

(c) The coal washeries at Dugda, Bhojudih and Patherdih which supply prime washed coal to the steel plants will be transferred to the Bharat Coking Coal Limited. The management of these washeries is already with BCCL since 1st April, 1975.

(d) Internal and international sales and marketing will be handled by one company so as to ensure close coordination between domestic marketing and export planning. Accordingly, internal sales will be taken over by SAIL International Ltd.

(e) HSL Liaison Office at London will be transferred to SAIL International Ltd.

(f) The Management Training Institute (MTI) and the R & D Organisation of HSL will be transferred to SAIL.

Necessary action is being taken to set up these new companies and to transfer the assets and liabilities of the various units on the basis of audited accounts and in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act and other relevant enactments. Pending completion of legal formalities, work of internal sales has been transferred to SAIL International Ltd. with immediate effect. Similar action is being taken in respect of transfer of the Management Training Institute and R & D to SAIL. Steel Authority of India Ltd. will continue to coordinate the activities of the new companies and units, to determine their economic and financial objectives/targets and to review, control, guide and direct their performance with a view to securing optimal utilisation of all resources placed at their disposal.

Since this is an important matter and the Hon'ble Members have been taking keen interest in the proper working of public enterprises in general and Hindustan Steel Ltd. in particular, I am taking this opportunity of apprising the Members of these important decisions before their actual implementation. We have every hope that these changes would bring about further improvement in the management and functioning of these units.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at three minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister will reply.

श्री भीष्म नारायण सिंह : उप-सभापति जी, मेरा नाम बोलने के लिए पुकारा गया था लेकिन मैं प्रधान मंत्री से मिलने के लिए चला गया था।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should have been there when your name was called. Yes, Mr. Chavan will reply.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it was a very happy experience to listen to the very interesting and instructive and useful debate on the foreign policy and on the working of the External Affairs Ministry for the last two days. I must say this discussion was a discussion in depth, as they call it, taking into account all the aspects of our foreign policy. I must, therefore, compliment the Members—to say “compliment the Members” is rather presumptuous; I must say I thank the Members—for the interest they took in the problems of the foreign policy and, at the same time, for making their very constructive suggestions. And I must say that the debate was of a very high quality which is quite befitting this honourable and learned House. I can assure the Members that we shall give serious consideration to the various suggestions they have made.

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

To us in the Ministry who have inevitably to work under the pressure of day-to-day events, a debate in the House is like a touchstone though I must say that we always try to see the problems in the foreign policy in all its perspective. But, sometimes, a discussion in Parliament gives us an added and valuable opportunity to see the whole thing again in perspective. When some collective assessment emerges, it certainly gives some new dimension to the judgment. Therefore, I must thank you for the general debate and its quality. One thing I must say that the debate has, in a way, reaffirmed the broad national consensus on our foreign policy which normally transcends party politics and cuts across party lines. It has been my experience this time also. To that extent, I can say that there is some sort of a sense of fulfilment of expectation.

I must say it has been a pleasant experience to get bouquets all the way. But I would like to assure you that we will not be misled by it. We will always try to be vigilant and not be complacent. Whatever the good results that we have achieved, have been, the result of a very wise and far-seeing fundamental foreign policy that was laid down by the leaders of our country after independence, and I should say, even before independence. As a matter of fact, the roots of our foreign policy can be found even in our freedom movement. Yesterday, Shri Pande reminded us, and very rightly, that even during our freedom movement, there was a foreign policy department of the party which led the liberation movement, namely, the Indian National Congress. Even from that time onwards, we had laid down certain aspects of our foreign policy. Naturally, with the changing world situation, some more aspects are added to it and sometimes, the presentation is changed. But the basic approaches have remained the same. I think this is the reason why we have always come to correct judgements and a correct assessment of situations. Therefore, if at all any tribute or compliment is to be paid, it should be paid to

the founding fathers or the architects of our foreign policy. Naturally, the foreign policy of any country cannot be some sort of a static thing. It has to be dynamic because it is dealing with a dynamic situation. As we see in the world today, the situations are such that one has to be constantly vigilant about it. Therefore, the foreign policy of any country has to be equally dynamic. But even then, certain basic tenets remain as guiding factors.

Here again, I would like to say that this is because the basic foreign policy tenets are rooted in our cultural heritage, as Shri Pande was mentioning yesterday, I was pleased to see him participate in this debate because he is one of our veteran freedom fighters who belongs to that generation which has seen the emergence of certain basic policies of India, as history was being made.

The striving for peace in the world, willingness to work on the basis of co-existence and cooperation with all nations of the world, the aspirations for an equal and just economic order and an unfailing support to the struggle to ensure freedom and human dignity are the guiding principles of our foreign policy which draws sustenance and strength from our cultural traditions and our freedom movement. This is really the basic thing that I wanted to say by way of introduction.

I was just wondering as to what points I should choose because nobody has made any specific criticism or suggested any options for our foreign policy. But certainly some Members did make suggestions. For the first time during this debate I have heard every speech—every sentence of every speech—and, it is very difficult to compare speeches. Naturally some speeches contained some aspects and some speeches contained some other aspects. If I do not mention any names, please excuse me. Incidentally I may mention some names, not by way of selection but because I may be required to refer to some of the points made by the member. There is one point that Prof. Dutt made, and as an academician, naturally, he has the facility of putting it in a very precise man-

ner and in a very elegant language, I should say. I would like to read what he said—I got this “uncorrected copy” of his speech last night because I wanted to read and find out whether I heard him right. He said:—

“We are heading towards a mixed international system. And I say our foreign policy must have a certain world framework in which to operate—non-alignment, anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism and peace. All these are the principles which were laid down by Jawaharlal Nehru. But, at the same time, we must have an evolving world situation, framework of an evolving world situation in which to operate, and say that we are heading towards a mixed international system in which both the allies and the adversaries will be held in a situation of growing fundamental co-operation. We are in the midst of a transformation, certainly a drastic modification of the structure of international relations.”

This is his assessment and I would say, well, by and large, yes. Naturally, no country, particularly no country of India's status and experience can work its foreign policy without having an international framework for it. I would like to say that the foreign policy of India has, from the very beginning, this international framework operating. Because, the policy of non-alignment, though it was meant for India, really speaking, has international ramifications. It is, in itself, an international framework and it has positive ingredients of anti-imperialism and anti-neo-colonialism, working for peace and disarmament. These are, really speaking international approaches and it is on this basis that the non-alignment movement has been built. When we say that our foreign policy is non-alignment, it is not something negative. It is a composite concept; consisting of certain positive elements in it, and these positive elements, really speaking, are the international framework of the policy. Not that we have to now evolve some framework because the world is now evolving I think, the international

framework is there and the new elements of the international situations are certainly taken into consideration.

Just this morning I was going through a booklet. Possibly some of you might have seen it. It is by one of our young diplomats. Certain articles on Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru appear in it. The booklet is called *The Legacy of Nehru*. It is edited by Shri Natwar Singh. In it I came across tributes paid by Martin Luther King, Jr., famous leader of the black movement: as a matter of fact, he was a leader of humanity, though he was working for the cause of Black America. He was certainly a leader of mankind as a whole. He paid these tributes some time in 1965. I was rather amazed when I saw the insight of the man—the way he looked at Pandit Nehru's life. I am mentioning this because it relates to foreign policy; it is not just to say something about Pandit Nehru. He said: “Jawaharlal Nehru was a man of three extraordinary epochs”. I will only read a part of it; I do not want to read the whole of it. “He was a leader in the long anticolonial struggle to free his own land and to inspire a fighting will in other lands under bondage.” This was his first epoch. The second epoch was: “He lived to see victory and to move then to another epochal confrontation—the fight for peace after World War II. In this climactic struggle he did not have Gandhi at his side, but he did have the Indian people, now free in their own great Republic. It would be hard to overstate Nehru's and India's contributions in this period. It was a time fraught with the constant threat of a devastating finality for mankind. There was no moment in this period free from the peril of atomic war. In these years, Nehru was a towering world force skillfully inserting the peace will of India between the ranging antagonisms of the great powers of East and West.”

And the third epoch was—I will read this out and I would like to invite your attention to this particularly—“The third epoch of Nehru's work is unfolding after his death. Even though his physical pre-

* [Shri Y. B. Chavan.]

sence is gone, his spiritual influence retains a living force. The great powers are not yet in harmonious relationship to each other, but with the help of the non-aligned world they have learned to exercise a wise restraint. In this is the basis for a lasting *detente*. Beyond this, Nehru's example in daring to believe and act for peaceful co-existence gives mankind its most glowing hope."

This really speaking is the basis of our foreign policy and its international framework—this concept of non-alignment, the concept of anti-colonialism, the concept of anti-imperialism, the concept of working for peace, and, at the same time, working for peaceful co-existence. What you, Mr. Dutt, mentioned yesterday was about some sort of a mixed international arrangement—I do not know what exactly you had in mind; you will have to expand that idea. But when Pandit Nehru was thinking in terms of peaceful co-existence and, at the same time, believing in an anti-imperialist struggle, development of developing countries on these lines, he was also thinking of some mixed international arrangement. And this daring thinking and acting for peaceful co-existence really laid down the basis for the *detente*. At the present moment, we do see it. I had dealt with it in detail when I spoke in the other House. I do not want to repeat it here. At present, the big powers are thinking in terms of *detente* because of many reasons. One of these is that the developing non-aligned countries have created a certain force, a certain condition in the world. This is one aspect. Secondly, there is a certain technological imperative. Naturally, the success in the technological development has reached a stage when nobody can say that they alone are tallest there may be descriptions of the world today as 'bipolar' or 'tripolar' or 'five-polar'. I do not know how many poles there are. Basically, there seem to be two. But both the poles have come to realise that if there is a war, a nuclear war, nobody is going to be a winner. Therefore, there is no other alternative, but *detente*. This

is the position. At the present moment, the word '*detente*' has become—I do not say dirty—somewhat unfashionable; for the purpose of election they are making it unfashionable. But the fact remains that the technological revolution has created certain political compulsions in the international sphere. And one of them is that the powers with all powerful weapons have come to realise that they just cannot make use of those powerful weapons. Therefore, while we always consider *detente* as some sort of a very healthy development, and we welcome it, at the same time we say that *detente* should not really be confined to one particular continent or one particular situation, that it should not become merely a technique of crisis management but that it should be a genuine movement which can be made applicable to all the continents and all the situations and all the tensions in the world. This is, what our foreign policy expects and this is one of the objectives that we have before us. Therefore, when we think of non-alignment, I would like to say that we should think of non-alignment in a much more positive manner.

During the debate, many Members have referred to non-alignment. And non-alignment has been a basic tenet of our foreign policy. The Summit Conference of Non-aligned Nations will soon be taking place in the capital of one of our friendly countries, Sri Lanka. And incidentally, this will be the first Summit in Asia. Therefore, India, along with all the other Asian countries, is proud that this Summit is being held in our continent, and we should certainly make all efforts to make it a great success. Possibly, you may be aware that we are making the necessary efforts, and I am leaving for Algiers to attend the Non-aligned Co-ordination Bureau meeting which is going to do the preparatory work. And I think all the non-aligned countries of the world as well as the other countries are looking forward to this historic meeting that is going to be held at Colombo.

From the beginning, non-alignment was never a uni-dimensional concept; it was a composite policy consisting of a number

of fundamental elements. In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, the objectives of non-alignment are—

“the pursuit of peace, not through alignment with another major power or groups of powers but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue, the liberation of subject peoples, the maintenance of national and international freedom, the abolishing of racial discrimination and elimination of want, disease and ignorance which afflict the greater part of world's population”.

He was thinking in terms of humanity. He wanted to make non-alignment a positive instrument in the hands of humanity. This particular aspect will have to be kept in mind.

With the changing world situation, it is only appropriate that different facets of non-alignment may receive emphasis at different times. However, to suggest that any element of non-alignment has become irrelevant to the contemporary reality is, to my mind, incorrect. I am making this point because there is a line of argument in the world today that the cold war era has come to an end. May be, yes; exactly “cold war” may have come to an end, but the point is whether the basic situation has changed. I would certainly put a big question mark before it—in the sense whether there is a complete sense of stability in all the developing countries. Can we say that with confidence? I think in the last two years our own Prime Minister has been warning the nation about the forces of destabilisation being active and that we have to be quite aware of those forces and be prepared for it—creating some sort of a consciousness in the minds of people and creating that sense of solidarity and unity and confidence in our own capacity. This confidence is very essential. So to say that the world has become safe and, therefore, we need no longer worry about military pacts would be incorrect. The world has changed, no doubt, since the first Non-aligned Summit in Belgrade in 1961. Yet we are far from a stage where the world

is without war, without want and without conflict or tension. In this changed and constantly changing world, the versatile concept of non-alignment is even more relevant than it was in 1961. It is true that the powers which confronted each other earlier, have now embarked on the path of relaxation of tensions. I have not used the word *detente* because, some people, as I said, are becoming allergic to the word. We have welcomed this positive development. In fact, we have expressed the view that to be meaningful, *detente* must extend to other continents and areas of tension and conflict. In fact, in our own region we are constantly striving to build a structure of durable peace and friendly co-operation. Yet, military alliances are still a reality. In fact, some of the pacts which were so far dormant have been revived again. What is more important is that impelled by a vision of global scarcity of basic resources, raw materials and energy, an economic dimension is being added to the military groupings. My colleague, the Minister of Commerce, is sitting nearby and he may bear me out when I say these things.

Recent events in Africa and the intensification of efforts for domination of the Indian Ocean are symptomatic of the stresses and strains to which *detente* is subject. To a large extent, the logic of *detente* derives from what I earlier called the technological imperatives. It would, therefore, be premature and unwise for anyone to conclude that military pacts have become a thing of the past. The non-aligned movement has played a very important role in preserving the independence of newly-liberated countries, in sustaining and strengthening the liberation movements, in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism. The movement has also been in the vanguard of the struggle for securing a new and just international economic order. We, therefore, welcome the growing strength and the increasing appeal of the non-aligned movement. At the same time, it is essential to remember that the basic strength of the movement lies in unity and cohesion and not in mere numbers. We believe that this

[Shri Y. B. Chavan.]

unity and cohesion of the non-aligned movement cannot be maintained if any of its fundamental principles are sacrificed in the interest of expediency. This is an important point regarding non-alignment and when I got this opportunity, I thought I should make this point here. I would not deal with further details about the question of non-alignment. But because the question of a viable international framework for our foreign policy was mentioned, I thought it necessary to explain that India's foreign policy is certainly aimed at looking after India's national interests. Our country's foreign policy cannot afford to do anything else. But at the same time, it must have also the international framework. And this is the international framework. The international framework of any foreign policy and its national framework, really speaking are very organically inter-connected.

One flows from the other. So, I thought I should mention a few things and then go to the some of the other points that were made by the honourable Members.

Some Members made a mention about some of the developed countries and I will touch on them briefly. Well, in the case of the USA, we have certainly some points of difference and we have never tried to conceal them, like the supply of arms to the countries in our neighbourhood and to the regions where they are not necessary and the building up of the Diego Garcia base, for example. These are all issues on which we have differences and we have never tried to conceal them and we cannot conceal them because there are differences. At the same time, I would like to make it clear that both the countries do recognise the need to build up a mature and realistic relationship on the basis of equality, reciprocity and mutual respect. The various Sub-Commissions created under the Indo-US Joint Commission have been meeting and have, to a certain extent, succeeded in identifying certain areas of mutually beneficial co-operation and I hope this process will continue. When I am talking about our relations with the USA, I must, at the same time mention about our re-

lations with the USSR also which are very important for us and I would like to say that our relationship with the socialist countries in the world is a very important facet of our foreign policy. Our friendly relations with the USSR are very important to us and they are of a positive quality for us. They are not based on any opportunistic considerations because—as somebody has said this morning and I underline that—they have stood the test of time and because they have made contributions to our economic growth and our political understanding. Therefore, our relationship with the USSR is excellent and, as you are aware, our Prime Minister is visiting the USSR only next month. I am sure this will give us an opportunity to discuss all the issues mutually and these discussions will give further opportunity to take the relationship to a higher level of understanding. Some people have tried to link up our relationship with USSR with some of the latest developments that are taking place and here I must come to the point about our new initiatives which we took regarding China.

We have always been making efforts for the normalisation of our relations with China. We were not getting the response. But, this time, we got the response and we have taken the first step and it is a significant step. We are upgrading the level of our representation in Peking to Ambassador-level, and we have appointed our Ambassador. They have given their agreement and he will soon go there. The intention on both sides is to make a sincere effort for improving the relationship, bilateral relationship, friendship and understanding, because we believe that we must have better relations with our neighbours. Though the situation went in an absolutely opposite direction in 1962, we did not sever our diplomatic relations with them. Naturally, our efforts will be to improve our relations. But that does not mean that this relationship will be at the cost of others or that our relationship with the USSR will be against any other country. The basic point which one has to

take into consideration is that India's friendship with any country is not meant against anyone else and it has to be taken into account on its own merits.

One of the Members, who made a very good speech in Hindi this morning said—and I would like to use his words—that with some countries we should have *khas maitri* and with others *aam maitri*. I will not like to make this type of distinction in friendship. I am reminded of a similar type of thing the other day in the other House when one of the leading members of the Communist Party asked me: Select your friends. Really speaking, it means, on the other side: Choose your enemies also. I told him at that time that this was not our way. All our leadership from the days of Mahatma Gandhi, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, and Prime Minister Indiraji also has expressed our policy very well. She said that wherever we have friendship, we should try to strengthen it where there is a little lack of friendship or hesitation, try to turn that into a positive willingness for friendship; wherever there is hostility, try to reduce it and convert it into a positive friendship. This should be our policy—not to make *khas maitri* or *aam maitri*. It should be *maitri*. Because of some historical reasons, sometimes friendship can become more warm. But that is a different matter. We ourselves should not try to make a distinction as *khas maitri* and *aam maitri*.

Our decision to improve relations with China does not in any way mean that there is going to be any effect on our relationship with Soviet Russia, because our relations with them are of a positive nature. And these are based on certain experiences and certain positive attitudes. I am sure that this type of friendship will certainly grow from strength to strength, though we want to improve our relations with China and other neighbours.

Here I would like to make one point. I am reminded of the argument made by Shri Prakash Veer Shastri yesterday. He said that since we have decided to improve our relationship with China, it was proved

that we were following an independent policy. Whom are we trying to convince? Do we need any proof to show that we are following an independent policy? Is it only now that we are following an independent policy because we have taken a step towards China? We have always been having an independent policy. (Interruptions). Our friendship with the USSR has been deliberately misinterpreted by some people in other countries. Really speaking, there was no necessity of interpreting that and saying. Now you are a good boy, you are trying to do this. So this logic I did not like—not from you, Mr. Prakash Veer Shastri. I just wanted to make this particular point.

Now, something about Pakistan. Pakistan is one of our neighbours. We have taken certain steps. We have been trying to take such steps since Independence. But they have not reconciled themselves to India. What can we do? We are neighbours. Geographical neighbourhood is something that we cannot choose. You can choose anything else. We are neighbours geographically. We have to take it as a fact of life. From the very beginning, we have been trying to make efforts in this direction. Well, what happened in 1971, etc., I do not want to go into. The Simla Agreement was there. We did take many steps. Some steps were successful. But, then, there was rather a halting situation. Recently, our Prime Minister took the initiative, and Mr. Bhutto also responded to that.

I wish that he continues to remain in the same mood and does not start sniping at India again. I hope that this accord which we have arrived at is implemented in the same spirit in which we have reached it. This is a very important step and we are glad that the step that we had thought of has started to show results. The basis was this. As neighbours we are bound to have problems. Which country is not going to have problems? If we have problems, what are we supposed to do? We have to sit together, find out options, try to convince each other and find a solution. That is the Simla Agreement. Without any interference from any

[Shri Y. B. Chavan] friend or foe, big or small, it has to be left to ourselves. We should sit down and discuss this matter. All the problems mentioned in the Simla Agreement have been solved by now. This is certainly a very positive development. I am specially making a mention of it because everyone of you, the whole nation and I think most of the countries in the world have appreciated this. Therefore, I thought I should mention this. This is exactly what we were trying to do from the very beginning. The Simla Agreement came in 1972. Well, its implementation was halted. Now, it has been put on its track. I hope it proceeds further without any unexpected difficulties because we want to improve our relations with Pakistan. We want to improve our relations with every nation around India. We want the same type of relations with Bangladesh. What has India not done for Bangladesh? From 1971 onwards, we have done everything that is possible. But unfortunately what happened in 1975 has created a different situation and a sort of anti-India propaganda has taken hold of the situation. First they said that India is about to intervene militarily. We invited their military people and told them to send their military delegation. They can come and see whether there is any preparation for that sort of thing. Then they discovered Farakka. Now, this has been used as some sort of an instrument of propaganda against India. I think no one can put it better about Farakka than the Prime Minister herself. As she said this is not an insoluble question. We never thought that it is an insoluble question. Realistically speaking, we have laid down the way of solving that question. Well, if Bangladesh has got problems, certainly we can sit together and discuss these matters. We invited them. We said, "Please come along and sit with us. But come with a desire and intention to solve the matters". We do not say Bangladesh has no problems about the waters of the Ganga. But we have also got some problems. Farakka was not just built because we had extra money. It is not merely a question of money. It is a question of the life of Calcutta and the people who live

in Calcutta. As a matter of fact, it is a question of the life of West Bengal. I should like to say that it is the question of the life of the entire economy of India because Calcutta port is not a port for West Bengal only. It is a major port of India. It affects the economy of India. Therefore, naturally we have got problems. They have got problems. We can sit together and solve the problems. We asked them to send their technicians. Ultimately, they sent their technicians. Our technicians also went. Let us see what happens. They say it is a political decision. I do not know how it is a political decision. If it is politically motivated, I do not know whether they will come to this decision. But, on our side, we are willing to discuss this matter and find a solution. There are no problems between two neighbours and between two nations which cannot be solved by understanding and negotiations if there is a willingness to solve the problems.

We want all friendship with Bangladesh. We want all the stability in Bangladesh and progress in Bangladesh because, basically we think the problems of Bangladesh, India and Pakistan are the same—the poverty of the broad masses of people. Unless we solve this problem of poverty of the broad masses of people, there is no hope of any further development. And there comes the question of peace because if there remains a vast humanity who are depressed, who are exploited, how can there be peace in the world? It is only the prosperous humanity, contented humanity, a humanity which is not exploited that can think in terms of peace. And when we talk of peace, it is not just a pious wish. It is a very positive concept one has to work for it, and work very hard.

Sir, some Members reminded me about our relations with the Arabs. Particularly a Member from our side asked me what we are doing about the Arabs and why we did not mention in our Report about Kenya and the Arabs. He said that in 1974-75, it was mentioned. Well, I can tell him that our relations with the Arab countries and West Asian countries, not only the Arabs, the Iranians and the people of Turkey, and the whole of the Arab

world, have been continuous and traditional. On the major issue of West Asia or the middle East as it is called, on the question of Palestine, for example, we have always supported the Arab cause. And Dr. Pande again yesterday mentioned the history of it and how Gandhiji reacted when it was decided to send the Israelis into Palestine. He was not sitting down in the conference of foreign affairs advisers and experts. As a leader of millions of masses, he just naturally reacted. And I can tell you that that is the basis of the foreign policy of India towards the Arab world since 1927 or 1928. Since then, it has become the policy of India. So, our relations with them are good and, in the last few years, we have made much more progress with conscious efforts. Our relations with Iraq have been very friendly and positive. Our relations with Egypt have been traditionally good since the days of our independence. Our relations with Syria are good. Our relations with most of the Gulf countries are good. In the matter of economic co-operation with the UAE and other countries, we have got some common projects, and particularly there is a sea-change in our relationship with Iran. And I must say this is one of the very important areas where there are some positive results. Very recently, we had the visit of the Iranian Prime Minister, Mr. Hoveyda. And to quote him, sky is the limit for co-operation between India and Iran. This is how others are looking at it. This feeling is based on the mutuality of interests and confidence. On the basic issue of the Arab nations we have stood by them and we will continue to stand by them. The lands forcibly occupied by the Israelis must be vacated and, the national rights of Palestine people must be restored to them and this is the basic approach on which we are absolutely firm and we shall continue to be firm and make our own constructive, positive contribution in this particular area.

The events in Lebanon have saddened us and we can only hope that peace and harmony will return to that beautiful country. This is a thing that keeps us worrying. Well, I do not want to go more

into that the area of West Asia is of most vital interest to us and we certainly will continue to work for co-operation in this area. Whether they vote for us in one particular election or not is not the ultimate test in this matter. Somebody just mentioned about the election but I can say that even in that context a large number of Arab countries voted for us. I would like to make my point clear because it would be rather misleading otherwise.

I think before I come to South-East Asia, I should mention our relationship with Nepal which is very important for us and there has certainly been further progress on account of the visit of the Prime Minister of Nepal. Our relations are better than they were before and, I think, both sides have realised that they have to be realistic in this matter and it is that realism which has put this relationship in a still better condition. We have identified the areas of co-operation in the development of river projects and this content of co-operation, I am sure, will certainly strengthen the political ties also.

The relationship with Bhutan is excellent and I do not think I need say anything more than that. We had a visit from the King to India last year. I also visited Bhutan last year. Their Ministers also come here at different levels and the relationship is certainly growing from strength to strength.

Now, coming to South-East Asia, I would like to say that recently we welcomed the approach of the ASEAN States for peaceful and good-neighbourly relations in the region. Our relations with individual nations are good. I should say that with Malaysia we have got good economic relations and so is the case with Indonesia and Thailand. The most important thing that I would like to mention about South-East Asia is the emergence of Vietnam, the victory of South Vietnam. Their decision to reunify South Vietnam and North Vietnam is a very important development of 1976 for Asia. First of all, a small nation of nearly 45 million people,

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

united nation—fought against the biggest power in the world and ultimately triumphed, showed that a determined people, inspired by nationalism and progressive ideology, can fight like one man and ultimately succeed. I mention this thing because the emergence of a United Vietnam is a very important factor for peace and progress in Asia. We had recently the visit of the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam but I would not like to merely mention her as the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam but as Madame Binh, who is one of the important leaders of Vietnam. Her visit gave us an idea that our outlook and our views on more important economic issues and international issues are, similar or identical. I am sure our co-operation will certainly and to the strength of the forces of peace in Asia and the world.

I must mention the other important continent, and that is Africa. As somebody said yesterday, these are the areas which are more important for us. I think Prof. Dutt said that these are the most important areas for us. To the north of India, USSR is our neighbour, so is China. Then we have West Asia, South East Asia and across the Indian Ocean is the African continent. As you know, the most difficult question that the world faces today is the issue of national liberation in the Southern Africa, the question of liberation of Zimbabwe, that is, Rhodesia, Namibia and the struggle against the forces of racism in South Africa. The situation there is something that really causes concern to us. It should cause concern to everybody who has got interest in peace in the world, because things have so developed there that in spite of efforts made for negotiations, for understanding, I think the situation is such and the consensus there is such that possibly an armed struggle is the only way left. If there is unity amongst the liberating forces, it will be much better for them. This is certainly an area where we will have to keep our eyes fixed because these are areas of tension, areas of conflict against injustice where we cannot be helpless spectators. That is why we are watching it actively. Our sympathies are definitely on

the side of the forces of liberation. One cannot rule out the possibility of intervention by other big powers there. So, this is one area which is a matter of concern to us.

Somebody read from the report of the External Affairs Ministry, one sentence that India looks at the world situation with hope and concern. I think that sums up the whole issue. Hopes are certainly there because there are forces of detente which are strengthening the non-aligned movement and its progress. The liberation and emergence of Vietnam, the liberation of Angola, the liberation of Mozambique, dismantling of the Portuguese empire and constructive discussions about the economic problems amongst the developing countries, are matters of hope. Then, there are matters of concern. What is happening in the Middle East? What is happening in Diego Garcia? What is happening in Zimbabwe? What is happening in the South Pacific? What is happening in other places? Somebody gave very interesting figures—I think it was Prof. Dutt—of nearly fifty per cent of the arms production going to certain areas. What about the huge defence budgets in the world for creating these sophisticated arms? When there are sophisticated arms, they do not lead towards peace. They always create tension and problems which may lead to something negative and not peace. So, these are all matters of concern. This African issue, as I said, is a matter of concern to us. We hope that the African countries will remain united and will stick to their rights. We hope that the forces of liberation will emerge successful as they did in parts of Asia. If they do so in Africa, certainly, the forces of progress will further be strengthened and this is what we have to work for.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta yesterday gave some suggestion and he said 3 P.M. that we must make detente irreversible. This can be made irreversible only by making detente universal. This is the only way of making it irreversible. If it is only confined to Europe I must say it is hanging by a

narrow thread. If this is the base of detente, it is a very narrow base. It will have to be extended further. This is the only way in which it can be extended further. This is the only way of doing it. This will have to be done carefully. There are many other points of concern in Africa. But this is the major question in regard to which we will have to be very watchful and wide awake in the days to come to see these problems through.

I will mention one or two more points before I conclude. I know I have already taken quite a lot of time, but these are certain issues which one must deal with. Once we start dealing with one issue, it leads to another. While I am replying to the debate, I must do justice to it.

The other day I made a statement here on the policy of Canada in regard to the nuclear programme of India. We did say what we had to say. I do not want to add to it. I am merely taking it as an illustration. This is a new trend which is developing. This is a very important thing which we have to take note of in a general sense. At the present moment, I am not talking about Canada as such. I have already said all that I had to say but one cannot think of it in isolation and therefore I consider it as an indication of a trend on this particular matter. This new trend is that the developed countries appear to have decided that they would not make it very easy for the developing countries to participate in the technological revolution. This is the basic thing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Where is the Commerce Minister? Is he here?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : We should take it more as a challenge for action, for scientific and economic progress. I do not know what exactly is happening in the United States of America about supplies of uranium fuel which is before N. R. C. There seems to be some sort of an understanding among the developed countries in this regard only because India conducted a peaceful nuclear explosion. We have said that we do not want to make nuclear

weapons. It is not our policy. But at the same time, we do not want to give up our right to have peaceful nuclear experiment because it is for peaceful purposes and this has been accepted by the scientists. This is the trend. At one time, our Prime Minister made a very profound observation in this regard. I do not remember exactly what she said. She said that historically, we have missed the industrial revolution, but we do not want to miss the technological revolution. This is a very important observation. We missed the industrial revolution and came the dark era of imperialism and colonialism. This is the time when we should keep pace with the advancing technology. We should make our own efforts in this direction. We should not be deterred and we should pursue our policy and be partners in the technological revolution. This alone would keep India what it is today and this alone would make India what we want India to be. We do not want to become a power in the sense the word 'power' is used. We certainly want India to be strong. We certainly want India to live in peace and work for co-operation. But this can be done only through our participation in the technological revolution. Canada's attitude is certainly a warning in that direction. We should take note of this warning and take it well. The developing countries should take it, not as a warning to India, but as a warning to all of them. My colleague has participated in certain international economic conferences. So have I. We see them talk in very plausible terms, but when it comes to the question of taking decisions on very vital matters there are hesitations. There are hesitations on transfer of technology because technology also means, in economic terms, further development and expansion of trade and also allotting a fair share in that trade. And the developed nations do not want to make it easy for you to get your own share in the expanding world trade. I think the way world trade has expanded after the second World War is unique. Therefore, developing countries and the non-aligned countries have to see that we are not denied our share of the technology.

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

Nobody possibly would be too willing to give it to us and you cannot also take it by compulsion. I think as human beings we all have got talents, and capacities as people of developed countries have, we have also got talent. But it is a question of time. They have got the advantage of early start of 200 years. That is our initial disadvantage. But I am sure that if we work hard towards this end and I think we will gear up our economic policy, our commerce policy and our foreign policy, ultimately we will succeed. I have said it before and I would like to repeat that ultimately the success and strength of our foreign policy depends upon the strength of our internal political, economic and scientific policies and, therefore, just as we take care of our foreign policy postures and our relations with the different countries we have to take care of these also and ultimately these are the basic forces of strength for India. If we strengthen them we will be strengthening India and the Indian people and it is the strength of the Indian people that would make the Indian foreign policy a strong foreign policy and a successful foreign policy.

THE TEA (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1976

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE
(PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA) :
Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Tea Act, 1953, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the Tea Act, 1953 (29 of 1953), which came into force on the 1st April, 1954, seeks to provide for the control by the Union Government of the tea industry and for that purpose to establish a Tea Board. The Act also seeks to levy a duty of excise on tea produced in India, which at present is six paise per kilogramme. The Tea Board has been discharging its functions under section 10 of the Act for the

development of the tea industry in the country.

In recent years, the tea industry has been facing some difficulties in the matter of finance, managerial skill, etc. A number of tea gardens have been closed and a few others are reported to be sick or uneconomic, and it is feared that unless corrective or remedial measures are taken in time, they would be closed down eventually. According to an assessment made during 1975, there are about 43 sick/closed tea gardens in the regions like Darjeeling, Terai, Dooars, Cachar and Assam covering an area of 8,986 hectares and affecting about 18,000 workers. This situation not only creates problems of unemployment and economic hardship, but might, also, affect productivity and the nation's exports ultimately. To meet such difficulties and to take corrective action, it is proposed that the Government should acquire powers to investigate into the working of the sick tea gardens and also to take over the management of these gardens which, on investigation, call for such steps being taken for resuscitating them back into economic units in a given period of time so that production from these gardens may maintain healthy trends and help exports.

In the Tea Act, 1953, there is no provision for taking over the management of the sick and uneconomic tea gardens. The present Bill seeks to amend the Tea Act, 1953 on the lines of the provisions contained in the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 which contains provisions for empowering the Government to take over the management of industrial undertakings under certain circumstances. The intention is to order investigation and direct the units to take corrective or preventive action if that would suffice. If such action does not suffice, the Government would have power to take over the management of such tea estates (only with factories) for maximum period of 7 years, 5 years in the first instance and by two annual extensions. The Bill also seeks to make provision for the