

**REVISION OF FOURTH PLAN FOR REDUCING  
OUTLAYS ON PLAN PROJETS**

132. SHRI VENIGALLA SATYANARAYANA: Will the Minister of PLANNING be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Fourth Five Year Plan is under revision with a view to reducing the outlays on plan projects; and

(h) if so, the reasons which necessitated the downward revision of the Plan?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI MOHAN DHARIA): (a) No. Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

**ANNUAL PLANS FOR STATES**

133. SHRI K. L. N. PRASAD: Will the Minister of PLANNING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Planning Commission has finalised the annual plans for 1972-73 of all the 21 States;

(b) if so, what will be the total outlay of the plans; and

(c) the total Central assistance likely to be provided for these plans ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI MOHAN DHARIA): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A total outlay of Rs. 1601.75 crores has been approved for Annual Plans 1972-73 for States.

(c) An amount of Rs. 718.66 crores has been allocated as Central assistance for 1972-73 Annual Plans of States.

**MACHINERY TO AVERT THREATENED CLOSURE  
OF INDUSTRIAL UNDERTAKINGS**

134. SHRI K. L. N. PRASAD.: Will the Minister of INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal under the consideration of the Government of India to set up a suitable machinery that could help in averting threatened closure of Industrial undertakings;

(b) if so, the details of the scheme; and

(c) whether labour representatives will be associated with such a machinery?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (PROF. SIDDHESHWAR PRASAD):

(a) to (c) The matter is engaging the attention of Government.

12 NOON

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER  
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE****DEMONSTRATION IN FRONT OF THE  
HEADQUARTERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
CONTROL COMMISSION AT SAIGON**

2/LT. K. P. SINGH DEO (Orissa): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the demonstration in front of the headquarters of the International Control Commission at Saigon by a number of South Vietnamese to protest against the Indian Chairmanship of the Commission.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH): Sir, consequent on the upgradation of our mission in Hanoi to Embassy level on January 7, 1972, on a reciprocal basis, a number of hostile demonstrations in front of the I.C.S.C. Headquarters and our Consulate-General in Saigon have taken place.

Two demonstrations had earlier taken place in front of the I.C.S.C. Headquarters on the 11th January, 1972 and 23rd February, 1972. The latest incident took place on the morning of March 14, 1972, when South Vietnamese local employees of the I.C.S.C. struck work and displayed slogans on the walls of the Indian Delegation building demanding immediate replacement of Indian Delegation on the I.C.S.C.

As repeatedly pointed out earlier, India's decision to raise the level of its mission in Hanoi was not in any way directed against South Vietnam. It was in recognition of the realities of the situation and in exercise of our sovereign rights. The I.C.S.C. in Vietnam is an international body created by the nations participating in the Geneva Conference of 1954

[Shri Surendra Pal Singh] and any attempt by any one of the parties to unilaterally alter its composition or prevent its functioning is totally unwarranted.

The Government of India would still hope that wiser counsels will prevail and the South Vietnamese Government would take effective steps to prevent recurrence of such incidents.

2/Lt. K. P. SINGH DEO: In view of the deplorable incidents earlier, where our National Flag has been burnt, our Embassy has been raided and our Indian citizens have been intimidated by some Vietnamese in South Vietnam, may I know, Sir, from the Government whether they have any information either from their own sources or from the Ambassador that the demonstrations were sponsored by any organisation or by any Government, and what is the reaction of the Government of South Vietnam on these incidents?

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair].

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH: It is true, as I said in the main statement, that two demonstrations did take place earlier, one in January and the other in February and during these demonstrations some very ugly incidents took place as a result of which some shops belonging to Indian nationals were looted and the Indian National Flag was also torn. All these things were pointed out to the South Vietnam Government and a protest was lodged. They gave an assurance afterwards that in future they would see to it that such things did not occur. They also gave an assurance that the life and property of the citizens of India will be given full protection.

2/LT. K. P. SINGH DEO: In spite of the fact that the Government of South Vietnam has assured to give protection to our Indian citizens, is it not true that these incidents took place after the request made by us? Then what other steps have now been taken by the Government to see that the interests of our Indian citizens are safeguarded there? I would like to know how many Indian citizens are there in North Vietnam and how many in South Vietnam. Could the Government enlighten us?

SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH: As far as our knowledge goes, in the incident which took place in March no. Indian citizens or

traders were involved. Only a strike of the employees of the I.C.S.C. took place. They shouted slogans and did things of that sort. No demonstration was organised against Indian citizens.

As regards the number of Indians, Sir, approximately, 2,000 Indian nationals are in South Vietnam at present.

श्री राजनारायण : (उत्तर प्रदेश) श्रीमन, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ, यह जो प्रदर्शन वगैरह हो रहा है, इसका मूल कारण क्या है। भारतीय झंडे को जलाना, भारतीयों के साथ अमर व्यवहार करना, उनके अहित में कोई काम करना, यह सर्वथा अवांछनीय है, इसकी जितनी निंदा की जाए, थोड़ी है। मगर मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि मूल कारण क्या है? क्या सरकार इस बात को समझती है कि यह सरकार उत्तर वियतनाम और दक्षिण वियतनाम में कोई भेद की दृष्टि बरत रही है और भेद की दृष्टि बरतने मात्र से भी कुछ इस प्रकार की घटनाएं हो रही हैं क्योंकि मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस सरकार को आगाह कर दूँ कि इस सरकार की जो विदेश-नीति रही है यह बराबर गलत बुनियाद पर कायम रही है। यह कभी तो एटलांटिक गुट के साथ रहती है, दुम में और कभी रशन गुट के दुम में रहती है। यह पारी पारी से एक एक स्वामी की सेवा करती है। आजकल यह रूसी गुट की दुम में जा रही है, और अगर रूसी गुट की दुम में जाने से यह उत्तर वियतनाम को कुछ ऊँचा दर्जा देकर वहाँ एम्बैसेडर रैंक का प्रतिनिधि रखती है और यहाँ कांसिलेट रखती है तो हमारी दृष्टि से यह गलत है। मैं चाहता हूँ, इस सरकार को सर्वदृष्टि रखनी चाहिए। इसको, न तो रूसी गुट, न अमरीकी गुट, इसको सफाई से कहना चाहिए क्योंकि नान-एलाइन्मेंट शब्द रखने मात्र से नान एलाइन्मेंट की पालिसी नहीं चलती। नान एलाइन्मेंट एक कर्म होगा जो न रूसी गुट में जाएगा न अमरीकी गुट में जायगा—वह स्वतंत्र होगा, सुजसात्मक होगा, और अपनी नीति के अनुसार चलेगा। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, सरकार इस बात को स्पष्ट करे। तो क्या इस सरकार ने उत्तर वियतनाम

को दक्षिणी वियतनाम से सुपीरियर स्टेटस दिया है ? यही मूल कारण हो रहा है वहाँ के लोगों में रिजेंटमेन्ट का । अगर यह कारण है तो सरकार ने ऐसा क्यों किया ?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): We did raise the level of our representation in North Vietnam because of the realities of the situation. It is our sovereign right. . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Of the Russian Government.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: This is absolutely incorrect.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: This is absolutely correct,

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: If the hon. Member shouts, he cannot drown me like that. I am in total disagreement with his far-fetched ideas. This is his favoured theme—that everything the Government does in the External Affairs or elsewhere is wrong. I cannot really join issue with him everyday, but his assessment of the situation is entirely incorrect. We have taken the right step in raising our level of representation at Hanoi. This is our own decision. We have not taken this decision at the instance of any other Government and have no doubt that the world realises that India is not in a mood to accept any suggestion of that type—which is in the mind of the hon. Member—from any country whatsoever. It is unfortunate that the South Vietnamese Government and people should have reacted in the manner that they have done. We continue to hope that wiser counsel will prevail and they will realise the reality of the situation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): This is the first time that such incidents have taken place in Saigon. We are told that the local employees of the Commission had demonstrated. Obviously this could not have been done without some kind of an instigation by the South Vietnamese Government or whatever the regime is. Surely it has been done at their instance. In view of incidents of this kind, I do not know why the Government should not consider it wise to make a suggestion that the Commission should not be in a 'place like Saigon where it is surrounded by people not only hostile to India but are also

engaged in violating in a blatant manner the stipulations of the Geneva Agreement under American inspiration.

Now, in this connection I should like to know how long this show will go on, this kind of a thing. Why is the Government delaying full diplomatic recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam particularly when we know that the Americans are bent on escalating the war in the name of Vietnamisation of the war in this region and they have no intention of ending their aggression in that region ? Would it not be better to fully identify with the national liberation forces and recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government and then see that the Geneva Agreement is enforced and respected by a complete and final triumph of the national liberation struggle in that region?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: With regard to the first suggestion made by the honourable Member that we might consider shifting the headquarters of the International Control Commission from Saigon to Hanoi, it is a suggestion for action and India alone cannot take a view in this respect because there are two other members on the International Control Commission and there are also Two Co-Chairmen. But the possibility of such action cannot be excluded if the Government of South Vietnam fails in its elementary duty of ensuring the safety and the smooth functioning of the International Control Commission in South Vietnam. With regard to the second question we do recognise some of the elements which have been mentioned by Shri Bhupesh Gupta, but we do continue to take the view that the situation in South Vietnam is still fluid and it is for that reason that we are disinclined to change the representational level at the present stage in South Vietnam.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): I suppose this is the first time that such a demonstration has been made in Saigon against the ICC or the Indian Chairmanship. We all know India used to ditto American policies in Vietnam along with Canada and enabled the American aggression inside Vietnam. That was the first phase. Recently, of course, there is a bit of change. That is why they have staged this demonstration. Is this demonstration sponsored under American inspiration? And then again comes the question why the Government professes support for national liberation

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

movement it' it cannot recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and why the Government applies double standards in respect of North Korea and South Korea where the world knows that the American aggressive army is still there and India is taking no steps whatsoever to vacate the American aggression. Even we did not express an opinion on that.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not accept the suggestion made by the honourable Member that we have been dittoing the US policy in Vietnam. That is not correct. We have our own views which we have expressed from time to time. I cannot say whether these demonstrations are entirely of South Vietnamese origin or whether they have derived inspiration from any other country. That is irrelevant. And we have expressed our concern and regretted that such demonstrations should take place and that the Government of South Vietnam should ensure that they do not recur. Thirdly, I do not see what is the objection that the honourable Member has raised about our observing double standards in North Korea and South Korea.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Both In North Korea and South Korea we have same type of representation, that is, Consulate-General.

SHRI NIRAN GHOSH: I will put the question again. In respect of Vietnam there has been a shift in the policy of the government. Previously we had sided with the American aggressors.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That is incorrect.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Now there is a change. But in Korea, where American aggression has taken place, the aggressive army is still there. But the Government of India, either in the United Nations or outside, so far as my knowledge goes, have not expressed any opinion against this aggression or have not taken any steps to vacate the American aggression and the presence of the American army in South Korea. That is the double standard.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: There is no double standard so far the question of re-

iliation is concerned. The whole Korean question is a complicated question. It comes before several organs of the United Nations from time to time and we have expressed our views thereon. I would request the hon. Member to refresh his memory by studying the Government of India's stand as put forward in the United Nations.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu): The International Control Commission in S.ugon under the Indian chairmanship has done excellent work to which India's Foreign Minister has made reference in this very House on a number of occasions. I would only like to have an assurance from the hon. Foreign Minister that the same standard will be maintained, and whether engineered by local people or outside agencies, India will not submit herself to any kind of pressure from whatever quarter it might have come.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We will continue to discharge the international obligation that we owe to the world community and we will continue to shoulder the responsibility that we have undertaken to shoulder as a result of the Geneva agreement and the protocol establishing the Commission. We hope that this type of demonstration is a passing phase and it is our expectation that it will die out.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव ( बिहार ) : श्रीमन्, अभी उपमन्त्री महोदय ने बताया कि फर्स्ट इंसीडेंट के बाद दक्षिण वियतनाम ने भारतीयों की सुरक्षा और भारतीय प्रापर्टी की सुरक्षा की गारन्टी दी थी, उसके बावजूद भी यह प्रदर्शन हुआ और दूसरे नुकसान भारतीयों को उठाने पड़े। तो क्या सरकार बताएगी कि इसके बारे में साउथ वियतनाम का क्या रिएक्शन है और अपनी सरकार का क्या रिएक्शन है। अमरीका ने हिन्दुस्तान को बदनाम करने के लिए और हिन्दुस्तान को कठिनाई में डालने के लिए चीन के साथ अपनी बातचीत में जम्मू और काश्मीर का जिक्र किया और आज अखबार में देखा कि डेविड एच० माइनेट ने, जो अमरीका सरकार का न्यूज डायरेक्टर है, बंगला देश की छीछालेदर करने की कोशिश की है। तो इस आन्दोलन में जो भारतीय कमीशन के विरुद्ध

किया गया उसमें अमरीका का हाथ है ऐसा विश्वास कर क्या भारत सरकार अमरीका सरकार से प्रोटेस्ट करना चाहती है ?

फर्स्ट इंसीडेंट के बाद साउथ वियतनाम ने भारत सरकार को एश्योर किया था कि हम इंडियन प्रापर्टी और इंडियन लाइफ की सुरक्षा करेंगे, उस एश्योरेंस के बाद भी यह इंसीडेंट हो गया। तो वहाँ की सरकार का इस बारे में क्या रिएक्शन है और हमारी सरकार का क्या रिएक्शन है ?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: With regard to the first question, I would urge that the hon. Member, I think, has confused South Korea with South Vietnam. The present question relates to South Vietnam, not South Korea. There is no new point that he has raised. My colleague has already answered the question and given the factual information. I deplore these demonstrations. But, we should make a distinction between a demonstration and danger to the life or property of the people. A demonstration need not always be a danger to the life and property. We should, therefore, make a distinction, although we deplore at the same time the fact of a demonstration.

About the US-China communique and about the mention of certain unsatisfactory matters in that communique, I had the occasion to answer a Calling-Attention Motion here in this House the other day and I have no further information to give.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : हमने वह नहीं पूछा। हमने यह कहा कि जो एटिट्यूड उसने प्रदर्शित किया चीन अमरीकी कम्युनिक में जम्मू और काश्मीर के मामले को घसीट कर, दूसरे आज जो अखबारों में आया है कि डेविड एच० माइनेट ने बंगला देश के बारे में छीछालेदर की है और उसी तरह से जो यह दुर्घटना साउथ वियतनाम में हुई, वह अमरीकन इंस्टीट्यूशन से हुई है, तो इस पर सरकार का क्या दृष्टिकोण है !

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Sir, this is the hon. Member's own view and I cannot answer about the intentions of other Governments or instigation by the other Governments.

## PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

### ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS (1970-71) OF THE INDIAN TELEPHONE INDUSTRIES LIMITED, BANGALORE AND RELATED PAPERS

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Twenty-first Annual Report and Accounts of the Indian Telephone Industries Limited, Bangalore, for the year 1970-71, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India thereon, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1407/72].

### INDIAN TELEGRAPHS (SEVENTH AMENDMENT) RULES, 1971

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Sir, I also lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Department of Communications (Posts and Telegraphs Board) Notification G. S. R. No. 1471, dated the 18th August, 1971, publishing the Indian Telegraphs (Seventh Amendment) Rules, 1971 under sub-section (5) of section 7 of the Indian telegraphs Act, 1885. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1517/72].

### ADJUDICATION PROCEEDINGS AND APPEALS (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1971

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Cabinet Secretariat (Department of Personnel) Notification S. O. No. 5389, dated, the 18th November, 1971, publishing the Adjudication Proceedings and Appeal (Amendment) Rules, 1971, under sub-section (3) of section 27 of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1947. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1409/72].

### CABINET SECRETARIAT NOTIFICATIONS

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Sir I also beg to lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) each of the following Notifications of the Cabinet Secretariat