

RAJYA SABHA

Friday, the 10th May, 1974/the 20th Vaisakha,
1896 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock, **Mr. Chairman** in the Chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Opening of Information Office of P.R.G. of South Vietnam in New Delhi

*354. **SHRI SARDAR AMJAD ALI :**

SHRI IBRAHIM KALANIYA :

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA :

SHRI N. R. CHOUDHURY :

Dr. R. K. CHAKRABARTI :

Will the Minister of **EXTERNAL AFFAIRS** be pleased to state :

(a) Whether it is a fact that there is a strong feeling among some Members of Parliament that the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam should be permitted to open an Information Office in New Delhi;

(b) whether Government propose to permit the opening of the said office; and

(c) if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH) : (a) Government is aware of the views expressed by some Hon'ble Members of Parliament on this question.

(b) and (c) A decision will be taken at an appropriate time.

SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA : Sir, at the non-aligned summit at Algiers, all the non-aligned countries agreed to extend recognition to the P.R.G. and regular diplomatic relations have been established by a large number of non-aligned countries. Here the demand is that the least we can do is that we should allow them to open an office here as a kind of Information Office from where they can put their point of view. This demand has been before the Government

for a long time. I would like to know what are the hesitations which prevent this, if there are any ?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : This question has been discussed here on a number of occasions in the past and the Government's stand has been made known on a number of occasions. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in repeating all those reasons all over again. But, Sir, suffice it to say that there has been no substantive change in the situation since we last discussed it, which warrants any change in the position of the Government.

DR. R. K. CHAKRABARTI : Is it a fact that opening of an Information Office in the country means recognition of the Provisional Government? Then what will be our relation with the present South Vietnam Government?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH : Sir, the opening of an office here does not necessarily mean that we recognise the P.R.G. but it is quite possible that once we allow their office to be set up here, the P.R.G. may make a request for recognition thereafter.

DR. V. A. SEYID MUHAMMAD : Are there certain principles on which the activities of similar bodies are permitted in this country? If so, what are those principles?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, there are no particular principles. Each case is decided on its own merits.

SHRI S. G. SARDESAI : The Minister just now replied that no substantial change in the situation has taken place to warrant any change in the Government's position with regard to the opening of this office. The point is that this should have been allowed and permitted long ago. What happened on the question of G. D. R. ? We know that finally when full ambassadorial representation was given, no new reasons were given by the Government of India as to what changes had come about. This recognition was given to the G.D.R. one fine morning. The point is that this Government once again one fine morning will give recognition without giving us any new reasons. The reasons for giving this kind of facility already exist. They have existed for a long

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Harsh Deo Malaviya.

time. The question is why this delay? When *de facto*, we know, that the Government is being represented, *de facto* recognition is there, then why not allow opening of this office? That is the point.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, I do not think that the information of the hon. Member on the analogy of G.D.R. that he mentioned is quite correct. There was a substantial change in the international position of G.D.R. when we did accord recognition and this was as a result of extensive discussions and talks with the Government of G.D.R. that the recognition was ultimately granted.

Having said that, in this particular case the premises upon which the hon. Member based his question is not correct and so the reply given by my colleague remains in the field.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : The experts on this subject are agreed that the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam *de facto* controls not only vast areas of South Vietnam but also have the allegiance of the vast majority of the population. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is the Government's assessment of the real situation about the allegiance of the people to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and if that is the real Government what prevents the Government of India to accord recognition and as a preliminary starting of the Information Office in New Delhi and why is it not consistent with Government's own professed statement that they would support anti-colonial, anti-imperialist struggles in South East Asia?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, on the extent of actual physical control of territory there are claims and counter-claims and it will not be wise for us to adjudicate and to express our opinion upon claims and counter-claims. The allegiance owed by the entire people of south Vietnam to P.R.G. or to Saigon Govt. or whether the majority owe allegiance to one or the other Government is a matter on which people may have their subjective views and there is no possibility at the present moment of testing that view. Under these circumstances I think it is not proper for us to speculate. Our support to the PRG has been very amply demonstrated. We have

been supporting their admission to international organisations. We first supported in Lusaka the admission of PRG as observer to the group of non-aligned countries; in Algiers we supported their being seated as equals with other governmental representatives. So we have been taking a view which is helpful to them and the PRG representatives themselves are fully aware of our views in this respect.

SHRI KALI MUKHERJEE : May I know whether the PRG has been recognised by the USSR and Eastern Europe and if so have they opened their embassies and offices in those countries.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Sir, several countries, socialist countries also have recognised the provisional Revolutionary Government of Vietnam including the USSR. There is hardly any socialist country which has not recognised the provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Vietnam. In fact none of the socialist countries according to my present information has any relations with the south Vietnam Government functioning from Saigon and that position has been there for a considerable time. Including the socialist countries the total number of countries who recognise the PRG is 38.

श्री ओइम्प्रकाश त्यागी : मैं गाननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक भारत सरकार की यह नीति रही है कि वह कहीं भी जनता और जनहित क्रान्ति की लड़ाई में अपनी महानुभूति और इनडायरेक्ट सहयोग देती रही है, पर उनकी भारत की भूमि पर आफिस के रूप में सक्रिय सहयोग देना, क्या इस तरह की कार्यवाही से वह अपने को उसमें सम्मिलित करना अनुभव करती है? क्या इससे भारतवर्ष की विदेश नीति नहीं प्रभावित होती है? उदाहरण के तौर पर, मान लीजिए, अगर हम दलाई लामा को सक्रिय बेस स्थापित करने के लिए मौका दे दे, तो फिर क्या चीन के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध प्रभावित नहीं होंगे? अपनी विदेशी नीति के अंतर्गत इस तरह अगर हम सक्रिय क्रान्तिकारी दलों को

आफिम बनाने के लिए जगह देते हैं, सक्रिय लडाई के लिए भारतवर्ष में बेस देते हैं, तो इस तरह की कार्यवाही कहा तक हमारी विदेश नीति में फिट बैठती है ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : The analogy of Tibet which the hon. Member has given, if I may say so, is absolutely inept because we have always recognised that Tibet is a part of China and any part of another country cannot have representation in any form in any other country including India.

श्री ओझमप्रकाश त्यागी : मैंने तिब्बत का नाम लिया उदाहरण के तौर पर।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : Now please. It is all right. Now, the *Udaharan* or example really is not correct. This might create a wrong impression in the Government of the People's Republic of China. For the information of the hon. Member I might inform him that these days the Chinese News Agency reports very extensively from the newspaper with the hon. Member's party is connected. Motherland is the main paper which is quoted by the PRG these days. So, I would like to say that this example is certainly not applicable because Tibet is a part of China. Now we are left with the question that, if there are two rival claimants of suzerainty or whether one of them is the only legitimate government of the country, then it is a matter which is discussed on meritis. Thirdly, I would like to say that we take decisions on such matters after taking the justice of the case into consideration and we believe that adherence to justice does not in any way compromise our external affairs policy. Our external affairs policy gets strengthened if we adhere to certain principles.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Anand.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : Does the Minister seem to suggest that justice does not lie with the PRG?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : I do not think you are helping the PRG.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. Kurian, I called you to put a question and you put it. Now you are taking up other people's time.

SHRI J. S. ANAND : The hon. Minister himself referred to the stand taken by our Government in Lusaka and Algiers. I want to know why is the stand, in this specific case different from the stand they had taken in certain international conferences. There they wanted to recognise the PRG as an equal, but here they do not allow them to open an information office. Why should we be the 39th or 40th country among the anti-imperialists? Why should we not be before so many countries?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH : We are not in a race in this to establish that we are more revolutionary than many of the other countries. Probably the hon. Member himself would not like that. But, Sir, coming to the specific point there is absolutely no contradiction in our stand in the non-aligned conference and other forums as compared to the attitude that we are adopting with regard to the formal recognition of PRG. There are other very vital considerations. We have some sort of relationship with Saigon also. At one time we were members of the International Control Commission. All these factors are there and we have to take a view which is in the best national interest and which also conforms to principles of justice.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Rajnarain, last question.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, क्या सरकार इस बात को स्पष्ट करेगी कि दक्षिण वियतनाम में इस समय एक सरकार पहले की है और दूसरी वहां की अस्थायी क्रान्तिकारी सरकार है, अस्थायी क्रान्तिकारी सरकार कम्युनिस्ट डोमिनेटेड है, कम्युनिस्ट ब्लाक की है और वहां की जो दूसरी सरकार है उस सरकार से इस सरकार का कोई रिश्ता है या रिश्ता नहीं है, उस सरकार से भी इस सरकार का रिश्ता रहेगा या उस सरकार से इस सरकार का रिश्ता नहीं रहेगा ? हमारा प्रश्न है कि क्या सरकार इस बात को भूल गई है कि उत्तर कोरिया, दक्षिण कोरिया उत्तर वियतनाम-दक्षिण वियतनाम, भारत-पाकिस्तान, ये सब द्वितीय विश्व

युद्ध की उपज है? क्या सरकार इन दोनों को मिलाने के लिए, दोनों को एक करने के लिए, दोनों में तारतम्य बिठाने के लिए प्रयत्नशील रहेगी या यह सरकार अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में एक गुट में शामिल होगी?

श्रीमन्, माननीय मंत्री जी के उत्तर से उत्पन्न एक सवाल है। मुझे बड़े दुख के साथ सुनना पड़ा उनके उत्तर को। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या माननीय स्वर्ण सिंह जी इस प्रस्ताव को भूल गए हैं—

"This House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressors from the sacred soil of India however long and hard the struggle may be"

श्री सभापति: अब आप रिलेवेंट प्रश्न पूछिये।

श्री राजनारायण: मैं आदरणीय पंडित जवाहरलाल जी नेहरू ने जो चीन के हमले के अवसर पर लोकसभा में प्रस्ताव किया था उसको रख रहा हूँ। माननीय मंत्री जी ने यह कैसे कह दिया कि Tibet is part of China. मैं इसको इंकार करता हूँ। यह मंत्री जी ने कैसे कह दिया? (Interruption)

श्री सभापति: आप सवाल पूछते हैं या नहीं? आप उनको कंटेडिक्ट करे चले जायेंगे।

(Interruption)

श्री राजनारायण: मैं आपकी इजाजत से पूछ रहा हूँ, आप सुनिये। सरकार इस बात को स्पष्ट करे कि तिब्बत चीन का पार्ट कैसे है? तिब्बत पर जब समझौता हुआ था उस समय भी कहा गया था सुजेरेन्टी

(Interruption)

श्री सभापति: 15 मिनट एक सवाल में लेंगे तो कैसे काम चलेगा?

श्री राजनारायण: भूपेण गुप्ता को कम्प्यूनिस्टी बात कहने के लिए पूरा

मौका मिल जाता है। (Interruption) बताया जाए कि संगोपा नदी हमारी थी या नहीं, मानसरोवर और कैलाश पहाड़ हमारा था या नहीं? तो कैसे मंत्री जी ने कह दिया कि तिब्बत चीन का हिस्सा है?

श्री सभापति: आप कितनी दफा एक बात को कहेंगे। छठी दफे आपने कहा कि तिब्बत चीन का हिस्सा है?

श्री राजनारायण: यह तो मामूली सवाल नहीं है।

(Interruption)

श्री सभापति: दस दफे कहिये तो जरूरी सवाल हो जाएगा।

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I have said with a great deal of deliberation that Tibet is part of China and I repeat that that is our position.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Never, never.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: You may not agree.

श्री राजनारायण: यह देश के शत्रु हैं जो मातृभूमि की रक्षा नहीं करना चाहते हैं। श्रीमन्, राजेन्द्रप्रसाद हमारे राष्ट्रपति थे, उन्होंने कहा था कि भारत की सरकार ने भूल की तिब्बत पर चीन का कब्जा कबूल करके।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Next question. Mr. Choudhury.

Locomotive Power Requirements of Steel Plants

*355. SHRI N. R. CHOUDHURY: †
SHRI SARDAR AMJAD ALI:
DR. R. K. CHAKRABARTI:
SHRI HARSH DEO MALAVIYA:
SHRI ROSHAN LAL:

Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of wagons on an average which are being detained daily in steel plants;

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri N. R. Choudhury.