make our own arrangements and preparations for strengthening ourselves in everything. We cannot ignore that in view of our experience in the past. Militarily, economically and psychologically, in every way, we have to strengthen ourselves in order to meet any contingency that might arise.

Shri Kapur Singh: Sir, I hate to interrupt the Minister of External Affairs, but he has said that he relies on the people of Pakistan for the maintenance of good neighbourly relations as well as the maintenance of the Tashkent agreement, in spirit and letter. The people of Pakistan are already friendly to us; it is the Government of Pakistan which is creating all this trouble. Why do we not make a proper distinction between the people and the Government and then address ourselves to the proper party?

Shri Swaran Singh: I am thankful to Sardar Kapur Singh for reminding me that the people of Pakistan are not unfriendly to India. It is necessary for us to stress that from time to time because even the people are sometimes fed on slogans which were raised by both the Pakistanis and the Chinese during the last visit of the Chinese leaders. This is the strategy which is adopted by the Pakistani leaders to project to the people of Pakistan that China perhaps is their main or only supporter. Therefore, the common hostility of the Pakistani and Chinese leaders as the cementing factor between China and Pakistan is always exploited by the leaders of Pakistan and China. This has to be encountered always....

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Somebody in Rawalpindi has already named a child after the name of Mr. Liu Shao-chi. He is Liu Shao-chi Ahmed.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is necessary, therefore, that we have to explain this correct position and our correct attitude so that the people of Pakistan should continue to hold the view that we believe they held so far, that they have nothing to gain and everything to lose by an armed conflict between India and Pakistan.

It is amazing that the Chinese statements of support to Pakistan against the so called Indian aggression and on Jammu and Kashmir should be more vociferous, more loud, than even the Pakistani stand. These are the instruments that are generally employed by the Pakistani leaders to instigate the people of Pakistan and also for several other purposes.

I do not want to recount the experience of other countries in relation to China. It is for the leaders and people of Pakistan, if they so desire, to benefit by the experience of the deepening relations between the present leadership of China and those countries, their governments and their people.

The internal contradictions that are there in the Pakistani posture of sticking to the defence pacts and of hoping to get massive economic aid from the western democracies on the one side and, at the same time, of getting military aid and having closer tie-ups with China, on the other, is a matter which will be for the leaders of Pakistan to explain and it is for the other countries to decide whether they should accept the explanations of Pakistan in this respect. We, on our side, cannot take an academic or a theoretical view of this. This is a matter which is very much a live matter for us and it casts the responsibility upon us of strengthening ourselves in every way, going ahead with our preparations in as best a manner as possible, getting help from all quarters wherever we can get help and, at the same time, continue to be ready to settle all our disputes and differences with Pakistan by peaceful means. This is the essential ingredient of the Tashkent Declaration—

our determination to resolve all differences and disputes with Pakistan by peaceful means.

There is nothing that exists today between the two countries or that can arise between the two countries which cannot be resolved by peaceful means and we will always continue to take this line of showing our determination to resolve all the disputes and differences by peaceful means. We hope that Pakistan also will have to change its present attitudes and postures of blackmailing others and will revert to the path of reason; it will see wisdom in improving relations between India and Pakistan.

This is all that I wanted to say on these two issues which are of a grave concern to us and of which several hon. Members had made a pointed mention. There are other issues and I would like to mention those briefly.

Here, I would like to say that our Prime Minister's last visit to Paris, Washington, London and Moscow was a very successful visit. Several hon. Members have paid their tribute to the manner in which our Prime Minister upheld the honour and dignity of our country and explained our viewpoint in very clear and dignified tones. I am sure that the House would join me in paying our tribute to the excellent work and results that have flowed from this visit.

But whereas there was almost complete unanimity in expressing this approbation, I am sorry that Professor Hiren Mukerjee and, may be, one or two other lone voices, raised certain doubts. I do not want to go into details but I would like briefly to mention the points that have been raised not so much in relation to the Prime Minister's visit but as important matters of policy upon which we have to clarify our position and reiterate our attitude.

I was amazed to find that there was some indication in Professor Hiren Mukerjee's speech that we are not as enthusiastic about the policies of

peace and non-alignment and of anti-colonialism that we have always pursued. I am sorry that this should have been said because I can say with a great deal of happiness and, if I may add humbly, pride that we have steadfastly adhered to the pursuit of policies of non-alignment and peace which we have followed all these years and of which our late Prime Minister and leader of our country, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, was the architect. It is unimaginable and unthinkable that the Prime Minister or anyone of us should ever think of deviating from the pursuit of those policies.

What was the content of that? On anti-colonialism, on the question of Rhodesia which is the most important question, I claim that the Indian attitude in this respect has been in line with the most progressive countries in any part of the world including Africa. From the very beginning we took decisive steps in relation to Rhodesia. As soon as the white racist government declared independence illegally in a unilateral fashion, we broke off diplomatic relations and we cut off all economic relations although we had a sizable trade and a favourable trade balance with Rhodesia. We did not count our rupees and we cut off our trade relations because we wanted to demonstrate our solidarity with the African people; we wanted to demonstrate to the white racist regime our strong feelings in this respect. Even thereafter, in the United Nations, I myself and my colleagues at the time of the General Assembly made very forthright statements which were greatly appreciated by all the African leaders. Even a few days back, there has again been a resolution in the United Nations and India was one of the co-sponsors of that. We have always urged that it is imperative that the white racist regime, which has assumed power illegally, should be ended and if the economic pressures and other pressures that the world is mounting against them do not fructify, there should be no hesitation even with regard to the use of force to end this regime. I cannot imagine a clearer stand and notwithstanding

that, I am sorry to note that Prof. Hiren Mukerjee thought it necessary to mention Rhodesia in the course of his speech as a point of criticism against us.

Again on anti-colonial issues, in relation to South Africa for ending that government's policies of apartheid, for working to end colonialism in Mozambique and Angola and for lending all possible support to the freedom fighters there, and also in regard to Arab countries where still the last vestiges of colonialism are still there and also in several other parts of the world, we have, in a very persistent and consistent manner, always worked for ending these last vestiges of colonialism and we think that, having ourselves attained independence from colonial rule, it is also our duty, and we will not consider any sacrifice too great, to discharge our responsibilities and our obligations to those brethren of ours who are still groaning under foreign domination.

Then again a mention was made that there was a back-sliding--this was the expression that Prof. Hiren Mukerjee used--on Vietnam. I made the position quite clear when Mr. Hem Barua was speaking yesterday that the Press report of our having conveyed to anyone that the report does not express our position correctly was incorrect and this news is also incorrect that anybody in the Ministry was reprimanded or taken to task for incorporating this in the report. I said that yesterday when Mr. Hem Barua was trying to build an argument on that basis. I want to reiterate the position that the report should be read as a whole and we should not pick up paragraphs here and there and read them.

On Vietnam we have explained the position quite clearly and in this connection I was a little sorry and I was also surprised when Mr. Krishna Menon, whose speech I heard with great attention--there are parts in his speech with which I fully agree--said that, although the Minister has said that there is no change in the policy.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

we do not know what that policy is. Our policy is clearly stated in the report and I would like again, for the purpose of clarification, to reiterate the stand which we have always taken in this respect. We have always taken the view that a military solution of the unfortunate situation in Vietnam is not possible. We have always taken the view that the only way to resolve the dispute is to go back to the Geneva Agreement and in this, I would like to inform the House that there is a ray of hope because all parties to the Geneva Agreement, fortunately for the world community and for them, continue to take the attitude that they adhere to the Geneva Agreement. It is no doubt correct that each side is blaming that the other party is breaking the Geneva Agreement, but each signatory to the Geneva Agreement takes the view that they adhere to the Geneva Agreement. So, the Geneva Agreement and its implementation, is the only hope and we will very strenuously work for starting any talks which might see the end of these difficulties.

Shri Krishna Menon: What have we done for starting these talks?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would like to assure Mr. Krishna Menon that we have never hesitated to do the necessary work nor prepare the ground or sound the parties for starting talks in any fruitful manner. We do not claim that we succeed every time; sometimes the situation is such, and he himself is fully conscious of the complexity of the situation. But in a matter like this we do not take the attitude that nothing can be done; we do continue to hope that something can be done and it should be done and we are exploring all possibilities from time to time by contacts with various Governments to find out if there could be some method of starting talks and starting a dialogue. . . .

Shri Daji (Indore): The stand of the U.S. is that they were not a party to the Geneva Agreement and, therefore,

the Geneva Agreement does not bind the U.S. What has the hon. Minister got to say on that?

Shri Swaran Singh: Our stand on that issue is quite clear that the Geneva Agreement is the Agreement which can be the basis, and perhaps the only basis, for a settlement of the dispute. On that issue I do not know what is the exact attitude of the United States Government, but I do know that, although the United States was not a signatory to this, they have made statements where they have accepted the Geneva Agreement in substance and they have never made any statement that they are not bound by the Geneva Agreement. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Krishna Menon: The Geneva Agreement prohibited entry of any foreigners except a body of friendly people.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is correct. That is what I said when I made the statement that, fortunately for every one, each party says that they are bound by the Geneva Agreement and they will honour it, but each party is accusing the other that the other party is breaking the Geneva Agreement. One party says that the American troops are there and there is the allegation by the others that outside help is inducted, which changes the complex of the military balance. I do not want to go into the details thereof because we ourselves. . . .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): He is equating the Americans' presence in South Vietnam with whatever suspicions he is inviting—God knows for what reasons—about other foreign interests operating there. For a long time India has not said a word about the withdrawal of American troops who are there to the extent of 200 to 300 thousands; for a long time India has not said a syllable about the use of napalm bombs and poison gases about which allegations are being made; for a long time nothing has been said by India and he says that it is

not soft-peddling, it is not back-sliding. [2]

Shri Kapur Singh: All the time in his speech the Minister is presuming that South Vietnam is in full accord with the Geneva Agreement. I want to ask whether it is not a fact that, at the time of signing of the Geneva Agreement, South Vietnam refused to append its signature to the clause which divides South Vietnam from North Vietnam.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is not for me to adjudicate about the attitude of the various countries and to express my own opinion. Our attitude on this issue is quite clear. I would also like to say categorically in reply to what Prof. Hiren Mukerjee has said, that I am not trying to equate anybody; I am only stating the position which is taken up by those countries for the information of the House and for the information of the country; it is necessary for all of us to know what each side says; you may not agree; you may not accept that, but there is no use saying that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: What is our policy at this present moment in regard to this?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is surprising that Mr. Mukerjee should feel excited; although he himself says that our policy is clearly mentioned in the report, what he says is that somebody is back-sliding on that report; if he has gone through the paragraphs, he knows that all that is bothering him is mentioned in the report. . . .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Please do not send summaries of world press comments any further. The whole world is talking about India backsliding.

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not know which world is that.

Shri Krishna Menon: I would like the hon. Minister to reply to the point just now mentioned that South Vietnam was not a party to Geneva Agreement.

Shri Swaran Singh: He himself was present at that time. On the factual side it was for him to clarify. I would like to make the position quite clear that our position on this question of Vietnam has been very clearly stated from time to time. I have again enunciated with utmost clarity that we feel strongly and we continue to hold the view that (i) a military solution is not possible, (ii) the only possible solution is that the Geneva Agreement should be implemented and (iii) there should be peaceful talks, dialogue in order to end this.

About the presence of foreign troops in any part of the world, we have always taken the position, which continues to be our position, that the presence of foreign troops in any part of the world in any other country is something to which we are totally opposed. All that is mentioned in the Report. I do not know why Mr. Hiren Mukerjee should feel so much excited about it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You are very discreet.

Shri Swaran Singh: We have always taken the view that, if heightened form of armed activities continue, there cannot be any talks. Obviously, for any talks to start this should be stopped.

Shri Hem Barua: You have said in your Report that the American troops should be withdrawn.

Shri Swaran Singh: You have to read the whole of the Report—the earlier paragraphs and also the later paragraphs—in order to find out the full impact of that. We have tried to present it in as objective a manner as possible and I stand by every word that is mentioned there. There is no use pressurising me either from one side or the other. We have taken a very clear line and we will continue to take that line.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): We are only strengthening you; we are not pressurising you.

Shri Alvares (Panjim): Are there two lobbies, one for the Americans and the other for Vietnam? Who is pressurising you?

Shri Swaran Singh: You have the privilege to say anything you like. I will hesitate to tread on this rather dangerous ground. I will leave the hon. Members opposite to decide as to which lobby is for whom. I can assure them that there is no lobby on this side.

Shri Hem Barua: There is a lobby behind you. What is that lobby for?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is only one lobby, which is the national lobby and that is in the interest of India. That is the only lobby to which all of us belong on this side of the House. It is for you to decide amongst yourselves by peaceful means as to what are the lobbies.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Don't look behind; look forward; look ahead.

Shri Swaran Singh: I would like to say a few points about our Arab policy. Something has been said by Shri Krishna Menon. I agree with his analysis that in relation to the Arab world we have pursued a policy of strengthening our friendship with the Arab world. We are very happy that the Arab countries who expressed themselves at the time of the Casablanca conference have taken an objective view even on such controversial issues as Indo-Pakistan conflict. Maybe, certain countries in the Arab world do not fully agree and we have always expressed our view point with regard to them. Let us not forget that there is in the Arab world a strong, resurgent, progressive force, a force which is pitted against the type of this new development, about which Shri Krishna Menon made a pointed reference, new ideas of Islamic pacts and the like. These are directed really against this progressive Arab forces. Let us try to understand the situation. We should therefore condemn it not only on the ground that these are

theocratic ideas, but also because they are opposed to the progressive ideas, and we should continue to work for ensuring that these efforts do not succeed. Our attitude has been to strengthen our friendship with the Arab countries. The Arab countries have always brought about a great deal of understanding in appreciating our attitudes, and in this respect we have good relations, both economic and political. We work together in the United Nations and in several other fields in a very friendly manner. This has to be strengthened.

I am sorry that in this connection Mr. Trivedi, who is not here now, made a statement without verifying the facts, when he said that we send only Muslim Ambassadors to the Muslim countries. I must confess that I have never considered this matter from that aspect. It had never occurred to me that in making an appointment to a particular country the person's community should be the consideration. When I checked up the list, it was surprising to find that out of 13 countries who are members of the Arab League, there are only in three countries Muslim Ambassadors and in the other countries we have got non-Muslims. Out of 23 non-Arab Muslim countries there are only 6 countries to which we have got Muslim Ambassadors accredited and in the 17 other countries we have got non-Muslims as our Ambassadors. In making these appointments, it is mainly the suitability of a particular Ambassador that is considered and it also depends upon the exigencies of service. The communal consideration does not enter into our consideration while making these appointments.

To be fair to these countries, I would also like to say that they themselves have mentioned to us that they would not like us to feel that a Muslim Ambassador of India will in any way have a better chance of being acceptable or being effective as compared to a non-Muslim Ambassador. So it is neither in our thinking nor in the thinking of the countries to which these Ambassadors are accredited. I

am sorry that, belonging as he does to a communal Party, Jan Sangh, he should impose such communal considerations and should make a remark just off the cuff, without even trying to verify the facts. I would not have mentioned this, but I must be frank with the House. I must say that while making the selections it has never occurred to me that I am sending a particular Ambassador to a particular country because he happens to be a Muslim, a Christian, a Hindu or a Sikh. It was his capacity to function which was the sole consideration. When Mr. Trivedi mentioned this, I checked up the list and this is the result. This shows how unwittingly, by making remarks we unnecessarily excite communal feelings in the country and also try to project them to other countries, the countries who themselves are pursuing policies which are nationalist, which are secular, which are non-communal. We should try to encourage the pursuit of such policies rather than to try to influence them in the wrong direction by making speeches here which may have adverse effect upon their thinking and upon our relations with them.

I have tried to cover most of the points and now I would like to touch upon one or two small points. I have already informed the House that we have constituted a Committee to review the working of the Foreign Service.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: What about the recognition of G.D.R.?

Shri Kapur Singh: What about the recognition of Taiwan and Israel?

Shri Solanki (Kaira): What about our relations with Israel?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): We should also be permitted to put questions.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is quite interesting that the demand for all the three is not from all quarters. It is also interesting to find that one group asks for the recognition of Taiwan,

another for the recognition of Israel and the third for the recognition of G.D.R. Even all the three are not combined for all the three.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But you cannot ignore them for that reason.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am only mentioning this. I am not using this as an argument. I will come to that a little later. We have constituted, as I have said, a committee to review the working of the Foreign Service and we are hoping that they would produce a report which will help Government to improve the working of the Foreign Service and our Missions abroad. I would like to inform the House that the response generally to the questionnaire has been very good. I think several hon. Members of this House have already replied to the questionnaire and I shall be very happy to get further comments, further views or further advice from any other hon. Member . . .

Some hon. Members: We have not received it.

Shri Swaran Singh: It may be that some hon. Members may not have received it. They have circularised it not to all but to a fairly large number of them. But I would arrange to circularise it to the other hon. Members who may be interested. If they could give me their names, we shall send them the questionnaire . . .

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: It may not be sent to the Congress Party Members.

Shri Swaran Singh: They have circularised it to a large number of persons from the Congress Party also. But I shall see that this is more widely circularised, and any views that are expressed will be most welcome, and we shall benefit by them.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When does he expect the report?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would say that some of the criticism that has

[Shri Swaran Singh]

been directed either against the Foreign Office here or against our Missions is, to say the least, not at all justified. Let us not forget that sometimes when we visit foreign countries and we try to explain our viewpoint, generally they are very courteous, and it is quite a common phrase—many of us who have visited other countries have experienced this, and generally they say—'Oh, now, I have learnt for the first time that this is the Indian position.' Let us not always be just misled by this courteous acknowledgment of learning for the first time the Indian viewpoint. Sometimes, the countries have got their own national viewpoints and they have got their own postures, and when you try to explain and suggest and press, that may have its effect, but let us not always come back with this impression that 'I happened to be the first person who has explained that viewpoint to them'. This is a normal courteous way of response and this should be taken in proper perspective and it should be viewed in a proper spirit and we should not come to this conclusion from that that the Missions abroad have not functioned or have never explained our viewpoint.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): May I humbly suggest to the hon. Minister that all this is not as simple as he is just trying to make it? There may be some justification in our drawing attention to certain aspects of functioning of the Indian Embassies abroad, which need attention. That was all that we wanted to say.

Shri Swaran Singh: I readily concede that, and that is the reason why we have constituted this committee, and I have said already, and I would like to repeat, that I have not got a closed mind on that. I have already benefited by the reports, for instance, of the delegations of the Members of Parliament who visit abroad. They have suggested several points of policy, even points of administration

and points of functioning. I have myself taken action in several matters, based upon the reports which were given to me. Even orally, several points were mentioned to me in confidence, and I have greatly benefited by them. Shri K. D. Malaviya was not in my mind when I referred to this, but Shri Manoharan was in my mind. He said that on a particular occasion some important dignity of another country had said that our Ambassador had never mentioned a certain thing to him. Since a Member of Parliament has said that, I shall check it up.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagao): He said that our Ambassador also said that he did not know that fact. That was the more important point.

Shri Swaran Singh: I shall check on that. But I cannot believe that these Ambassadors who are supplied with all the information are not aware of any such thing. I wish that Shri Manoharan had mentioned this to me and had not kept it for the debate. As soon as he had come back from there, he should have spoken to me, and at that time his memory also would have been fresh. He could have also written to me or spoken to me. I have got very excellent relations with Shri Manoharan, and he could have mentioned it to me, and by this time I could have checked it up and could have given him a reply one way or the other. That would have been better rather than to mention it in this manner.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): I think Shri Manoharan is not correct. In the Ministry's report and papers supplied, mention has been made of it. I know it. Therefore, Shri Manoharan was not correct when he said that.

Shri Swaran Singh: This is an answer to what Shri Manoharan had doubted.

These are matters about which we must take broadly an overall view and not be influenced too much by incidents. There could be indifferent representatives, there could be good representatives and there could be very effective representatives. But I have no hesitation in saying that under the guidance and leadership of our leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the inspiration that he always provided to the members of the Foreign Service at the headquarters and in our Foreign Missions, they have on the whole done well, because this was a new field of activity for us, and we entered the international life and we played an important role, and we shall continue to play an important role in the international sphere, at the same time always taking every possible step to strengthen and improve our functioning procedurally and the like. As for selection and training etc. this is a subject on which the IFS Review Committee will make their report, and in the meantime if there are any suggestions, I shall be glad to consider them.

Naturally, as usual, publicity also has come in. Some hon. Members on this occasion, for a refreshing change, have also said that in certain countries our publicity was good. This is a matter to which we are constantly giving attention, through the press, the radio and the like, for both external broadcasts and other purposes; and some more steps would also be taken. The Chanda Committee's report has also been received, and this deals with our external publicity, so far as AIR is concerned. I am sure that follow-up action will be taken so that we can use our resources, limited as they are, to optimum advantage so that we can project the viewpoint of our country and we may be able to counteract the mis-statements of which there are plenty in view of the special position in which we find ourselves on account of the hostility of China and the hostility of Pakistan against us; we have to be vigilant all the time and do everything possible to counteract these things.

On the question of the GDR, what we are proposing to do is that we are developing our economic relations, and we hope to establish an office of the STC there before long, and this will enable us to increase our trade. Beyond that, I think that at present the stage has not yet arrived when we can make any further move.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there are any cut motions which have to be put to vote separately, hon. Members may indicate them.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: The hon. Minister had said that he would answer queries at the end of his speech. That was why many of us did not interrupt while he was making his speech. Those of us who did not ask him questions during his speech should be permitted to ask questions at the end of his speech now. It is only fair.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the question that he wants to ask?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It seems that he has left a number of loose ends flying all around. He has not spoken, though he said he would, about developing greater relations with Taiwan or Israel, and dismissed it by saying that he would speak about it somewhat later. He has not said anything about the movement for Pakhtoonistan or about human rights in Tibet. He has not spoken even a word about a very important matter raised by Shri Krishna Menon, namely the Indo-American Foundation. I know it from very reliable sources that there was a time when the Government of the United States were agreeable to constitute this foundation on the basis of 10 Indians and 9 Americans, whereas now the position is that we are going into this Foundation on an equal basis of directorship or management. These matters must be made clear before the Demands are voted.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am grateful to the hon. Member for reminding me particularly about the economic part

[Shri Swaran Singh]

of Shri Krishna Menon's speech which I had heard with rapt attention.

Shri Solanki: What about the first part of the question?

Shri Swaran Singh: He himself said that a good part of that would have to be dealt with at the time when the Finance Bill would be discussed and voted upon. But I would like to clarify one or two things which it is very necessary for me to do. One is about the Indo-US Foundation.

14 hrs.

There has been a lot of misgivings and a good deal of lack of appreciation of the true facts. With your permission, I would like briefly to give the information I have got about this Indo-American Foundation. As you know, PL 480 supplies of foodgrains and other agricultural commodities are paid for in rupees and not in foreign exchange. The manner in which these rupees can be used is determined by the various agreements relating to PL-480 supplies which are entered into from time to time. On an average, 80 per cent are made available to the Government of India in the shape of loans for financing Plan projects and programmes. Roughly 7 per cent has been kept aside for making loans to industrial units in the private sector which have American collaboration and about 13 per cent of the total amount remains at the disposal of the US Government.

This 13 per cent can be used for various purposes provided for in the PL-480 Act and in accordance with the agreement entered into with the Government of India when the supplies are made. Expenses of the US Embassy, development of agriculture and promotion of education are among the various items provided for in the PL-480 Act. The amount of rupees at the disposal of the US Government has been growing as PL-480 supplies have been coming in from year to

year. As these amounts are invested in government securities, interest also is earned upon them. Then again, as loans made for Plan projects are repaid, the funds increase further. The total amount at their disposal at present is estimated to be above Rs. 300 crores.

The idea of setting up a Foundation for education out of these funds was mooted over a year ago. In order not to have an inflationary impact on the economy, the intention is that the entire amount transferred to the Foundation would be invested in government securities . . .

Shri Krishna Menon: How is it?

Shri Swaran Singh: As a rule, only the amount of interest earned would be used by the Foundation for its purposes. We welcomed this approach as a constructive one (*Interruption*). I am giving the facts. You can have different views. But I think the House should know the facts.

As the amount to be so invested is to be the equivalent of 300 million dollars, the sum normally available for expenditure would be Rs. 5 to Rs. 6 crores. It is necessary to mention this fact because an impression was sought to be created that this would be a major portion of the total effort of the country on education. I do not want to tire the House by giving facts. But our total education programme runs in terms of cost into several hundred crores—it is something of the order of Rs. 400 crores. When we are spending Rs. 400 crores, a sum of Rs. 4-5 crores annually which will be utilised for certain purposes like research or special types of educational activities cannot be regarded as something which will topple our entire educational set-up. I think it is very unfair to put forward that argument.

Shri Krishna Menon: How can he unilaterally make a statement of that character. . . (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Swaran Singh: Concern has been expressed about possible risks involved if these funds were to be used in a manner contrary to our values and our policies or for purposes of which we do not approve. We have no reason to feel that in making this generous amount available, the President of the United States has any intention whatever of influencing our internal policies. At the same time, it is necessary as many Members of Parliament and educationists have pointed out, that the actual agreement under which the Foundation is set up should provide adequate safeguards so that this danger is altogether eliminated for all time. The actual agreement has yet to be negotiated. We would certainly pay the fullest regard to the considerations which have been urged when the draft comes to be discussed.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Will the draft be discussed in Parliament? Before they enter into the agreement, would the draft be discussed here? Is he giving an undertaking and assurance that it would be discussed here before Government go further?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is not necessary. Like all other matters, the Government will take all these into consideration.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: All what?

Shri Swaran Singh: All these points of view that have been expressed will be kept in view in finalising the agreement. Government have to take the responsibility. No agreement, before it is entered into, can be discussed in Parliament.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Please reply to the point. We appreciate the attitude of the US Government in giving this. We are only asking information from the hon. Minister. Why could it not be possible for the US Government, believing in international co-operation and helping this

country, to give this amount to the University Grants Commission which is dealing with higher education in this country? Why do they want an administrative body. As in other spheres of assistance like irrigation and others, why do they not allow Indians to have a little wisdom to administer this fund? That is the basic question.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: He might also answer this. I know the Government of USA was also at one time agreeable to have 9 American directors on this, our share being 10 Indian directors. Now the Government has shown its agreeableness or inclination to accept a proposition where they would be on an equal basis. Why is this so?

Shri Swaran Singh: These are matters of detail. I would request hon. Members not to formulate their arguments merely on the basis of press reports. All these matters have still to be finalised, and nothing has yet been settled about the number or about the other things. These are the matters which have been discussed.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad raised a basic point, why could the Education Ministry not do it. I think this matter had been under discussion between the Education Ministry and the US authorities for quite sometime, and it was considered that a joint trust or a joint foundation of this type where the actual function has to fit in with our own policies, programmes and plans, should not in any way be objectionable. This was the view taken by the Education Ministry.

Shri Daji: Why are they insisting upon this? What is the objection in giving the money to the UGC?

Shri Swaran Singh: This was a matter which had been under discussion between the two parties. As I have already mentioned, we will keep these essential things in mind.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): Do they want to help us in our educational advance or do they want to control our educational policy? If it is the former, why should they ask for a body of this type to administer this fund? Why should they not give the money straightway to the Government of India?

Shri Swaran Singh: We have taken help in various spheres like economic development, establishment of plants and the like. I am referring to another point raised by Shri Krishna Menon. But in accepting aid from any country, we have always endeavoured, and we will continue steadfastly, to adhere to the policy that it is our policy that prevails. The other party can make suggestions, they can give us the benefit of their experience, but the decision ultimately is ours. Let there be no doubt or fear in any quarter that in accepting aid from any country, whether it is from the US, France, UK or USSR or any other country, we will ever be influenced or will ever change our own policy, either in the economic field or in the international field. It is for this reason that we should view it with a certain measure of confidence in ourselves rather than always have a feeling that the other party is bound to influence us in some way or other, either directly or indirectly.

On the basic question, I agree that the real strength of the country lies in developing our economy and making it strong. That is the object before the country. We have to develop ourselves economically so that we are not dependent on aid from any country. But so long as our development effort can be accelerated by aid from outside, we should not hesitate to avail of that aid, at the same time, always ensuring that we do not give up our independence, our sovereignty, our line of action and our policies in this respect. This is the policy we are pursuing.

Shri Krishna Menon: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, he cannot make a unilateral

statement and leave it like that. He says the funds will be invested in Government securities and this does not lead to inflation. Normally, investment in government securities is for the purpose of the internal saving of the country and not for the purpose of borrowing and this is like investment anywhere else. Therefore, the inflationary effect is all the same, irrespective of the object. So, if he is going to lay down an economic proposition of that kind, it cannot go unchallenged.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: He has not answered about Taiwan and Israel. He said he would say something.

Shri Swaran Singh: On Israel there is some confusion in the minds of the hon. Members. We do recognise Israel. Many of the hon. Members have been saying that we do not recognise Israel.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Establish diplomatic relations.

Shri Swaran Singh: There is an Israeli Consul also in Bombay.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We know that.

Shri Swaran Singh: We feel that it is not necessary to have Ambassadors between the two countries, and we have to look at the whole impact of that upon our relationship with a large number of countries, and we have to take a view which is in our best national interests. We have carefully considered it from time to time and we continue to hold the view that we cannot make any change in our present policy in relation to Israel.

So far as Taiwan is concerned, we recognise the People's Republic of China.

Shri Hem Barua rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more questions.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You allowed other Members to raise points. Why don't you allow him?

Shri Hem Barua: I have certain submissions to make to you about Israel. It is true that there is the Indian consul in Tel Aviv or not. question is whether we have an Indian consul in Tel Aviv or not. We do not have any. And the most unfortunate thing is that when the head of the State of Israel came, a fleet of cars was put at his disposal in Calcutta, and a bill for Rs. 432 was sent to him.

Shri Swaran Singh: That position about our relationship we intend to continue.

Shri Shinkre: Continue sending bills?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put all the cut motions to the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1967, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 16 and 17 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. 16—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,41,69,000 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, 1967, in respect of 'External Affairs'".

DEMAND NO. 17—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,10,82,000 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, 1967, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'".

MINISTRY OF IRON AND STEEL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 65, 66 and 131 relating to the Ministry of Iron and Steel, for which 4 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the table within 15 minutes indicating which of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND NO. 65—MINISTRY OF IRON AND STEEL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,90,000 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, 1967, in respect of 'Ministry of Iron and Steel'."