

10th August, 1970, as an undertrial u/s 151/107 Cr. P.C., has been released from Jail to-day forenoon, the 18th August, 1970, in compliance with the orders of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Jamui."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, you need not have read it. He is physically present here. Here, I should like to bring to your notice that these arrests under the so-called provisions of the Cr. P.C. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is under section 151.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, section 151 of the Cr. P.C. You are a practising lawyer; you know better. Now these arrests are absolutely *mala fide* and gross misuse and abuse of authority and power. This is one way of degrading the law. Now section 151 was never meant for this kind of thing. To-day we find that in some States, especially in Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, this provision is being used by the Government. I should like to know what the Central Government is doing. That is why I have got up. The Indian Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code are Central Acts. And now the law is administered is also something which should interest the Central Government, although it may be implemented at the State level. My submission here is that these laws are being used by the State Governments contrary to the spirit and letter of the Constitution. Let us not just wait for the Supreme Court to say so. Whatever may be the position technically, morally and politically and, in a broad sense, even legally, these laws are being used *mala fide* with a view to suppressing legitimate movements. I am surprised that the Prime Minister of the country, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who has condemned our movement as unconstitutional and unlawful or illegal, does not say a word against this kind of misuse of law in the various States of the Indian Union. Yet she presides over the Union Government of the country. Therefore, I take serious exception to it. The Prime Minister, on the contrary, should not only call a conference of Chief Ministers to thrash out as to what should be immediately done for land reforms and for redistribution of land, but should also call a conference of representatives of parties and other leaders who are interested in radical land reforms in order to work out a common approach, a common line of action. It is a strange thing, Sir, that in the sovereign Parliament we are completely ignored. We have got the Foreign Minister here; the Food Minister is here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That point has already been made a number of times.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Otherwise, every day you would be reading these messages. Your time will be wasted on that.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): The Government is not coming forward with any explanation. That is why it is being raised.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Central Government should not be sitting on the fence in the manner it is doing. PSP leaders are in Jail, and their supporters and followers are in jail. Members of our party and supporters of our party are in jail, SSP and other responsible leaders are also in jail.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA (Bihar): Sir, on a point of order. When popular Governments are functioning in the two States, Bihar and U.P.—I am supported by my friend on this point—especially in Bihar, if something is happening there, what can be done here? The matter should be taken up there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The matter is being taken up there. But the Central Government cannot be indifferent to the developments there. The Central Government, whether we look at it from an economic point of view or from a political point of view, has an important function and a responsibility to discharge. That is what I am pointing out. Unfortunately the Central Government has assumed an ostrich-like policy of sitting on the fence and allowing things to happen as if each State is left to the Chief Minister concerned. We protest against this attitude of the Central Government.

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—*contd.*

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I heard with great respect and attention the speech of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition. It was only expected that it would be an example of opposition for the sake of opposition. It was not unexpected. But what really disappointed me in that speech was . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have all Members of the Opposition gone?

SHRI SHERKHAN (Mysore): No, we are here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, do you not belong to the Opposition?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do, but what about those benches? I do not find anybody there.

SHRI B. K. KAUL (Rajasthan): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you are the entire opposition.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: But those of us who expected that the Leader of the Opposition would spell out an alternative foreign policy would feel deeply disappointed. It was a speech which seemed to have accepted the fundamentals of the Government's foreign policy. Secondly, the criticism was only of petty matters and was full of contradictions. For example, there was a talk of subservience to the Soviet Union, but a few seconds later the Government was accused of by-satellitism. There was an appeal for aid-diplomacy which in other words means that we should try to placate both the super powers in order to obtain aid so that we are no longer dependent on only one bloc; and at the same time by-satellitism was sought to be attacked. From a scholar in English language and literature I found it rather difficult to follow the mixed metaphor of the tri-polar system. What tri-polar system is, I cannot understand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't do.

SHRI A. D. MANI: English is not our language.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: I am in favour of speaking in our own language. I have no difficulty about that, Mr. Mani. But since we speak in that language, we have at least not to mix metaphors. The Government was accused of not taking into account the tri-polar system; yet, at the same time, the argument was made out that the world was being divided into spheres of influence by the two super powers and presumably we must keep ourselves aloof from either of the two spheres of influence.

Perhaps the only way in which the honourable gentleman wants us to keep aloof is to keep aloof from the rest of the world because unfortunately the rest of the world does not look at every problem the way some of the hon. Members sitting in this House look at international issues. This would be a total negative foreign policy. Our purpose is to make friends and influence the thinking of other countries and thereby not only to project our national interests, but also to ensure that we are, broadly speaking, able to carry the sympathies and understanding of a large number of other countries.

The most important charge which the honourable Leader of the Opposition made against the Government was that the foreign policy was being used in pursuance of narrow party interests. Unfortunately, on major issues, the opposition has sought to use the foreign policy issues not

to improve India's international image, but in order to bring down the Government. This is the example set by the opposition itself. I need hardly refer to the issue of the June 1967 war or the Rabat conference. The whole purpose was to bring down the Government rather than advancing the national interests, Sir, actually speaking, my complaint is that the Government is far more sensitive to criticisms from certain honourable gentlemen on the opposition than it need be. Consequently, a carefully worked out foreign policy cannot be implemented because for the implementation of any foreign policy a certain degree of inner consistency is essential. But if in order to satisfy the sensibilities of certain opposition groups, the Government starts making compromises, then the result is that our national image is sullied and the purpose of achieving certain results from our international policy is defeated.

The most important basis of India's foreign policy from the very beginning was that India, having fought against the imperialism and having fought for her own national liberation, stood quite clearly in opposition to imperialism in every part of the world and stood by the people fighting for their freedom and liberation from the yoke of imperialism. Consequently, it also took up a definite stand on issues like racialism or indirect colonialism. This policy, I submit, was the correct policy and I have no doubt it still is the basic policy of the Government. But unfortunately it is not being implemented wholeheartedly because the Government seeks to become too sensitive to certain opposition voices.

Sir, let us take the questions of Vietnam and Cambodia. On the issue of Cambodia and on the issue of Vietnam, even the former Secretary of Defence of the United States has given an unequivocal call for the withdrawal of all American troops—a time-bound schedule. We have also said that which is good. But what we should have done was more to recognise that the struggle for nationalism and for socialism of the people of South-East Asia is not going to be defeated by any power, any super-power or any triangular combination or whatever that may be. We should have seen that in the struggle of the Vietnamese people who are having the same urge which we have honoured in our own country and in all countries of Asia and Africa.

Secondly, our voice should have been on the side of the people of Vietnam. We should have recognised the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam as the authentic voice of the people of North Vietnam at least. I am glad that the Minister of External Affairs resisted the pressures from

certain sections in our country and abroad and welcomed Madame Binh, the Foreign Minister of the Provisional Revolutionary Government. But, I am disappointed that the recognition of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam is being unnecessarily delayed. I am also disappointed that on Cambodia we are not taking as clear-cut a stand as we should have taken. Nobody today, outside a small narrow circle of conservatives, really recognises that the Lon Nol regime represents the will of the whole of Cambodia and everybody knows how the coup in Cambodia was brought about and sustained by the US imperialist troops. And, I need not give any evidence more than the evidence of the intellectuals of the United States itself, the professors and the students of innumerable American universities and colleges who have taken a determined stand on Indo-China.

Sir, in West Asia, it is a matter for gratification that the Government of India have taken a consistently correct stand. The Security Council Resolution of 22nd November 1967 was, in no small measure, passed due to the efforts of India. The principles enunciated therein are all important principles and quite rightly we stand by those principles. But the most important point therein is that there should be, as a first step, a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied by Israel in June 1967. It is also important that the question of the Palestinian people should be equitably solved. We in this country are proud of the fact that Gandhiji had made his position on Palestine absolutely clear from the very beginning.

Many of us would remember the demonstrations and meetings that we organised in defence of the rights of the people of Palestine from 1936 onwards. For us to forget the rights of the people of Palestine would, I think, be most unfortunate. Within the framework of the resolution of the Security Council of November 1967, the Government of India, in my opinion, should do whatever lies in its power to ensure that justice is done to the people of Palestine. I would also like to remind the Government of India of another responsibility. We, the people of India, were the first to liquidate the Portuguese authority from one of its oldest colonies, namely, Goa. Are we forgetting to-day that there are many colonies of Portugal still left, at least there are three major colonies of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau and there is also Macao and unfortunately the People's Government of China does not seem to be interested in liberating. I do hope that the Government of India will take a determined stand to express its solidarity with the struggle by the people of the colonies of Portugal for freedom and for liberation. The Government of India

have been consistently fighting against apartheid in all its forms and they have also opposed the British attitude towards Rhodesia and towards racialism in British itself, but there is a danger that there might be a sliding back on this also. An impression is being deliberately created to create misunderstanding about India in certain foreign quarters and this impression is that now India is no longer interested in championing the cause of the down-trodden people. In the interest of this country the Government should pursue a more vigorous policy in this respect. I would also urge on the Government to take note of the Soviet-German Treaty. Even West Germany has, by implication, recognised the GDR but perhaps our Government is waiting for the day when the Federal Government of Germany would grant diplomatic recognition and then, in accordance with the practice followed by our Foreign Office in the case of Algeria, four days later we will also give diplomatic recognition to the GDR. I hope we do not keep up that tradition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They have applied for clearance to the West. It is on the American desk.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: I was a little surprised that the Leader of the Opposition seemed to be a little worried about the Soviet-German Treaty. The whole world has welcomed it. I am surprised. Does the Leader of the Opposition want that an impression should be created that India does not want world peace?

SHRI N. G. GORAY: I do not think the Professor is correct.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not Israel also?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him express his opinion.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not say that, I withdraw my criticism. But I have got a distinct impression that he said that now that this matter of the West is settled, Russia would put the heat on in the East.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: He was trying to interpret it.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition observed, as far as my recollection goes, that he was unhappy, and the hon. Member, with all his experience of public life much more than mine, must have seen that he was in no way welcoming a treaty which is being welcomed in the whole world as a treaty contributing to peace.

SHRI N.G. GORAY: I will answer you afterwards.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should conclude now please.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: I feel that the Government should not allow India's policy to be put in a strait jacket in which we have permanent enmity on all fronts, especially with two of our major neighbours. Every effort should be made to see that some elasticity is introduced so that we have some manoeuvring and there is no arm-twisting. I would therefore, Sir, conclude by appealing to the Government that it should boldly pursue its policy of working for world peace, for anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism, and consciously working for the economic development of the underdeveloped and the backward countries.

SHRI B. K. KAUL: Also anti-alignment.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: Therefore, for this purpose the most important instrument of these policies would be working firstly through the non-aligned countries by bringing about their solidarity and secondly by working through Afro-Asian countries and adding to them the Latin American countries because, on the issue of economic development, as we know in the case of UNCTAD, it is possible to unite all these developing countries. I therefore earnestly hope that the Government would not be deflected from its well-considered policy that it would modify and adapt its policy in the light of changing circumstances, and that it would steadfastly try to interpret and to take out those urges and support those urges of the common people in different parts of the world for which India had earned a proud place.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : श्रीमन्, लगभग एक वर्ष हो गया, तब से भारत की अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर इस सदन में विचार विमर्श नहीं हुआ। हमारे पिछले मंत्री महोदय इस बात में संतोष करने थे कि जब किसी मित्र ने एक आध प्रश्न पूछ लिया तो उसका उन्होंने भी एकाध उत्तर दे दिया और समझते थे कि उनके कार्य की इतिश्री हो गई। हम समझते हैं कि पिछले समय से अब तक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति में बहुत परिवर्तन हो गया है और उसके अनुसार भारतवर्ष का दृष्टिकोण क्या है और भारतवर्ष का अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति में क्या स्थान है, इसमें भी बहुत बड़ा परिवर्तन हो गया है। हमारे कांग्रेसी मित्र इस सरकार की तारीफ करने में अघाते नहीं हैं...

श्री अर्जुन शरोड़ा : क्या आप बुराई करते-करते थक जाते हैं ?

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : भाई अर्जुन शरोड़ा जी तो जाबों की खानापुरी करते हैं, हम, जो सच्चाई है उसको जनता के सामने रखते हैं। इतना ही हम में और आप में अन्तर है।

अभी हमारे मित्र प्रोफेसर साहब ने कहा कि सरकार की विदेश नीति बड़ी अच्छी है, सरकार को डट कर उससे चिपके रहना चाहिये। दूसरे शब्दों में वह अपनी सरकार को यह सलाह दे रहे थे कि सरकार को प्रजातन्त्रीय बात न मुन कर के डिक्टेटरशिप पर खड़े जाना चाहिये। सम्भवतः उनका मत यह हो सकता है। जैसे एक उदाहरण उन्होंने और दिया कि जो मिडिल ईस्ट की पालिसी है, उसमें सिनाइ के मैदान से हट जाना चाहिये, कब्जा नहीं करना चाहिये। तो मैं अपने योग्य मित्र प्रोफेसर साहब से पूछूं, बड़े विद्वान हैं वह कि कृपा करके यह बताओ, क्या यू० ए० आर० ने भी कोई प्रपोजल कभी पास किया है कि चीन को भी हिन्दुस्तान की भूमि से हट जाना चाहिये ?

आपको उनकी बड़ी फिक्र पड़ गई चाहे हमारी उनको फिक्र पड़ी हो या न पड़ी हो। इसी को कहते हैं दरिया दिली और पिछले वर्षों से जो दरिया दिली हमारी सरकार ने की उसको भी हमने देखा। हमारे बहुत से मित्र नये कांग्रेसी बन गये हैं, दस, बीस वर्षों से कांग्रेसी हो गये हैं, लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि 1947 में जब हमारे देश को स्वतंत्रता मिली थी, तो श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने दिल्ली में एक एशियाई कांग्रेस बुलाई थी। उस सम्मेलन में 60, 80 देश के प्रतिनिधि यहां आये थे और वे हिन्दुस्तान को अपना मुखिया मानने के लिए तैयार थे। उस परिस्थिति को हमने अच्छी तरह से देखा और उसकी थोड़ी बहुत बातें जानने भी हैं। उसके बाद हमारी स्थिति और हमारी इज्जत दबती ही चली गई जब कि सुरक्षा परिषद् में पाकिस्तान के मुकाबले में हमारी दुर्गति हुई। यहां पर जितने तारीफ करने

वाले हैं, वे इस बात को अच्छी तरह से दिल में जानते हैं कि सुरक्षा परिषद् में पाकिस्तान का 8 वोट मिले थे और हिन्दुस्तान को केवल एक वोट मिला था और वह वोट भी एक छोटे से देश मलेशिया ने दिया था। मगर हम यहां पर यह देख रहे हैं कि लागू फिर भी तारीफ करना नहीं छोड़ते हैं, परन्तु हम चारण और भाट की तरह प्रशंसा करने वाले नहीं हैं। पिछले कुछ वर्षों से हमारी हालत और भी खराब हो गई और इसी तरह के आगे गीके आते रहे तो संसार में हिन्दुस्तान को एक ही दोस्त मिलने वाला नहीं है, क्योंकि हमने अपने व्यवहार से गारे दोस्तों को नाराज कर दिया है। हमारी सरकार को छोटे सवार बनने की जयदस्त इच्छा रहती है और सब जानते हैं कि दुनिया की राजनीति में हमारा क्या स्थान है। हम यह बात अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, लेकिन तब भी जिस बात में हमारा दखल न हो, जहां पर हमारी आवश्यकता न हो, वहां पर भी हम अपनी राय अवश्य प्रकट कर देगे और कमजोर होने के कारण जो हमारे दुश्मन हैं, वे तो मित्र नहीं बन पाते, बल्कि जो हमारे मित्र हैं, वे भी दुश्मन बन जाते हैं। आप पड़ौसी देशों का उदाहरण लीजिये और शुरू से आप देख लीजिये। आज हमारे देश को आजाद हुए करीब 23 वर्ष हो गए हैं। इन 23 वर्षों से हमारी सीमाओं का अभी तक माप नहीं हो सका है और सीमा के बाहर हमने दो, चार देशों को अपने हाथ से निकाल दिया।

भारतवर्ष में जब प्रंग्रेज आये थे, तो भारतवर्ष की सत्ता को पक्का करने के लिए एक सहायक प्रथा चलाई थी। हर राज्य को अधिकार था और उसको बाध्य किया जाता था कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के राज्य को मजबूत बनाने के लिए एक स्टैंडिंग आर्मी रखे और उसके साथ ही बाहर के देशों के लोग या रूस वाले हिन्दुस्तान में कभी न आ जायें, इसलिए वहां की सीमाओं की वे सुरक्षा करें। उस समय से लेकर अंग्रेजों का राज्य गया, 1947 तक, और तब तक इन देशों की परराष्ट्र नीति यही थी कि भारत की सीमाओं

को सुरक्षित रखा जाय। उनके लिए उन्होंने एक बार नहीं, दो बार नहीं बल्कि कई बार सीमाओं को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए चढ़ाई भी की। एक बार तो अंग्रेजों ने काबुल पर चढ़ाई की, जिसमें 15,999 सिपाही मारे गये और केवल एक डा० ब्राइटन ही बच पाये। इसके बाद भी हमारी सरकार ने इस बारे में कोई सबक नहीं सीखा।

श्रीमान, हमारी आंखों के सामने तिब्बत का हलाक हो गया और हमारी सरकार बीणा बजाती रह गई, फिर भी आज हमारे कांग्रेस के भाई इस सरकार की तारीफ के पुल बांध रहे हैं। इसके बाद नेपाल में टैक्नीशियनों के नाम पर वहां से हम भगाये जा रहे हैं और वहां भी हमको धक्का दिया गया है। यह हमारी सरकार की दूसरी कामयाबी है।

तीसरी कामयाबी श्रीमान, हमारी सरकार की यह है कि पाकिस्तान के मुकाबले में हम कच्छ से बहादुरी के साथ पीछे लौट आये और उसके बाद पाकिस्तान के साथ जो ताश्कन्द का समझौता हुआ, उसके बारे में दुनिया को मालूम है हमारी अकलमंदी, हमारी ताकत और हमारी शक्ति के बारे में। उसके बाद चीन के साथ जिनकी सीमा हमारे मित्र श्री शर्मा के राज्य से लगी हुई है।

(Interruptions)

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा (बिहार) : आप तो हर जीत को हार ही बतलाया करते हैं।

श्री निरंजन उर्मा : यह तो मस्तिष्क की बात है। हमारी तो आंखें खुली हुई हैं और हम चीजों को साफ देखते हैं, लेकिन हम उन मित्रों से दुःखी हैं जिनकी आंखें खुली रहती हैं, परन्तु जिनका मस्तिष्क बंद रहता है। उनको देख कर हमें बड़ा आनन्द आ रहा है। हमारे भाई शर्मा जी का राज्य सीमा से लगा हुआ है, लेकिन थोड़ा अन्तर पड़ गया है।

चीन भी हमारे देश में आया और हमारी सरकार बहादुरी के साथ भागी तो हमारे मित्र ने, त्यागी जी ने जवाहरलाल नेहरू से कहा था कि

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

अगर मेरे सिर पर बाल नहीं हैं, तो क्या चीन यहां पर भी आकर कब्जा कर लेगा। महाराष्ट्र के शिवाजी बनने को सेकिन्ड शिवाजी आए थे, वे प्रतिज्ञा करके आए, जैसे पेशवा भारतवर्ष का राज्य लेने आए थे, वैसे हम भी लेंगे, लेकिन भगवान की कृपा से उनकी पेशवाई समाप्त हो गई और वे कुछ भी नहीं रहे और चीन को नहीं निकाल सके।

इसके बाद बर्मा की बहादुरी का नमूना आप देखिए—पड़ोसी देशों की बात हम कर रहे हैं—बर्मा में मे जितने हिन्दुस्तानी थे, वे बड़े कायदे के साथ भगा दिए गए। उनके जो रत्न थे, आभूषण थे सोने के, वे एम्बेसी में रखवा लिए गए और बर्मा के साथ हमारी सीमाओं का अब मापांकन शुरू हुआ है, अब जांच हो रही है। अगर एक-आध सीमा के ऊपर विवाद हो गया तो बर्मा भी लड़ने को तैयार है।

वहां से चलने के बाद समुद्र की तरफ लंका आ गया, बहुत छोटा सा देश है, हमारा देश है, अपना देश हम मानते हैं, भाइयों का देश है। लंका के साथ हमारा सीमांकन, हमारी नौकाओं का समुद्र में कितना भाग है, इसके बारे में अभी तक जांच नहीं हुई, यहां तक कि सरकार ने कच्चातिबू नामक एक छोटे टापू के ऊपर अपना अधिकार छोड़ने में बहादुरी समझी और उसके लिए बता दिया कि मेले के समय लंकावासी वहां आ जाते हैं। हम आपकी बहादुरी का अभिनन्दन करने लगे।

हमारे पड़ोसी देशों की गणना हो गई, अब पड़ोसी देश कौन सा रहा? अब थोड़े आगे बढ़ें—मिडिल ईस्ट। मैं इस सरकार को चार्ज करता हूं, इस सरकार पर दोषारोपण करता हूं कि इतनी भयंकर साम्प्रदायिक यह सरकार है कि भारतवर्ष के बाहर संसार में कोई ऐसी सरकार नहीं है। वह हर बात में हिन्दू-मुस्लिम का प्रश्न लेती है, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में हिन्दू-मुस्लिम दृष्टिकोण रखती है। रवात सम्मेलन में हमारी जो दुर्दशा हुई, वह दुनिया को मालूम है। मुगलों के

समय में जब किसी का सम्मान किया जाता था तो उसको मन्सबदार बनाया जाता था, सिरोपाव दिया जाता था, सिरोपाव देने की प्रथा थी यानी पगड़ी देना, अगर हमारी सरकार और उनके साथी समझते हैं कि रवात के सम्मेलन ने उनके हाथों में कंगण पहनाए हैं, तो उनको बहुत बढ़ाई है। वहां से हारने के बाद भी हम सरकार से, भाई स्वर्ण सिंह जी से दो बातें पूछते हैं कि रवात के सम्मेलन में किसी हिन्दू को क्यों नहीं भेजा, मुसलमान को क्यों भेजा?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह गए थे।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : बन्धु सुरेन्द्र पाल सिंह कैबिनेट मंत्री नहीं हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जनाब फखरुद्दीन अली साहब कैसे गए थे? दूसरी बात पूछता हूं कि पिछले साल लंका में कुरान का 1400वां सम्मेलन हुआ था, जनाब फखरुद्दीन अली साहब लंका में कैसे पहुंच गए, स्वर्ण सिंह जी क्यों नहीं गए?

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : आप जानना चाहते हैं?

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : आप अपनी बताइए। जब आप परराष्ट्र मंत्री नहीं रहेंगे, तब हम अपनी बात सोचेंगे। हम आपको थोड़े ही कह रहे हैं, जब तक आप यहां कुर्सी पर बैठे हैं, देश का भार अपने ऊपर रखे हुए है और देश मिटता है तो वह जिम्मेदारी आपकी है, इसलिए हम आपसे कह रहे हैं, नहीं तो कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी। आप यहां से चले जाएंगे तो घर पर खेती करेंगे, हम वकालत करेंगे, लेकिन जब तक इस देश की विदेश नीति की जिम्मेदारी आपके कंधों पर है, तब तक आपको नाराज नहीं होना चाहिए।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : नाराज बिलकुल नहीं हूँ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : अब इजराइल की समस्या देख लीजिये। आप दुनिया के देशों को मान्यता देते हैं, लेकिन इजराइल को मान्यता नहीं दे सकते, क्योंकि हमारे मुसलमान दोस्त नाराज हो जाएंगे। मैं आपसे पूछता हूं कि पिछले मसय

जब हमारा पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध हुआ था, उस समय—ईमानदारी पे आप बताइए—कि इजराइल ने आपको शस्त्रों से सहायता दी थी या नहीं ? जिन समय उसका युद्ध हुआ तब आपने गालियों से सहायता दी । एक मित्र और होता जिसे आपने खो दिया ।

इजिप्ट, मिश्र देश के जहाज सुधरने के लिए बम्बई के बन्दरगाह में आते हैं और चले जाते हैं, यह आपने देखा है या अंधेरे में है ? वे कुछ आपको पैस देते हैं या नहीं ? और आप बताइये कि पाकिस्तान ने जब आपका 70 करोड़ रुपये का माल, लगभग एक अरब रुपये का माल रख लिया था, तो उस वक्त आपके परम् मित्र नासि ने जहाजों को स्वेज नहर से क्यों नहीं आने दिया और क्यों ब्लाकेड कर दिया और हमारा माल वहां फंस गया ? मित्र वह होता है जो समय पर काम आये । तुलसीदास जी ने कहा है : धीरज धर्म मित्र अरु नारी, आपतकाल परखिये चारी ।' लेकिन दुःख की बात तो यह है कि दिल में वह सब समझते हैं, लेकिन कहते नहीं हैं । अरोड़ा साहब समझते हैं । जो हमारा आपत्ति काग में मित्र होता है वही हमारा सच्चा मित्र है और जो हमारे वशव और बड़प्पन में हमारी हां में हां मिलाते हैं वह कभी हमारे मित्र नहीं हो सकते । मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स प्राफ़ अमरीका, ब्रिटेन, फ्रांस और इसके साथ ही रूस से भी हमारा किसी प्रकार का मनोमालिन्य नहीं है । कोसीजिन अपने देश का हित करने में सबसे श्रेष्ठ व्यक्ति हैं, निक्सन साहब अपने देश का हित करने में सबसे श्रेष्ठ व्यक्ति हैं । वे अपने देशों का हित साधन करने के लिए जब कभी कोई आपत्ति आयेगी तो भारतवर्ष का हित साधन करने नहीं आयेगें और हमारे भारतवर्ष के लोग हैं कि जो उनके हित में अपना हित समझ कर चाहे भारतवर्ष का सत्यानाश हो जाय, उन देशों के पीछे चलने वाले, उनके फिजूलगू बन जाते हैं । यह नीति संसार में अच्छी नहीं मानी जायगी । कोरिया की बात हमारे अक्टर साहब ने कही । उत्तरी

कोरिया की तारीफ की और मादाम बिन के लिए कहा कि वे यहां आयी . . .

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : कोरिया का नाम उन्होंने नहीं लिया ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : उनका आशय उसी से था, लेकिन अगर उन्होंने नाम नहीं लिया तो मैं उनका धन्यवाद देता हूँ । उन्होंने एक चीज छोड़ दी जिसके लिए मैं आशा करता था कि वे जरूर कहेंगे । अगर आपके फिजो साहब चीन और अमरीका चले जायें और उनका सम्मान वहां किया जाय तो आपके दिल में क्या बैठेगा ? नागा विद्रोही वहां चले जायें और उनका सम्मान वहां किया जाय, तो आपके दिल में क्या होगा ?

(Interruptions)

उनसे मुझे प्रेरणा मिलती है, उनके पीछे कुछ इतिहास तो है, लेकिन दुःख तो उनसे होता है कि जिनके पीछे कोई इतिहास नहीं है, लेकिन सदन में आकर जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति के पांडित बनते हैं, उनसे सबसे ज्यादा संकट होता है । तो मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि अब हम रूस और अमरीका के बारे में भी थोड़ा सा विचार कर लें । रूस हमारा मित्र है और अमरीका भी हमारा मित्र है । सबसे अच्छी पालिसी हमारे लिये यह है कि हम दोनों की मित्रताई कायम रखें और मित्रताई कायम रखने के लिए संतुलन करें—बैलेन्स आफ पावर, ब्रिट्रेन की पालिसी अच्छी थी, उस समय जब टाम्स वुल्जे नाम के वहां एक प्राइम मिनिस्टर थे । उनकी पालिसी शक्ति संतुलन के सिद्धांत पर निर्भर करती थी । उसको हम देखें और उससे लाभ उठायें । ऐसा आपने नहीं देखा होगा कि कोई राष्ट्र उस पार्टी का साथ दे कि जिसके साथ के कारण अंततोगत्वा उस राष्ट्र का नाश हो जाय । अगर आप शक्तिशाली हैं, तो किसी की सहायता कर सकते हैं और अगर शक्तिशाली नहीं है तो आप महात्मा गांधी से लेकर उनके पहले जगद्गुरु शंकराचार्य और महात्मा बुद्ध और राम के सारे उपदेश उनको सुनाइये, लेकिन कोई उनको सुनने वाला नहीं है । आपकी बातें सुनने के लिए कोई तैयार नहीं होगा ।

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

आप देखें कि पिछले दिनों जब चीन के साथ आपका युद्ध हुआ था तो रूस ने क्या कहा था। उसकी बात आप भूल गये? रूस वालों ने कहा था कि इस लड़ाई में दुःख की बात यह है कि एक हमारा मित्र है और दूसरी तरफ हमारा भाई है...

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : 'चाइनीज ऐक्शन इज ए स्टुपिड ऐक्शन' यह उन्होंने कहा था।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति का तकाजा यह है कि संसार में हमारे मित्र रहें। अभागी राजनीति वह होती है कि जिसमें देश के कोई मित्र नहीं होते और भाग्यवान वह राष्ट्र होता है, जिसके बहुत से मित्र होते हैं। इस समय हम संसार में अकेले खड़े हैं। हमारे पास अच्छे अस्त्र-शस्त्र नहीं हैं, हमारा कोई मित्र नहीं है और जैसा कहा जाता है उसके अनुसार कल अगर पाकिस्तान या चीन हमसे युद्ध छेड़ दे तो हमें अपनी रक्षा के लिए बड़े राष्ट्रों की शरण में जाना पड़ेगा। और अब तो जनाब आपने अमेरिका को इतना नाराज कर लिया है कि जो उसने बड़े-बड़े जहाजों में सहायता की सामग्री भेजी थी, किसी भी प्रकार से भेजी थी, वह भी शायद आपको सहायता न करे। और रूस हमारा मित्र है, सहृदयता और सत्यता उसके हृदय में कितनी हो, लेकिन चीन के खिलाफ लड़ने में एक बार हिचकेगा और आपकी सहायता में नहीं आयेगा। कभी-कभी ये हमारे कच्चे मित्र यह समझ लेते हैं कि चीन और रूस की सीमा पर जो झड़पें हो गईं, इसलिए चीन से रूस नाराज हो गया और चीन की हिन्दुस्तान से झड़प हुई तो रूस चीन से सब मित्रता तोड़ कर के उसके मुकाबिले में भारत से मित्रता करेगा, भारत की सहायता करेगा, हम उन मित्रों को भी चेतावनी देते हैं कि यह भी सम्भव नहीं होगा। हमको अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति पर विचार करते हुये बिलकुल देखना चाहिये कि हम कितने गहरे पानी में हैं और हमारा कौन-कौन मित्र है और कौन-कौन दुश्मन है। हमारे देश में एक सबसे बड़ा, अच्छा राजनीति का पण्डित हुआ है, श्रीमान, जिसे

चाणक्य कहते हैं। चाणक्य का एक वाक्य था और चाणक्य के उस वाक्य में यह था कि जो शत्रु का शत्रु होता है वह ही अपना मित्र होता है। इस अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति के वाक्य को भी हमने छोड़ दिया। अगर हमारा शत्रु है और उसके शत्रु है तो उससे हमको मित्रता करनी चाहिये थी। हमने अपनी आंखों के सामने देखा मिडिल ईस्ट की पालिसी में, पाकिस्तान को 47 नम्बर के टैंक देने में, पाकिस्तान को हवाई जहाज देने में कि ईरान, टर्की, बिलन सबने साथ दिया...

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : बर्लिन नहीं, बान ने।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : वैस्ट जर्मनी।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : बर्लिन ईस्ट जर्मनी में है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : बर्लिन आधा ईस्ट जर्मनी में और आधा उसमें है।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : नहीं, नहीं, बलिकुल नहीं। वैस्ट जर्मनी में बर्लिन बलिकुल नहीं है। बर्लिन थोड़ा एक सिटी स्टेट है और थोड़ा एक ईस्ट जर्मनी में है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मैं पूर्वी जर्मनी की बात नहीं कह रहा था, पूर्वी जर्मनी का अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति में अभी इतना कोई स्थान नहीं है, ऐसा अभी हमारे मित्र ने कहा। तो, श्रीमान, जब वह आर्मस् दे सकते हैं तो उनसे हमारी सहानुभूति क्यों होनी चाहिये। हमारी सहानुभूति तो उस पर होनी चाहिये जो हमारे साथ सद्व्यवहार करे। जो हमारे साथ सद्व्यवहार करे उसके साथ हम सद्व्यवहार करें और जो हमारे साथ बुरा व्यवहार करे उसके लिये उसी प्रकार से करें, शठे शाठ्यम् समाचरेत, जो शठ है उसके साथ उसी प्रकार का बर्ताव करें, मगर हमारी राजनीति वर्तमान में यह हो गई है कि हम अंधानुकरण कर रहे हैं, नानएला-इनमेंट का नाम लेते हैं, हम गांधी जी का नाम लेते हैं, लेकिन कार्य करते हैं यह कि थोड़े से दस-पांच हमारे व्यक्ति हैं, जिनका रूस की तरफ दिल

और दिमाग है और वह हमारे हाउस पर छाये हुये हैं और हमारी सरकार की पालिसी का निर्धारण करते हैं। अगर कोई बात रूस वाले ने कह दी तो इस सदन में और सरकार में रूस के सिवाय और कोई कुछ है नहीं, ऐसा वह समझते हैं। हम रूस के प्रति कृज हैं, उनके प्रति हमारी धारणा अच्छी है, क्योंकि उन्होंने एक समय शस्त्रास्त्र दिया था।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : अब भी दिया है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : अब तो शस्त्रास्त्र नहीं दे रहे हैं, बन्द कर दिया है। "303" की बन्दूक दे दें तो उनको शस्त्रास्त्र ही मानता, हम उन शस्त्रों को शस्त्रास्त्र मानते हैं जैसे कि एन्टी-वैलस्टिक मिसाइल या जो अणु बम्ब चीन बना रहा है, हमारे पास भी कोई डार तरह की चीज रख दे।

तो, श्रीमन्, हमारा मित्र अमेरिका भी नहीं है और रूस भी हमारा मित्र नहीं है। हमारा कोई मित्र नहीं है। हमारा मित्र, श्रीमन्, वह होगा जो कि हमारे गाढ़े में, संकट में, हमारे काम आ सके। उस समय यदि वह मित्र नहीं तो किसी प्रकार से वह हमारा मित्र नहीं है। श्रीमन्, इसी तरह से ताइवान के मामले में आप देखें। ताइवान, फारमोसा वह राष्ट्र है, जिसके चांगकाई शेक ने भारतवर्ष को 19. 2 ई० में स्वतंत्रता दिलाने के लिये यत्न किया और आज ताइवान की सरकार वह सरकार है, जिसने कि इस समय भी हमारे लिये ताइचुंग किस्म का धान भेजा और सहायता के लिये बराबर तैयार रहता है...

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : वह धान फिलीपींस से आया है, मनीला से आया है। फिलीपींस से आया था, ताइवान से नहीं आया था।

श्री उपसभापति : वर्मा जी, आपको समाप्त करना है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : श्रीमन्, मैं जल्दी ही समाप्त करता हूँ। श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा से कहना चाहूंगा कि ताइचुंग किस्म का जो धान है, वह मनीला से नहीं बल्कि वहां से भी आया।

और इसी तरह से दूसरे जो छोटे-छोटे देश हैं उन्होंने भी हमें चावल आदि की सहायता दी। तो क्या यह उचित होगा कि जो हमारी सहायता करते हैं, हमारे मित्र हैं, हम उनको भूखे भेड़ियों के भरोसे छोड़ दें। उनकी कोई सहायता न करें, यह बेचारी सरकार, इस सरकार को क्या दया का पात्र समझते हैं। इस सरकार का दुनिया में कोई दोस्त नहीं है, इस सरकार को अपनी कुर्सी बचाने के लिये दुनिया में भाट और चारण के किस्से कहने पड़ते हैं, तारीफें करनी पड़ती हैं, कोई आदमी बाहर से आ गया तो उसको छाता लगाने के लिये तैयार हो जाते हैं, लेकिन वस्तु स्थिति में इस सरकार का संसार में कोई मित्र नहीं है...

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : सिवाय आपके।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मैं मित्र नहीं हूँ, आप गलत समझते हैं, हमने यह प्रतिज्ञा की है...

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : जब आप ही मित्र नहीं है तो दूसरे कैसे होंगे।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : जरा हमें सुनिये। अर्जुनस्य प्रतिज्ञे द्वै न दैन्यं न पलायनम्। हमारी प्रतिज्ञा है कि न हम आपकी तरह दीनता से कोरा लेकर भिक्षा मांगेंगे, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में ऋण की भिक्षा मांगेंगे और भारतवर्ष में बहादुरी का बखान करेंगे, न हम उन आदमियों में से हैं, जो मैदान से भाग जाएं। आप में से कइयों को देखा है मैदान से भागते हुए। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में भी हम अपने मित्रों से यह निवेदन करते हैं कि हम आपके प्रति सदाशयता रखते हैं। कुछ मित्रों को विद्वान भी मानते हैं, लेकिन आप कभी-कभी गलती कर जावें उसको कह तो दिया करें, ऐसा मत मानें जो कह रहे हैं वही सही है।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (मध्य प्रदेश) : आप भी तो जो अच्छे काम करें वह सराह दिया करें।

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I shall be very brief but very clear in my remarks regarding the foreign policy of this Government. I have not come here to applaud or decry *in toto* the foreign policy of this Government, I am here to analyse it in the light of the existing circumstances in the international fields. We can have attacks and counter-attacks in international policies. But we must be one with the policy of our Government in international efforts. So I want to pass my remarks having this in view in my mind, Sir. Within the time at my command I cannot quote instance after instance for the views that I am going to express now. I want to advance the general principles to be followed by this Government in its future conduct in the field of international relationship and connected problems. Diplomacy which is the corner-stone of foreign policy is not foreign to us. From the days of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, we are having instances of the success of our diplomacy in the policy of our country. Diplomacy is conduct of relations between one group of human beings and another. It is older than the concept of Government itself. Sir, the edifice of our foreign policy rests on the pillars of preference for peaceful means for the settlement of international problems, opposition to colonialism and racial discrimination, non-alignment with military blocs and co-operation with the international organisation for peace and security as well as the well-being of the people. For this edifice, we must have a foundation that must be this. Our Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Mr. Mishra, stated that we are subservient to one of the power blocs, the USSR.

Sir, we must take the vow that we must not be subservient to anybody in this world. We say in our language:

INDIAN EVARUKKUM THAZHAN
INDIAN EVARAYUM THAZTHAN

It means the Indian will not be subservient to any force, to anybody in this world, and at the same time he will not allow anybody to be subservient to him also. That should be the foundation for the edifice of our Foreign policy.

In our part there is another saying, Sir:

YADUM OORAY, YAVARUM KEYLEER
which means all the countries are ours and all the nations are our friends. That does not mean that we will be slaves to anybody. At the same time we do not want any people to be slaves to us. That should be the foundation for our Foreign policy. On that foundation all the pillars should be raised and the edifice should be constructed.

Non-alignment is one of the pillars of our Foreign policy. That does not mean it is in

isolation from everything. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has once stated:

"Where freedom is in peril or justice is threatened, or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral."

So it has its own limitation. Non-alignment does not mean that we will be away when injustice is being done, or we will be away when aggression takes place. We will fight against colonialism. We will fight for the rights of all people, but we will follow the policy of non-alignment.

Through the independent non-alignment policy we must seek the preservation of our territorial integrity and security in the world so that with international co-operation an egalitarian society could be created in India and the rest of the world.

Kautilya's first noteworthy aphorism is:

"What produces unfavourable results is a bad policy, that is, a policy to be judged by the results it produces."

So I would like to remind this Government to put its foreign policy in the melting pot every time and test whether it produces good results.

I would also bring to the notice of the Government the following remarks in Indian and Foreign Review and request this Government to follow the general principles in its future conduct. I shall read out the relevant portion and conclude my speech.

From a study of ancient works on diplomacy written by Kautilya, Panini, the Kural (A Tamil classic of the 2nd century) and other literature on the subject, the following generalisations emerge:

"Nothing is gained in diplomacy without paying a price for it and the best diplomat is he who pays only the minimum price. To drive too hard a bargain or to pay too low a price may defeat the end object. It should be the essence of diplomacy to keep both parties satisfied as far as possible.

Too dazzling a success often contains in it seeds of eventual failure. A moderate amount of success should be the aim of a good diplomat.

It is well to remember that in state relations, things are often not what they seem to be. Thus, an apparently solid alliance may conceal deep fissures of rivalry.

Masterly inactivity is not a barren policy in international relations. Excessive activity at a wrong time or in a wrong place may prove disastrous. An Ambassador should sometimes not go out to meet

events, and there are advantages in allowing events to come to him. Very often to temporise is not to lose time but to gain it.

When dealing with unfriendly powers the face of a diplomat should be inscrutable and the language conciliatory but clear. An impassive and well-chiselled language employing all forms of courtesy should be cultivated.

In diplomacy one must never forget that after you have gained your point, a chance is always left open for your adversary to feel that his honour has been saved. The best diplomatic success is where both parties can claim to have gained something."

3 P. M.

I would request this Government to follow these principles which have emerged from the Analysis.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): That is from his Ministry; it is a publication by his Ministry.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN: Yes, definitely. But that does not mean that all they are saying to be opposed by us.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: What is it called?

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN: It is "Indian and Foreign Review". With these words, I conclude, Sir.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, this debate in the House is being held after a long time. It is being held at a very significant moment in international relations. Early this month at Moscow, a great treaty was signed between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union. That treaty is expected, and has already done so to some extent, to relieve tensions in Europe. As we know, the last two World Wars started in Europe. And continuation of tensions in Europe is always a threat to world peace. The second most important thing at the moment is the summit conference of non-aligned countries which is going to take place at Lusaka early next month and which our Foreign Minister and our Prime Minister will attend.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Why both?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: They will both contribute.

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh): To put weight.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: That shows India's great interest in non-alignment and in the success of the conference. Sir, judging from these two important events, the

two speeches made from the Opposition, those of Mr. S. N. Mishra and Mr. Niranjana Varma, were, to say the least, most disappointing.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (राजस्थान) :
प्राप इजराइल की बात नहीं कहेंगे :

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: मैं कहूंगा इजराइल की बात भी, आप धक्काड़िए मत, थोड़ा धैर्य रखिए ।

I was particularly, disappointed by the speech made by my friend and former class-fellow, Mr. Niranjana Varma. We were together at a Kanpur College studying History. He completed his M.A. and I was sent to jail before the examinations. So, I expected greater knowledge from him. His speech reminded me of a harsh one from Tulsidas, which says:

"मूरख हृदय न चेत जो गुरु मिले विरचि सम"

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : फिर भी आपको चेत नहीं हुआ ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Niranjana Varma and Mr. S.N. Mishra are very angry with the Soviet Union because...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I did not say that.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am coming to that. They are very angry with the Soviet Union because of a map which has been published by the *Times of India* in this country. On that account, Mr. Mishra is angry. Mr. Mishra, of course, recognises the great assistance that the Soviet Union has given to our economy and to our defence effort.

Mr. Niranjana Varma does not recognise even that. Mr. Niranjana Varma sang praises of Taiwan. It is very interesting that in one speech he condemns the Soviet Union for the map and in the same speech he praises Taiwan. Taiwan maps are worse than the Soviet maps. Taiwan never recognised the McMahon Line. Formosa never recognised our frontiers in the north-west with China. So if the Soviet map is a crime, a greater crime has repeatedly been committed by Taiwan and by Komintang. But Mr. Niranjana Varma, like a good Hindu that he is, wants us to break our friendship with the Soviet Union and have Taiwan as our friend. And then he says—he is a great scholar of world affairs and history...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vajpayee was sent there to Indianise Chiangkai Shek.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The Soviet map has figured so much in the current session of Parliament that a historian may be tempted to call the current session of Parliament the Soviet map session. Somehow our friends are more interested in the Soviet Union than, say, in the United Nations. I have with me a map of this part of the world published by the United Nations. I am sure my friends, Mr. Niranjan Varma and Prof. Mishra, has also seen it . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Now he is not a professor.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: All right, former Prof. Mishra. Now he is the Leader of the Opposition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. Once a professor, always a professor even though he preaches bad things.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Once a barrister, always a barrister though briefless.

Sir, the map of this part of the world published by the United Nations shows Jammu and Kashmir as completely separate from India . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA, REDDY: That should also be protested against to the United Nations.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I have got a copy of that map here. I will present this copy to Mr. Mishra . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Let it be laid on the Table of the House so that we can all see it.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora, you continue your speech.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, what about these interruptions? I must meet all interruptions . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, you need not answer the interruptions. You continue your speech.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Forty years ago I left my school. In the school debating society there were no interruptions.

Then there is a Readers' Digest map called the Great World Atlas. It is in the library of this Parliament as a reference book and it is not issued, but anybody can walk into the airconditioned library and have a look at it. That also does not show Jammu and Kashmir as an Indian territory.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD ANHA (Bihar): It was proposed by whom?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You know the Readers' Digest is a great American publication.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: यह किसकी कमजोरी है ?

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा: आपकी और हमारी, दोनों की ।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: सरदार जी से कहिये, ठीक करायें ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा: आप उसके लिए आवाज क्यों नहीं उठाते ?

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: हम आपके साथ हैं इस मामले में ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Then, Sir, there is an Atlas very much in circulation called the Philip's Atlas. That also does not show Jammu and Kashmir as Indian territory. My information is that the recent maps published by the State Department of United States—the State Department in the United States is like the foreign office plus C. I. A. plus a little more—show the cease-fire line in Jammu and Kashmir as the border between India and Pakistan . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that also in the Parliament Library?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Yes. You go and spend some time there. You are spending too much time in the restaurant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That too at the cost of others.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It is very interesting that those who cry a great deal about the Soviet map do not speak a word about these maps. I think they will concede that Jammu and Kashmir is as much a part of Indian territory as the area south of the McMahon line or the Aksai Chin area.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: One wrong does not justify another wrong.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am pointing out the mistakes committed by Shri Mishra in speaking the half truth. He must speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but truth.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you call it ignorance?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I cannot call him ignorant. That will be contempt of the Leader of the Opposition.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I agree with you heartily. Would you agree with me also?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please continue your speech.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: As far as the Soviet maps are concerned, Government has protested to the Soviet Union in writing four or five times and in addition to these written protests, many verbal protests have been made. I want to know from Sardar Swaran Singh whether any protests have been made to State Department of the United States for the heinous crime of publishing this wrong map and whether we have asked our Ambassador to the United Nations to launch a protest with the United Nations about the map which I have just shown and which shows Jammu and Kashmir as independent of India and whether we will consider imposing a ban on the Readers Digest which has now become a propaganda sheet. In the cold war there have been many casualties. Once upon a time Readers Digest and Foreign Quarterly used to be impartial and scholarly journals. But in the cold war, they have become propaganda sheets. The Readers Digest which published a wrong map of India in the Great World Atlas is not only allowed to be imported into this country, but it has got certain concessions about collecting advertisements from India and repatriating the money...

AN HON. MEMBER: They have got a big office in Bombay.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I do not know. You might have visited that office. You know whether it is big or small. But I think it is a nasty place...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: May I inform you of another thing?

SHRI A.D. MANI: On a point of order. He cannot supplement when another hon. Member is speaking.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I once asked about a British map about India. It was then said that it would be laid on the Table of the House. Six years have gone by and still it is not laid on the Table of the House...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please sit down. Let him continue his speech.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: While I want the Government to ban the Readers Digest, to protest to the United Nations and to strongly protest to the United States, I do not want the Government to break diplomatic relations with the United States merely because they have published a wrong map.

Similarly, I do not want the Government to endanger the friendly relations with the Soviet Union and endanger the extensive

co-operation existing between the two countries. The Government should launch a protest. It should be careful and not be swept away as a result of the Opposition demands and criticisms so eloquently voiced by Prof. S. N. Mishra.

AN HON. MEMBER: Professor S. N. Mishra?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Yes, Prof. S.N. Mishra, because Bhupesh Gupta wants that I should call him so.

Now, Sir, we must realise that no country in the world can live in isolation; not even the great powers can live in isolation. Similarly, Sir, we must realise that we must have friends and the Soviet Union is a dependable friend.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Yes, Sir. But half of my time was taken by others. You please give me five more minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You encourage interruptions. That is the whole trouble. Please conclude now.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I will take five more minutes now.

Sir, China invariably figures, as it must, in all considerations of world affairs by us. I personally feel that the time has come when we should take the initiative in breaking the Sino-Indian deadlock and the Government must consider the advisability of sending an Ambassador to Peking so that Peking may also send an Ambassador to Delhi. I say so, because...

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal): What about you?...

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am not available for sale, Mrs. Mukhopadhyay.

I am not an applicant for any job. I can recommend other people.

I say that we must send an Ambassador first because, as even a conservative paper like the "Times of India" has recently pointed out, we were the first to withdraw the Ambassador. We must break the deadlock and we must at least take the initiative in breaking the deadlock and if the deadlock is broken, we have quite a lot to gain and nothing to lose; we have already lost much.

Then, Sir, there is some objection to the Soviet interest in breaking the deadlock between India and Pakistan. Sir, India and Pakistan are the closest neighbours. When

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

the partition took place, many families were divided, hundreds, thousands, may be tens of thousands, of families were divided. Cordial Indo-Pak. relations should be, for any peace-loving Indian or any person with a human approach, a very desirable objective. If the Soviet Union has some influence or some friendly ties with Pakistan and it utilises, it for improving the Indo-Pak relations, why should we object to it? We should thank them, thank the Soviet Union, for their effort.

Similarly, there had been a very good development in the beginning of this month. Our Foreign Minister chose the forum of the Rajya Sabha to announce the Government decision to accord consular relations between the GDR and India. That is a welcome development. While I congratulate the Minister for that declaration, I feel that he has been hesitant and half-hearted. As almost all sections of the House have pointed out, full diplomatic relations must be established between the GDR and India. Now, as we know, a number of talks have been held between the leaders of the GDR and the FDR. Why should we wait for the two Germanies to recognise each other before we have relations at ambassadorial level with the GDR? The Minister must make up his mind quickly and before this session is over, make a fresh announcement. We should not wait and watch to see what others do. As Jawaharlal Nehru repeatedly pointed out, independent decision is the essence of non-alignment. In this matter of the GDR also, we must take an independent decision. I thank you very much.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Let me begin my speech with a small story which I am sure will interest the House. A man was found beating his dog incessantly, much to the annoyance and irritation of his neighbours. They all complained to the Police. Finally the man was taken to the station for interrogation. Nothing could be elicited from him and he was sent to a doctor. From there he was finally taken to a psychiatrist. He analysed him and gave out a verdict saying: 'The fellow suffers from suppressed desire. He was asked to explain in the common man's language. He said that the man has a complaint in his house that his wife is beating him which he cannot return back. So instead of beating his wife, he is beating the dog. Now, when specific instances are given, complaints are lodged as to how Soviet Russia is indulging in cartographic aggression, my good friend Mr. Arora is coming out with an excuse that America has done this, the Readers' Digest has done it. I am afraid like that husband, Mr. Arora is not in a position to counteract the argument posed by this side. The point is this. He has tried to mislead the House. He said that in the UN map

Kashmir and Jammu have not been shown as Indian territory. The UN is like a court, We have taken the case to the UN. Pakistan is a party and we are another party. So long as the case is before the court, how can the UN come out with a statement that this territory...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: They are not a court.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: It comes under, 'List of territories presently under dispute'.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The fact remains that Jammu and Kashmir has not been shown as Indian territory.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: It is a territory in dispute. Both the parties have gone there. So long as the case is before the court, any statement given will be considered *sub-judice*. Another thing he said was that the Readers' Digest has produced a map. The Readers' Digest is a private concern. It is not a Government concern, but the map—about which we have been talking—in Soviet Russia was prepared under the orders of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia and the Government there, and this is what has been brought out by them, and our Foreign Minister has accepted it as a fact and on the basis of that only the Government has been lodging protests with the Soviet Government. So, Sir, this is a clearcut case, and I want to tell the House that this is not an isolated incident. This has been going on for the last fifteen years. My hon. friend, Mr. Mishra, this morning pointed it out, and that famous political commentator, Mr. A. G. Noorani, has also written in the 'Indian Express' that this has been going on for the last fifteen years. Not only Soviet Russia, but all the satellite countries in the Soviet orbit are also publishing periodically this wrong map showing all the places belonging to India as belonging to China. Secondly, Sir, I want to know from the hon. Minister what is the object of the foreign policy which this Government has been pursuing for so many years. This non-alignment, has it brought out any good to the people? Any policy enunciated by a Government should be helpful and beneficial and should bring credit to the country. But I am afraid that up to now it has not brought any credit to the country. On the other hand, it has brought discredit to our country. Our Indians are suffering a great deal wherever they are outside India.

Take, for example, the case of Ceylon. Our people are driven away in thousands. They all come to Madras and they are begging for alms, which I see, and the pittance that we are giving them, one rupee or eight annas, does not enable them to make both ends meet. Of course many of the families

have given shelter. And what about our people in Burma? They have been completely driven away. No compensation is paid to them. Very recently, Sir, a case was brought to my notice that an ex-employee of Burma Government has yet to collect his provident fund from that Government, a provident fund to the tune of 40 to 50 thousand rupees. And he could not collect it. So many letters he had written, but not even an acknowledgment has come from Burma. To send a man from here to collect the money is not an ordinary thing. He has to get the *visa* from the Military Government of Burma. So the man is in a very pitiable condition in Madras. He brought his case to me. I said, "I cannot help you, nor can this Government help you." So this is the position of our India is who went to Burma. Take the case, Uganda. Also very recently it was said by our Finance Minister that the properties of our Indians, who are there, are being improperly confiscated without any compensation. Now, Sir, my friend, Dr. Antani, who, all know, is in close contact with the African countries, he has given me a piece of news, which is rather shocking. And the shocking news is that our people in Zanzibar and Tanzania are forced to have inter-racial marriages much against their will or wish, and if they don't do that, they are to be flogged in public. But the Zanzibar President has asked the Government to be restrained in this matter and not to go to the extent of flogging in public. This news, Sir, has come to the notice of my friend, Dr. Antani. I asked him whether I can quote him and whether this news is real. He said, "By all means you may quote me. I got the news from authentic sources." So this is the position of our people, Sir. And I was really surprised to hear Prof. Nurul Hasan when he spoke about Madame Binh and North Vietnam. I do not know wherefrom he got the information that we stand to benefit by recognising North Vietnam. Sir, there is not even a single Indian living in North Vietnam. On the other hand, we have about three to four thousand Indians living in South Vietnam, and these people are owning 16% of the total property in Saigon, owning landed property and other immovable property in Saigon. And they are engaged in trade. They are living in a peaceful manner and they are given equal rights with all other sections of the people, whereas in Hanoi there is, day in and day out, a regular campaign maligning India, India's foreign policy and Indian leaders. Hanoi has proved to be a confirmed stooge in the hands of China. Now, Sir, when you are at war with China, how can you recognise, how can you invite, and how can you give diplomatic recognition to a country which is supposed to be at war? This logic, I cannot understand. This logic I cannot understand. When Dr. Hassan was nominated I was very happy that we are acquiring

a knowledgeable man here. He was a nominated Member but when he joined the Congress (R), I came to the conclusion that he is not only knowledgeable in arts and science but in politics also. Sir, his support to the Government over Madame Binh's visit is really surprising. Who is this lady? What are her credentials? And what has she brought about? She has brought misery to our people who are living in Saigon, as a result of her visit to this country, our people are suffering a great deal in Saigon. For the information of the House I may tell you, Sir, that out of the 3 to 4 thousand people living there, 3,000 odd people are from Madras; they are from Tanjore District and other places. I met a number of them in Madras and they told me in horrid details how they are persecuted there because of this lady's visit there. That is what we have gained. Her husband is Hanoi's ambassador in Soviet Russia, if not ambassador he is some Charge-d'affaires or some job he is holding in Russia and I am quite sure that we have extended this invitation to Madame Binh at the instance of Soviet Russia. It was not a spontaneous invitation from here; we have invited her at the instance of Soviet Russia.

My second point is this. Mr. Arjun Arora—I am sorry I have again to refer to him—said that the time has come for us to come to an understanding with China. His was not an isolated speech made by a single Member. This is the thinking of the ruling party now. For some time past they are soft-peddalling on our problem with China. Inspired stories are put across in the papers. A few weeks ago we heard that Mao shook hands with our Charge-d'affaires in Peking on May Day and the news was given out in such a manner as if our Charge-d'affaires was the only person with whom Mao shook hands and made kind enquiries about our President, Prime Minister and so on and so forth. But we have got information that our Charge-d'affaires was not the only person Mao shook hands with; he shook hands with all and sundry there. This was an inspired piece of news given to the people of India. Now two days ago another news came out that Peking Radio has stopped abusing India. They make out as if it has come as a great boon that China has stopped abusing us, whereas...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Why are you putting those earphones on? Are you hearing your own voice?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: So that I can hear your interruptions.

Now, Sir, as I said, they are soft-peddalling with China. So far as the Indian Government is concerned, they have washed their

[Shri S. S. Mariswamy.]

hands off the territory that China has taken away. 18,000 sq. miles they have occupied. Kerala's area is 15,000 sq. miles; we have given away land more than Kerala State in area. As far as this Government is concerned it is not in their memory at all that such a vast territory of ours has gone into the hands of China. No attempt is made; no mention is made and no effort is made to recover that territory. Could you imagine that any other independent country would behave in such a callous manner as we are behaving? Could there be any other national priority than the recovery of our territory? Did our Government come out with a clear-cut statement that they will strain their every nerve to see that our territories are taken back from China? They have forgotten about it and they want the people also to forget about it. And that I am sure will not happen; they will not have a helpful response from the people to forget about this. So far as the people of this country are concerned, so far as the democratic parties in the country are concerned, they will see that these territories are recovered from the aggressor, that is, China. Whether the Government acts or not we will see that with that slogan we go to the polls and see that the ruling party is routed in the coming elections in 1972. I would appeal to our sister parties to make this as the only slogan, that is, that we recover and get back the territories which this Government has lost to China. The present move of the Government is a dangerous one and I warn our people as well as the other parties to be aware and to see that they do not succumb to this move.

Thirdly, my friend, Mr. Mishra, this morning told you that the Russian correspondents are using cars with CD numbers. A question was put in the House to which a non-committal reply was given that they are not aware of it. I do not know whether subsequently they made any enquiries about it but here I have the names of those Russian correspondents who use these Russian CD cars. For the benefit of the House I shall read out the names.

Let them check it up and if I am wrong let them correct me. Otherwise, they must correct themselves. Details of Soviet correspondents using CD plates are—

1. Boris A. Kalyagin, Moscow Radio and TV (CD 644).
2. Arkadiy A. Maslennikov, Pravda (CD 812).
3. Alexander A. Obukhov and Vladlen A. Baikow, Tax: (CD 1016).
4. Vladimir A. Simonov, Novosti (CD 3410).
5. Gennadiy N. Tapeshev, Intourist (CD 3780).

6. V. N. Matyash, Tass (CD 1084).

These are all the six gentlemen representing the various news agencies of Russia and also Radio Peace and Progress. These people use CD plates on their cars. The numbers and the names I have given. I want the Government . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You have been saying that they are a part of the Government.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I said it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You object to Radio Peace and Progress. If they are independent journalists, they are as free as the BBC. If they are not, well then they are entitled to use the CD plates. You contradict yourself.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Have you ever seen, Mr. Arora, a BBC correspondent or a Columbia Broadcasting Corporation correspondent or for that matter any other country's correspondent using these CD plates? Have you even seen it? If so, kindly enlighten me. When we made complaints about Radio Peace and Progress the Government said that it is an independent news agency . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You are contradicting yourself.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: If it were true, how could they use the CD car?

Another point which Sardar Swaran Singhji does not know is how much we feel about the matter. In one broadcast made by Radio Peace and Progress, reference was made to our leader Mr. N. G. Ranga. One and a half years ago when the DMK came to power in Madras, there was a series of fires in a number of slum areas in Madras. At that time Moscow Radio, Peace and Progress Radio gave out a very strange story saying that Mr. Ranga with heartburning, because the DMK had come to power, went to Madras with a lot of American money and contacted Rajaji—of all persons Rajaji—and Rajaji and Rangaji conspired together and started these fires in Madras. Could you imagine a more fantastic story? This Government does not know how much we feel about it. They have insulted not only Mr. Ranga, but also Rajaji, saying that they had conspired together, they had set hooligans and had started those fires. No other country would tolerate this sort of calumny against our leaders.

Now, Sir, I come to the BBC question. I would not have mentioned it, but thanks to my friend, Mr. Arora, he has reminded me of it. The BBC correspondent had taken some TV shots about India which are derogatory to our country and which have to be condemned. I agree. I join hands with Mr. Arora to condemn it, but to write a letter to the British Government and also to the

BBC especially and ask them to openly apologise or withdraw the films or otherwise they would completely close down their office in India is not a correct diplomatic move.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMI: A mature Government should show restraint. They should not act like a schoolboy. That is a very wrong move especially towards a country... (Interruption). So far as our country's honour is concerned, I am second to none in defending it. Whether it is Moscow or London or Washington, I would not lag behind anybody in condemning any country whenever they interfere in our internal affairs. This morning Mr. Mishra quoted the speech of Mr. Keating and condemned him and I welcomed it, I was very happy. Why should I support London or Washington? When I condemn Moscow, I condemn in the same breath Washington and London if they cross the limit and do something which is derogatory to India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please conclude now?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: I have taken twelve minutes. I have not exhausted my time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sixteen minutes you have taken.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Just two minutes more. Very recently in the Saurashtra area two aeroplanes had come and dropped leaflets. There was direction in the leaflets inciting our people against our Government and also directions to the Naxalites. These pamphlets have come in lakhs and have been distributed in Ahmedabad and other areas, and from there they have gone to Calcutta also.

There is another important matter. Very recently a ship had come and unloaded in Calcutta weapons. I do not know what they were. But Government has denied it. I have reliable information that it was a fact that they had come there and distributed them. The Government had come to know about the arrival of the ship only after its departure, not at the time when the ship was there. This is a very reliable news, and I want the Government to probe into the matter. At the rate at which things are happening I am really afraid how long we would remain as an independent country. The days it seems are to be counted seeing the way in which things are happening. This is a very serious matter and I want the Government to probe into the matter and find out what are the arms that have come, wherefrom they have come, to whom they have gone. These are facts the Government should furnish the House with.

With these words, I conclude.

श्री गोडे मुराहरि (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उप-सभापति महोदय, मैं सरकार की विदेश नीति पर जब बोलना चाहता था बहुत कुछ देर के लिये एक शंका होने लगी कि क्या बोलू, क्योंकि मुझे ऐसा लगा सरकार की कोई नीति ही नहीं है, कोई विदेश नीति नहीं है, रोज़मर्रा हैन्ड टु माऊथ पालिसी होती है . . .

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.]

. . . इस तरह की पालिसी चलती है तो उसमें बोलना भी बड़ा मुश्किल हो जाता है। पण्डित जी के ज़माने में उनकी एक नीति चलती थी, वह कहने थे नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी है हमारी। वह सचमुच नान-एलाइन्ड थे या नहीं, उस पर तो हम लोग बोल चुके हैं और उसको फिर दोहराने से कोई फायदा नहीं, लेकिन उनका कहना था कि वह एक नान-एलाइन्ड पालिसी चलाते थे। लेकिन आज कल की जो पालिसी वह समझ में नहीं आती। न उसकी कोई शुरुआत है, न उसकी कोई दुम है। ऐसा लगता है न कोई दिशा है न कोई क्रिया है, यानी क्रिया विहीन, दिशा विहीन एक पालिसी आज कल चल रही है। कभी कोई चीज़ हो जाती है तो सरकार एक झटके से उठ कर, कुछ करना चाहिये, इस खयाल से कुछ कर जाती है और उसके बाद खुद उनकी समझ में नहीं आता कि सही किये हैं या गलत किये हैं। वाद में जो कुछ भी कार्यवाही हो जाती है सरकार की तरफ से उसकी पुष्टि करने में वह लग जाती है, जैसे कि रबात काफ़ेस की बात हुई, कुछ हो गया उसके बाद सारा का सारा खर्चा ऐसा रहा कि उसमें जाना सही है, इसी की पुष्टि में लगी है। लेकिन उसमें जाने से पहले क्या हुआ, कैसे गये और कैसे बुलाये गये, इसका उनको खुद पता नहीं, उनको खुद साफ नहीं था। इस मामले में जहां तक इन्डोनेशिया के काफ़ेस की बात है वह भी वैसी ही है। लेकिन सरकार ने शायद यह सोचा कि इस पर अब कोई कार्यवाही ही नहीं करनी है, वहां जाना ही नहीं है। तो वहां गए ही नहीं। तो इस तरह की एक उनकी पालिसी चल रही है। मैं इस

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

झगड़े में नहीं पड़ना चाहता, जो अभी सदन में खड़ा हुआ कि रूस वाले दबा रहे हैं या अमरीका वाले दबा रहे हैं; क्योंकि हमारी सरकार की गति तो ऐसी है कि यह सबके दबाव में आ सकती है। यह रूस के भी दबाव में है और अमरीका के भी दबाव में है।

इसलिए यह कहना कि सिर्फ रूस के दबाव में है, यह एक बड़ी गलत बात होगी। जब किसी का दबाव पड़ना है तो सरकार भी दब जाती है (Interruptions) असल में हमारा दबाव पड़ेगा तो अच्छा होगा, क्योंकि इससे आपकी नीति भी सुधर जायेगी। अगर आप हमारे दबाव में आने लगेंगे, तो आपकी नीति भी सुधर जायेगी, लेकिन अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आप हमारे दबाव में नहीं आते हैं और दूसरों के दबाव में आते रहते हैं।

असल बात तो ताकत की है और जिसके पास ताकत है वह आपको दबा सकता है। आज हिन्दुस्तान के पास कोई ताकत नहीं है और यही कारण है कि वह कोई अपनी स्वतंत्र नीति नहीं बना सकता है। जब तक हम स्वयं ताकत ग्रहण नहीं करेंगे, तब तक हम कोई स्वतंत्र नीति नहीं चला पायेंगे। इसलिए जो ताकतवर देश होगा, वह दूसरों के ऊपर अपनी ताकत का दबाव डालेगा और अपनी नीति को चलायेगा। मैं इस झगड़े में पड़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ कि ये किस के दबाव में आते हैं या नहीं आते हैं।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी जो नीति हो वह राष्ट्रीय नीति होनी चाहिये और उसमें देश का हित होना चाहिये। हम जब अपनी सीमाओं की ओर देखते हैं तो पाते हैं कि हिमालय की तरफ जो हमारी सीमा है, वहां हम कुछ खो चुके हैं। चीन का हमारी सीमा में हस्तक्षेप हुआ और उसने हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा कर लिया, उस कब्जे को छुड़ाने के लिए हमने अभी तक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की है, क्योंकि हमारे पास न इतनी ताकत ही है और न कहीं से कोई सहारा ही है। न रूस ही इस बारे में हमें कोई सहारा

दे रहा है और न अमरीका ही कोई सहारा दे रहा है। इस मामले में दुनिया के जितने देश हैं वे चुपके बैठे हुए हैं और हमसे कहते हैं कि तुम अपना राम नाम जपो और अगर अपनी जमीन ले सकते हो तो ले लो। हमारे पास तो सहारा देने के लिए कुछ नहीं है। असल में सारी बात ताकत पर आ जाती है। जब तक हिन्दुस्तान की अन्दरूनी ताकत नहीं बढ़ेगी, तब तक आपकी कोई नीति चलने वाली नहीं है। मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि सरकार की जो नीति अब तक रही है वह फेलियर रही है और जब तक वह इन्टर-नेशनल स्ट्रेन्थ नहीं बढ़ायेगी, तब तक वह अपनी नीति में सफल नहीं हो सकती है तथा जो जमीन चीन के कब्जे में इस समय है, उसको वह वापस नहीं ले सकेगी।

इसी सन्दर्भ में मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह कहा जा रहा है कि चीन के साथ हमें बातचीत करनी चाहिये; क्योंकि माऊ साहब कुछ मुस्करा दिये हैं। इसके माने यह नहीं हुए कि अगर वह मुस्करा दिये तो हमें भी मुस्कराना चाहिये और यह समझ लेना चाहिये कि हमें बातचीत करनी चाहिये। यह कहना कि हमारे ट्रेड मिशन के किसी दूतावास के कर्मचारी को उन्होंने किसी पार्टी में बुलाया और इसलिए हमको भी तैयारी करके वहां पर चला जाना चाहिये। इस तरह की बात करना एक गलत बात होगी। जब तक हमारी जमीन के बारे में कोई ठोस बातचीत नहीं होती और ठोस बातचीत होकर कोई न कोई हल नहीं निकल आता, तब तक बातचीत करना ठीक नहीं होगा, यह एक फगूल बात होगी। हाँ, सरकार को इस बारे में कोशिश करते रहना चाहिये और चुप बैठा नहीं रहना चाहिये। चुप बैठना भी एक गलत बात होगी और सरकार को इस बारे में हर वक्त कोशिश करते रहनी चाहिये। उसे इस बात की कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि इस झगड़े के बारे में चीन कोई ठोस कदम उठाये। यह बातचीत चाहे किसी जरिये से हो, अगर कोई तीसरी पार्टी इसमें शामिल हो तो उसका इस्तेमाल कर

सकते हैं और जो हमारी खोई हुई जमीन है, उस जमीन को इस बातचीत के द्वारा वापस ले सकते हैं। इस बारे में अगर चीन के साथ कोई अच्छा समझौता हो सकता है, तो मैं कहूंगा कि आपको करना चाहिये, क्योंकि हम एक भेद झंझट से तो छूटेंगे।

दूसरी चीज हमारी पाकिस्तान के साथ जो झगड़ा है, उनके संबंध में कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस झगड़े को सुलझाने तथा इसको हल करने की भी कोशिश होनी चाहिये। अगर यह झगड़ा हमेशा चलता रहा तो इससे हिन्दुस्तान की प्रगति होना नामुमकिन है। इसलिए कोशिश यह होनी चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान के साथ जो झगड़ा है, उसको जल्द से जल्द हल करने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये। मैं इस बात के बारे में इसलिए जोर दे रहा हूँ; क्योंकि पाकिस्तान कल तक हमारा ही एक हिस्सा था और दोनों देशों की जनता भाई की तरह रह रही करती थी, जब तक हम उनको अपने साथ नहीं कर लेते, तब तक यह झगड़ा दोनों के लिये ही घातक सिद्ध होगा। इस झगड़े को हल करने के लिए अगर रूस मदद करता है तो उसकी मदद लेनी चाहिये और अगर ताश्कन्द एग्रीमेंट के अन्तर्गत यह झगड़ा हल हो सकता है तो उसको अवश्य करना चाहिये या अगर हम सीधे बातचीत के द्वारा इस झगड़े को हल कर सकते हैं, तो यह और भी अच्छी बात होगी।

चाहे अमरीका हो या कोई भी देश इसका हल करने के लिए तैयार हो, इसका हल करना चाहिए और काश्मीर और दूसरे जो भी मामले हैं, उन सबका लेकर परमानेंट सोल्यूशन निकालना चाहिए ताकि हमारी जो आज काल की फिजुन खर्ची डिफेंस पर है वह बन्द हो सके और लोगों को राहत मिल सके।

एक बात मैं ब्रिटेन के बारे में भी कहना चाहता था। ब्रिटेन में जो कन्जरवेटिव सरकार आई है, उसके आने से हमारी जो ब्रिटेन के प्रति नीति है, उसमें परिवर्तन जरूर लाना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि जो भी कार्यवाही ब्रिटेन की सरकार

करेगी और जो कर चुकी है उससे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान को अब सांचना पड़ेगा कि कामनवैलथ में रहना है या नहीं। कई मसलों के ऊपर हम लोगों को यह कहना पड़ा कि हम लोगों को कामनवैलथ से निकल जाना चाहिए। लेकिन सरकार ने हमेशा इस चीज का सामना नहीं करना चाहा, शायद डर की वजह से, पुराने सम्बन्धों की वजह से और दूसरे मेरे खयाल में परम्परागत अंग्रेजों के साथ जुड़ाव का दिमाग बन गया है, उसकी वजह से भी छुटकारा नहीं पाना चाहते हैं कामनवैलथ से। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि कामनवैलथ में रहने से कोई फायदा हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं है। जो फायदा आना था वह शुरू-शुरू में रहा होगा। लेकिन जो अब कन्जरवेटिव सरकार रोडेगिया को और साउथ अफ्रीका को आर्म्स देने वाली है और उनकी इमीग्रेशन पालिसी चल रही है, उन सब चीजों को देखते हुए यह तय करना चाहिए कि अंग्रेजों से कामनवैलथ से कोई सम्बन्ध न रखा जाय।

साथ साथ मैं चीन के बारे में भी कहना चाहूंगा। चीन से अभी हाल में खबर निकली थी—एक आई०सी० वी० एम० हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर से उड़ा कर कहीं जंजीवार में टेस्ट करने वाला है। एक तो उनको हस्तक्षेप पहले से हमारे ऊपर है, अब एक तरह से न्यूक्लियर डेंजर का सामना हमको करना पड़ रहा है, क्योंकि वह मिसाइल हमारे ऊपर से उड़ाएगा और हाइड्रोजन बम्ब का भी एक्सप्लोजन करने वाला है। इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए हम लोगों को भी सावधान होना चाहिए, लेकिन मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हम लोगों को भी बम बनाना चाहिए, क्योंकि मुझे इसका अभी तक ठीक उत्तर नहीं मिल रहा है कि अगर हम बम बनाने लगें तो क्या हमारे पास उतने साधन हैं या नहीं। एक तरफ हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों की जो जरूरियात हैं, उनको भी देखना है और जो हमारी इकानामी है उसको भी देखना है। एक बम बनाने से काम नहीं चलेगा, जब बम बनाने लगें तो बम बनाने के अतिरिक्त

[श्री गोडे मुराहरि]

सारी मशीनरी, सारा आर्गोनाइजेशन है, उसके सारे खर्च को भी देखना है। इसकी काविलियत, इसकी ताकत हमारे पास है या नहीं उसके बारे में हमें बहुत शंका है। इसलिए हम नहीं कहेंगे कि न्युक्विलयर बम बनाने के चक्कर में हम फंसे, लेकिन साथ-साथ इस डेंजर का सामना करने की भी कोई न कोई तरकीब सोचनी पड़ेगी। हो सकता है और देशों से सहायता लें या हम न्युक्विलयर अम्ब्रेला के चक्कर में जायें, लेकिन कोई न कोई इसकी हिफाजत होनी चाहिए। इसके बारे में सरकार अभी से सोचना शुरू करे तभी काम बनेगा; क्योंकि इस दिशा में चीन की प्रगति बहुत तेजी से हो रही है।

जहां तक मैप वगैरह की बात है, मैं तो समझता हूं कि रूस का वैसा मैप छपवाना गलत था, मैं उसकी निन्दा करता हूं। लेकिन साथ-साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि कई देश हैं जो गलत मैप छापते रहे हैं और कभी-कभी सरकारी इजाजत भी उसमें होती है। कभी यनाइटेड स्टेट्स की कंपनियां ऐसे मैप छाप देती हैं। हो सकता है कि वे इंडिपेंडेंट कंपनियां हों, लेकिन कई ऐसी संस्थाएँ हैं कि जिनके कामों में सरकारी हाथ होता है, तो यह सब चीज बंद होनी चाहिए। लेकिन यह सब क्यों होता है? यह इसलिए होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान के पास ताकत नहीं है। ताकत न होने की वजह से दुनिया के जो दूसरे देश हैं, वे जो चाहे करते हैं, जैसे चाहते हैं हमारे मैप्स छाप देते हैं, वे मैप भी छापेंगे और अपना काम भी करेंगे। इसी संदर्भ में मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि रूस और जर्मनी का जो पैक्ट हुआ है, उसका हम सब लोगों को वैलकम करना चाहिए; क्योंकि सबसे बड़ा खतरा दुनिया में जो पिछली बार में हुआ था, वह जर्मनी से था। जर्मनी में जब हिटलर का शासन हुआ तो उसने जो चक्र चलाया उसके चलते-चलते एक वर्ल्ड वार हुई और अभी भी योरूप में यह डर रहता है कि कहीं इस तरह का चक्र फिर न चल जाय। तो रूस और जर्मनी

में जब इस तरह का एक पैक्ट हो जाता है, तो वहां का एक बड़ा मामला हल हो जाता है और उससे रूस और जर्मनी में पीस का वातावरण आ जाता है और वह हमारे लिए फायदेमंद होगा; क्योंकि जब रूस वहां से छुटकारा पायेगा और जर्मनी उससे छुटकारा पायेगा तो वे दूसरे मुल्कों एशिया और अफ्रीका में पीसफुल इंटेन्स से अपना काम शुरू कर सकते हैं। वे यहां अपनी ट्रेड बढ़ा सकते हैं और अपनी आर्म्स रेस को बंद कर के एशिया और अफ्रीका के लिए एक विशेष दृष्टि अपना सकते हैं। इसलिए हम इस पैक्ट को वैलकम करते हैं और हम समझते हैं कि इस पैक्ट के चलते चलते जी०डी०आर० का मसला भी हल होगा और जी०डी०आर० के रिकग्निशन का जो मामला था, उसके सिलसिले में दोनों जर्मनियों में एक ऐसा समझौता हो जायगा, जो योरूप के लिए और सारी दुनिया के लिए अच्छा साबित होगा। इसी संबंध में कहना चाहता हूं कि जी० डी० आर० को जो रिकग्निशन दिया गया है, उसमें कंजूसीपन क्यों करता गया, यह बात समझ में नहीं आयी। अगर उसको रिकग्निशन देना था तो पूरे डिप्लोमेटिक रिलेशन्स तय कर लेते और तब बहुत से मामले हल हो जाते। पहले जो विचार था कि वेस्ट जर्मनी उसकी खिलाफत करेगा वह तो समाप्त हो गया। जब आपने काउंसिलेट स्टेट्स मान लिया तो उसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं थी। अगर पूरा दर्जा उनको दिया जाता तो उन का एम्बेसी यहां कायम हो जाता। हमारे जी०डी०आर० से काफी संबंध हैं और मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि इस संबंध में केवल जी०डी०आर० की ही बात नहीं है, ताइवान को भी आपको रिकग्नाइज करना चाहिए, इजराइल को भी रिकग्नाइज करना चाहिए, उसके काउंसिलेट को यहां आने दें, उसकी इजाजत आपको देनी चाहिए। और मैं तो इस धारणा का हूं कि जहां पर भी जिस सरकार का अधिकार चलता है, जिसके पास जमीन है और जिसकी वहां कुछ स्थिति है, उस सरकार को आपको रिकग्नाइज करना चाहिए और उस में कोई कंजूसी नहीं बरतनी

चाहिए और उसमें कोई फर्क करने की बात नहीं होनी चाहिए; क्योंकि जब आप फर्क करने लगेंगे, तो सारी पालिसी की इबड़ी उसमें आ जाती है। इसलिए जैसे आपने जा० डी० आर० के एम्बेसी के रिकनिशन को मना कर दिया और कांउसिलेट का रिकनिशन दिया उसी तरह से आप ताइवान को भी रिकनिशन दीजिए, साउथ वियतनाम की रिवोल्यूशनरी गवर्नमेंट को भी, अगर कोई टेरीटोरी है उनके पास तो उनको भी रिकनिशन दीजिए और दूसरे देश जैसे इजराइल है, उसको भी आप रिकनिशन दीजिए ताकि आपके ऊपर कोई एलजाम न आये कि आपने कोई फर्क किया है। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से आपका सपना बर्ताव होना चाहिए यूनिवर्सलिटी का व्यवहार आपको अपनाना चाहिए और जहाँ पर जिसका अधिकार हो, उसे वहाँ पर रिकनिशन देना चाहिए।

एक चीज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ आखिर मैं और वह यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान को अपने सेल्फ इंटेरेस्ट में तमाम पड़ोसी देशों को अपने साथ में लेकर चलना चाहिए। उसके आसपास के जो देश हैं जैसे नेपाल, भूटान, अफगानिस्तान या बर्मा। इन सब देशों के साथ हमको खास संबंध स्थापित करना चाहिए और उनके साथ मित्रता बढ़ानी चाहिए और इसके लिए एक स्पेशल ट्रीटमेंट हम को देना पड़ेगा। और एक 4 P. M. स्पेशल रिलेशनशिप उनके साथ रखना

पड़ेगा ताकि हमारे साथ जो भी उनका सम्बन्ध रहे वह हमारे लिये बाद में लाभदायक हो। और साथ-साथ मारिशश और फीजी के बारे में हम लोगों को अभी से ध्यान देना होगा और मारिशश और फीजी के साथ एक अच्छे तरह से हम लोगों को सम्बन्ध बढ़ाना चाहिये और उनके साथ ऐसा सम्बन्ध रखना चाहिए जैसे कि हम दोनों एक देश हैं और जैसे कि भाई-भाई हैं और जितना भी हम से हो सके उनकी मदद भी करनी चाहिये, ट्रेड में और ऐड वगैरह में। ये जो हमारे देश हैं वहाँ हमारे भाई यहाँ से जा कर के बसे थे और जो कि वहाँ पर मेजारिटी

में हैं और जो कि वहाँ पर सरकार चलाते हैं, आज कल वह अलग देश बन गया है, बहुत जमाना हुआ उनको वहाँ जा कर के बसे हुये, लेकिन फिर भी उनका हिन्दुस्तान के साथ एक सम्बन्ध रहता है, हिन्दुस्तान के साथ एक भाई चारा रहता है और इसका हम लोगो को पूरा उपयोग करना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इनके साथ एक अच्छा नजदीक का सम्बन्ध रहे।

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I take this opportunity to welcome my old friend, Sardar Swaran Singh, in this new assignment. He is an old and experienced Minister, a sort of an all-purpose Minister...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Multipurpose.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: ... who can fit in with the Housing Ministry as also with the Foreign Ministry. I am sure that during his term of office the affairs of the Foreign Ministry will get more of steadiness and balance and there shall not be abrasions as there have been in the past like the venture to Rabat.

The foreign policy of India was laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on a very sound basis. He had selected three principal items: the first was the support of India in the liberation struggle of the colonial countries; and second was what is known as non-alignment; and the third support to the U.N.O. Now, we have consistently adhered to these principles and I must say that we have greatly benefited by them. Some of these principles have undergone some changes. For instance, there is not much of colonialism today, and to talk of colonialism in any loud voice means beating a dead or a dying horse. My friend, Mr. Mariswamy, expressed certain doubts about the policy of non-alignment. He went to the length of saying that India has not benefited by it; on the contrary, India has been harmed by it. Perhaps he has not fully understood the implications of the non-alignment policy. I would like to quote the words of the author of the non-alignment policy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru:—

“According to the general consensus of opinion in this country we should follow a policy independent of this bloc or that bloc. You may, of course, sympathise with one or the other; that is quite a different thing. To become part of the power blocs means giving up the right to have a foreign policy of our own and following that of somebody else. Surely that is not the kind of a future that any self-respecting person would like to envisage for our great country.”

[Shri A. P. Jain.]

Now, that is important enough. Every independent country has a foreign policy of its own and it does not subordinate itself to the foreign policy of any other country. It refuses to be dictated to. If Shri Mariswamy has not benefited from this policy in a positive way, at least he has been saved from the inconvenience of India being aligned with Soviet Russia. So, this policy has been a very sound policy and it has yielded us great dividends.

This policy had another aspect. At the time when the policy was conceived, there was a threat of a nuclear war. That threat no longer exists. The partial test ban agreement has been followed by the non-proliferation treaty and it is just a matter of time for the United States and the Soviet Union to agree on the future nuclear build-up. There are also other changes that have taken place in the world affairs and world politics to which I shall refer later. Here I might enter into an alibi. The Government has acted correctly in regard to non-proliferation treaty by maintaining its future nuclear option. We should not subordinate ourselves to a policy which is not of our making.

There have been both qualitative and quantitative changes on the international scene. The CENTO and SEATO about which we used to hear so much are now as dead as their author, Dulles, himself. NATO is also at the melting point. I welcome the recent treaty between West Germany and Soviet Russia. It has not only lessened the tension, but it has made European politics more rational, because the principal partner of NATO, namely, America, will have less and less say in the affairs of Western Europe. Together with this, I welcome the improvement in the relations between West and East Germany. I hope that the day is not far off when these two countries, which are really parts of the same country, will live in peace and amity and will join together. I fully support the action of the Indian Government in raising the status of the East German Representative to a full consular status. I think that things are taking shape and soon we may have full diplomatic relations with East Germany.

Negotiation between Egypt and Israel is another important step towards lessening bitterness between these two nations, which have been on inimical terms. It is far too early to say what are going to be the future developments. But the fact that a beginning has been made is a welcome feature.

The changes on the international scene have affected our policy of non-alignment, though not in all its aspects. Non-alignment means not aligning with any of the power blocs and now that the two super-powers which were leading the eastern and western blocs are coming together, there is need for the review of our policy. Therefore, I would

suggest to the hon. Minister to give thought to as to what are we to do and how are we to give life and dynamism to our foreign policy in the context of the changes that have taken place the world over. In fact these changes are favourable to us. Nevertheless we should not ignore that they have taken the teeth out of the non-alignment policy as it was originally conceived. There was then the threat of cold war. There were then many dependent countries who wanted to liberate themselves. There were two power blocs which were in a perpetual state of cold war with one another. So, we had a particular role to play. Now, non-alignment means quite a different thing in the context of the world affairs. I would like the hon. Minister to thoroughly examine and decide what changes there should be to make this policy live and be dynamic rather than allow it to peter out.

Now, I support the proposal of Shri Godey Murahari that India should pay more attention to its neighbour. Sir, the euphoria given to the foreign policy by the charismatic personality, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, is no more and we must remember the wise words which he said and which I am quoting:—

“Foreign policy is not just a declaration of fine principles, nor is it a directive to tell the world how to behave. It is conditioned and controlled by a country's own strength. If the policy does not take the capacity of the country into account, it cannot be followed up. If a country talks bigger than itself, it brings little credit to itself.”

I think this applies to Rabat. Sir, I think we should concern ourselves more with our immediate problems. We must realise our limitations, our financial limitations and our military limitations. It is necessary that India should develop much closer relations, relations of friendship, not of bossing over the neighbouring countries like Nepal, Burma, Ceylon, Afghanistan and many others. They will provide us a shield against some of the activities which are threatening this country.

Now, I want to refer to another aspect of the foreign policy of ours and that is the Indian Ocean. Several times the question has come up before this House and the predecessor of the present Foreign Minister, I think, said that there would be no vacuum. Sir, I agree that there will be no vacuum. But, how is the Indian Ocean to be treated now? It is very vital for us. I would like again to quote the words of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. After he had returned from the Bandung Conference, he said, referring to the Bandung Declaration:

“The Declaration includes a clause which has a reference to collective defence. The House knows that we are opposed to military blocs and I have repeatedly stated that these blocs, based on the

idea of balance of power and negotiation for strength and the grouping of nations into rival camps, are not any contribution to peace. We maintain that view. The Bandung Declaration, however, relates to self-defence in terms of the Charter of the United Nations."

He then quoted different articles from the United Nations Charter which I am not going to repeat. Nearu further added, "It has been stated in the Bandung Declaration in clear terms that these rights of collective defence should be in accordance with the Charter. We have not only not any objection to this formulation, but we welcome it. We have subscribed to collective defence for the purposes defined in the Charter."

Now, that was the policy laid down by our great leader. Collective defence is not a negation of non-alignment. There is the virtual withdrawal of the British from the Indian Ocean although they have now modified their policy, of course, a little. They will keep some installations and some ships in Singapore. But the other countries, America and Soviet Russia, are increasing their power in the Indian Ocean. They are setting up, what you may call, refuelling stations; you may call them talking points; or you may call them transmitting stations. Both of them are doing it. We do not want the Indian Ocean to be made an object of any politics of the foreign countries. We must preserve its distinctive identity and the countries bordering the Indian Ocean, although they are poor and backward countries, yet a large number of them together, can certainly influence the world opinion. They should form a collective defence in terms as defined by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru with reference to the Charter of the United Nations and tell outside countries, whoever that may be: 'Hands off the Indian Ocean'. The Indian Ocean shall be used for peaceful purposes only. It shall not be used for other purposes. It shall give free scope to the peaceful trade and transit of all the nations.

The Prime Minister and Foreign Minister are shortly going to Lusaka. It is good but I am not sure about the achievements of this conference. There may be the usual talk or letting out one's steam against the ex-colonial powers. That will not be much good because colonialism is dead, dead as dodo. It might be in one or two odd places. Then the danger of a nuclear war has also very much diminished. It is time that some of the vital questions which concern us and which concern the other non-aligned countries should be taken up in the light of the changes that have taken place since the idea was conceived. Since Bandung the world has very much advanced. In particular, I would like the question of the Indian Ocean to be taken up at Lusaka to form the world opi-

nion that this area is not interfered with by anybody.

(Time bell rings)

You have rung the bell and I am most afraid of you. So I must stop.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I join Mr. Jain in congratulating my old friend, the Minister for External Affairs, for taking his new portfolio or shall I say going back to the old portfolio. He is very well versed in it. I would like to call him a man for all seasons and as he knows, that expression was used for a very great man in England, Sir Thomas Moore. He has seen different aspects of administration and I am sure his tenure of office would be a very successful one but there are three lapses in recent times in our international relations to which I would like to draw attention. It was before his time and I do not blame him but I want to refer to them so that they should not happen to him. The first was Rabat. I think we suffered the greatest diplomatic defeat there. Our secular image was tarnished, our country was humiliated. May I ask the Minister in future not to go to conferences uninvited and not to go to religious conferences?

The second is—I do not know whether my friend will agree with me—think it was a great mistake not to have gone to the Southeast Asian Security Conference. I think India has a big part to play in Southeast Asia. I have been to Southeast Asia myself as a Minister and I want to assure this House that I was surprised at the way Southeast Asian countries looked up to India. In many countries we have a common culture but apart from that common culture they look upon us as their big brother. The Chinese threat is there and they feel that the only country they can turn to is India. I am not suggesting we should have military alliances. I am against military alliances. I am not suggesting we should send armaments. But there is such a thing as economic support there is such a thing as political support, there is such a thing as psychological or emotional support, but what they felt, at least when I went there, was that they had been neglected and not looked after. Almost all Foreign Ministers—I am not saying that of my hon. friend—usually go to Europe, the United States, countries like that, but the small Southeast Asian countries are neglected, and therefore it is essential in the interests of our security that we should have much better relations with our neighbours and particularly Southeast Asian neighbours. The third lapse, which is a very recent one,—I don't attribute it to my hon. friend because it has gone on for some time—is about the Russian maps. I must take a reasonable view

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

of the situation. There is no doubt that Russia has gone on publishing these maps showing a large part of India as belonging to China notwithstanding our so-called protests. Now I do not want to be meek and mild or weak-kneed with regard to this matter. I know our friendship with Russia is very intimate and I know that the friendship has been traditional. I know how Russia has stood by us with regard to Kashmir. I appreciate all that. But one feels more hurt when a friend behaves like this than when a stranger does so. My friend, Mr. Arora, said that the United States has been doing the same, that the United Nations Organization has been doing the same. But is our friendship with Russia to be compared with that of our friendship with the United States? Mr. Arora will be the first to say that there is something special about our relations with Russia. Therefore, when a friend behaves like this, we are entitled to be angry, we are entitled to be indignant and we are entitled to say, "This will not do. We will not put up with it. We will not tolerate it." But I do not understand this meek and mild protest. If you protest, protest strongly. Otherwise keep quiet. Sir, I think meek and mild protests do more harm than taking up a strong positive attitude in matters like this.

Next, may I say a few words as to our international relations. International relations change, fluctuate from time to time, but National interests are permanent. International relations must be judged from the point of view of national interests and national security.

That is the only touchstone we can apply to international relations. We cannot be static in our international relations because the world is not static but our national interests do not change, our national security does not change. Therefore the touchstone must be the same to a changing situation, a situation which is changing from month to month, from year to year.

Now let us see what a great change has come over this world in the last few years. We adopted a policy of non-alignment and I think we were right in adopting it. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who was a master of international relations rightly decided in favour of non-alignment. Why? In those days you had the two mighty powers arrayed against each other. They are hostile to each other, they were on the verge of war, on the verge of a catastrophe and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru rightly decided that India should not ally itself with either of the two powers but it should remain independent. It should judge everything on its own merits; it should raise its voice in favour of justice; it should condemn tyranny, it should condemn colonialism and what was the result? Those

were the glorious days when India's voice was heard with attention in the councils of the world. When India's representatives got up nations listened to India because they realised that India was not speaking at the behest of Russia or America; it was speaking through its own national voice. But non-alignment was a dynamic policy. Today I am sorry to say it has ceased to be dynamic. It has become purely a defensive and negative policy. What change has come over the world today? The most important change that has come over the world is that instead of Russia and America being arrayed against each other they are coming closer and closer together. There is a detente between them. As somebody said, there is a hegemony of these two countries which is really ruling the world. Just consider for a moment; no important measure can get through the United Nations or through the councils of the world unless Russia and America agree to it. Take the Middle East. It is only when Russia and America agreed that a peace proposal was put forward and had to be accepted by UAR and Israel. Why is the war in Vietnam going on? That is because Russia and America for the time being cannot agree on a solution. De Gaulle tried to bring about what he called an independent European presence so that it should counter-balance this growing power of the two mighty countries which are trying to lay down the law for the whole world. And recently I think it is an event of great international significance—there was this treaty between the German Chancellor and Russia which again establishes that there is an attempt at having a Europe which is not in this case completed under the domination of the United States. Therefore the whole conception of non-alignment has changed. It is no longer a question of not belonging to one bloc or the other. The two blocs do not exist in the sense in which they existed in the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. These two blocs are coming closer and closer together and trying, well, as I said, to lay down the law to the world. Now apply this to what is happening in some parts of the world. Take Russia and I want to deal particularly with Russia. As I said, our friendship with Russia has been traditional, has been very intimate, has been very close and Russia has stood by us in times of stress. I do not know what would have happened about Kashmir if Russia had not exercised its veto on more than one occasion. With regard to Pakistan, Russia always sided with us, because Pakistan belonged to the American camp. But today there is a change in the Russian attitude and what is that change? The change is this, Russia today wants to have influence in Pakistan and not leave Pakistan entirely at the mercy of the United States. That is the meaning of Russia having trade treaties with Pakistan and giving

arms to Pakistan because Russia wants to make friends with Pakistan, as I said, to have influence in Pakistan.

A few years back Russia kept Pakistan at arms length because she thought that Pakistan was a stooge of America. Things have changed and this is an important change. Now, somebody talked about Tashkent. I am the first to admit that both India and Pakistan should be grateful to Russia for having brought about the Tashkent settlement, but what has happened subsequently? Here I would appeal to my hon. friend to bear this in mind. India, ever since the Tashkent agreement, has been loyal in letter and in spirit to the Tashkent agreement. It has extended her hand of friendship to Pakistan and every time that hand has been rejected and rebuffed. We have done everything in our power to see that better relations exist between these two neighbouring countries. The result is what all of us know. Now, here is where Russia can help India if she is minded to do so and it is where the hon. Minister should put pressure upon Russia. "You brought about the Tashkent agreement. Why do you not see that Pakistan implements it? It is no use turning to us. We have done our best." I am one of those who believe that we should do nothing and let the initiative come from Pakistan. But it is for Russia to tell Pakistan: "I was responsible for the Tashkent agreement. I expect the Tashkent agreement to be carried out. I expect the two countries to honour the spirit of Tashkent. India has been trying to do it, but what has Pakistan done?" It is not enough to make overtures to Pakistan. These are useless but with Russia's growing influence with Pakistan, something can be done if Russia really puts pressure on Pakistan.

Now, Sir, I have a feeling—I may be wrong and I hope the hon. Minister will correct me—that there is continued showing of Indian territory as Chinese territory in Russian maps is a sort of bargaining counter that Russia wants to keep against China. Do not forget that in the future, for the next ten years or the next fifteen years the problem will be Russo-Chinese relations. For the last ten years it was Russo-American relations. I think they are being solved or they are being sorted out. America is not afraid of the Russian threat or Russia is not afraid of the American threat. As far as Russia is concerned, the threat is from China and as far as China is concerned, the threat is from Russia. With regard to China, I agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Arora—I do not know whether he is here—that the relations that have been frozen should now be defrozen. I was reading only recently a book by Mahaux, the French Minister of Culture, who went to China in 1968. He met Mao and Mao told him: If the peoples

of India and China can come together, they can mould the destiny of Asia...

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): On whose terms?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Now, we are not discussing boundary disputes. This was the dream that Panditji had, that India and China would work together, work hand in hand and bring about a prosperous, affluent Asia. That dream was shattered by China's treachery in 1962. We all know it. But it is a mistake in international relations to have long memories. Look at what De Gaulle did. As soon as he came to power, he tried to forget friendship with Germany, a Germany which had fought France, a Germany which had confronted France in two wars, which had committed aggression on France. De Gaulle said: "That is past. I must think of the interests of my country today."

Sir, I am very glad that the Prime Minister is going to the Non-aligned Conference, because I think non-alignment must now take on a dynamic form and shape, and that can only be done if the non-aligned countries are economically strong. Then only can they prevent economic exploitation either by America or by Russia or by both. Non-aligned countries are militarily weak. They have not the arms to fight countries like Russia or America, but economic strength is a very important strength, and I wish the Prime Minister every success in her venture to this Non-aligned Conference.

Finally, I think that in our foreign policy what we have to remember is we should never close our options. It is a mistake for any country to have one option. It is equally a mistake for a country to put all eggs in one basket. I am afraid for some time we put all eggs in the Russian basket. That was a good basket at that time, the eggs were safe, Russia kept them safe for us, but things are changing now, and I think we should consider whether we should not have more than one option when we consider our international relations.

The other thing I would request with respect to the External Affairs Minister to remember is that we should not consider any nation as an untouchable. We should not have long memories in these things. I know we feel hurt about countries which did not side with us in the Pakistan war and the Chinese war, but we cannot carry on international relations like this. I am glad now that we are trying to make friends with Turkey, with Persia, and with other countries. I know they did not side us, but long memory in international relations is a liability, it is not an asset. We must forget these things and see what our interests are, and our interests are not to

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

treat any nation as a 'pariah' or a Harijan or an untouchable. Our interest is to try and to make friends with as many countries as possible.

With these words, I wish the Minister a very successful tenure of office, and I am sure in his hands the international relations of our country will strengthen our country, strengthen our national interest and strengthen our security.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to speak with some hesitation after Shri Chagla because he has spoken in such lucid and authoritative tones, and I can say that by and large I agree with the views that he has expressed. Sir, I would like to begin my speech with this observation that it would have been fair if the Foreign Minister had initiated the debate. Sir, we would have very much appreciated if he had told us what the Government's policy was in view of the rapid changes that have taken place in the world situation. Sir, I would like to point out to the opening sentence in the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs where they have said: "A decade of significant changes came to an end during the year under review."

"Man's landing on the moon and his safe return to earth was an event of unparalleled significance. It marked the beginning of the snapping of chains that have bound man to this planet through the ages. And it marked the beginning of a whole new set of ideas and concepts. Even as the world situation kept changing, situation in India also underwent many changes. Under these circumstances the foreign policy of India could not stand still and be rigid."

Sir, therefore, I would have liked the Foreign Minister to spell out in what sense the rigid policy of India has undergone a change, what modifications he did in that. Sir, many speakers have drawn the attention of the House to the phenomenal changes that have come over in foreign relations. The treaty between West Germany and Moscow was just now mentioned. The Lusaka Conference is going to take place. In the Eastern hemisphere new forces are arising. I would like to mention the emergence of Japan, a small nation, which was humbled in 1945, almost destroyed, just like a phoenix rising again, and it has now become almost a mighty power or is likely to become a mighty power. The Indian Ocean is being threatened. Now, Sir, I hope you will agree with me that it would have been much better if it were made known what the Government's thinking about all the changes was. Then it would have been impossible to join a debate with the Government. But the Government seems to think, here are the Opposition benches who go on speaking, and all that they have to do is to say that this

is not correct, that is not correct; here you are wrong, there you are wrong and so on. I do not think this sort of a debate would be fruitful unless the Government policy is pinpointed and that is what happens in all other Parliaments. It is the Foreign Minister who initiates the debate. He outlines the policy that is likely to be followed within the next two, three or five years, and then the debate is joined.

Sir, just of all I would like to question this concept of neutrality. As was just now pointed out by honourable Shri Chagla, this concept of neutrality had its genesis at the time when there were two blocs confronting each other, and very wisely, under the leadership of Pandit Nehru, we decided to follow a policy of neutrality. But these two blocs are vanishing. The two giants who were expected to join a struggle, a deadly struggle, which might have brought catastrophe to the whole world are no longer talking in terms of war. Everywhere they are trying to come to terms to solve their differences and to eliminate the chances of war. That is one thing. The other thing is, because of these confrontations, there are pacts and treaties. And the attempt of the U.S.A. was to down the might of Russia by throwing a ring round the Russian territory by way of SEATO, CENTO, etc. Now these pacts also are either dead or are dying. Therefore, altogether a new configuration is taking place in the world and, because of it, India will have to think in new terms not always talking of neutrality and non-alignment. Those words had value at those particular times, but those times have changed. And if those times have changed, the time has come now to modify our own point of view, to modify our own policy, and not to think always in terms of neutrality and non-alignment, because neutrality presupposes that you are not aligned with this or that. There must be two parties confronting each other. No longer are there two parties, China is emerging, Japan is emerging. There are three or four super-Powers most likely to dominate the world. In this world in which there are not only two, but more, super-Powers, what does it mean when you say that you are neutral? Do you mean we are neutral?

Are you neutral between the USA on the one hand and the USSR on the other? Are you neutral between the USSR on the one hand and China on the other? Are you neutral between the USA on the one hand and China on the other hand, or as between Japan and China? So, the word has lost its meaning, it has lost its relevance, and we will have to think anew. That is my first plea.

Then, I would like to come nearer home. Sir, many people have stressed the necessity of cordial relations between India and

Pakistan and India and China. I do not disagree with them. But what are the realities of the situation? In the same Report I would like to point out, what this Report has to say on page 31 and page 33. The Report says that in spite of our repeated efforts the policy of Pakistan towards India continues to be the same. And in similar words it has been said that China is still indulging in anti-Indian campaigns. We need not go to the Report at all. Just look at the flow of refugees constantly pouring into India. Now, this is what is happening, in spite of all our efforts to have the closest possible relations, the most friendly relations, with Pakistan. Now, those of our friends who have been advocating a new policy towards Pakistan, it is up to them to point out how this policy could be evolved, and it is up to them to point out what Pakistan has given by way of concrete proof that it is ready for a new relationship.

In the same way, China is behaving towards India. Sir, a good deal is being made out of the famous smile of Mao Tse-tung when he talked to our Charge d'affaires; when he met him, most probably he shook hands with him, they were at a dinner party; he smiled and said, "How do you do?" We have become so weak, we have become so anxious to establish good relationships with China that even one faint smile on the face of that great dictator encourages us to feel that now he is ready for the revision of the relationship.

SHRI A. D. M. NI: Inferiority complex.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Therefore, I am saying this. It was Shri Mishra who pointed out that Mr. Keating said something in Kashmir or that the maps were wrongly printed by Russia in spite of all our protests or about the smile on the face of Mao. What does this sum up to? It sums up to this thing that we have become so weak and so conscious of our weakness that we try to find out something here, something there, in order to boost our own morale. This is the sign of weakness and that is why Russia in spite of all our good relationships and our special efforts to remain friends with it, continues to print these wrong maps for ten years. It is not for one or two or three or four years. Repeatedly we have been pointing out that this is not the correct map. And again and again they are printing that map. Why does it happen?

Therefore, what I am saying is this. After all, foreign relation is the function of our internal strength. And if India is not strong enough, then whether it is Russia or the USA or Japan or China, they are not going to care whether India feels insulted or whether India is wronged. So the meaning of foreign relationship is to become very independent, to become self-sufficient to increase our own strength. And there I would

like to point out that we should take a leaf out of the Chinese history. China was also isolated. Russia refused all help. It was surrounded by all hostile countries. America did not come to the help of China. Nobody came. And even in spite of that, China had the courage to accept the challenge and now we are thinking that China has become so great, that it has become so strong, that the gap between India and China has grown so wide that now we shall have to do something to improve our relationship with China.

Sir, these nuclear blasts, these ICBM and other missiles, China has made out of its own strength. Cannot India do it out of its own strength? We do not want the nuclear devices. But we must do something and very quickly, otherwise, India's word in the international court will have no meaning.

Having dealt with India-Pakistan and India-China relations, I would like to point out that our relations with the South-East Asian countries also will have to be improved. Mr. Chagla has very correctly pointed out that we are neglecting these small nations. But these nations have their self-respect. They look to India as a country which is far stronger and which is likely to be the only bulwark against any aggressive designs of China. We must forge very close links with them. Indonesia is there. Burma is there. Malaysia is there along with so many other countries. In this respect, Sir, I would not like to exclude even Taiwan or Japan.

Sir, Taiwan was mentioned here. I do not know what prevents us from having closer relationship with Taiwan. They might have some quarrel with Mr. Mao Tse-tung. That does not mean that we should think that they are our enemies. When we had hostility with the Portuguese in Goa, was not the U.A.R. friendly with the Portuguese? They were.

Sir, we are neglecting Israel. We do not want to have our Embassy there. Why is it? Whenever we happen to have relations with countries like Taiwan or Israel, our policy is controlled or moulded by our friendship with other countries. We must have our independent policy. Now Israel and the U.A.R. are coming together. They are sitting at a table. At this time if we had our own diplomat and Embassy there, perhaps we would have been able to influence and bring these countries together. So, Sir, I am thinking in these terms. Let us not be obsessed with the strong idea of neutrality. Let us give it up and let us consider that our policy in international affairs will be guided solely by our self-interest. Whatever relationship is going to be of benefit to us we shall follow that. I would say that our conception of neutrality has become irrelevant. Let us discard it. There should be no hesitation in doing so. As you know, France and West

[Shri N. G. Goray]

Germany came together. Russia and Germany are coming together. You must have yourself read that though West Germany was still considered to be a sort of Fascist country and they were harbouring Fascism, they were likely to go Nazi, that did not prevent Russia to have a treaty with them. In the same manner let India's Foreign policy be really flexible. We should give up this rigid attitude. I would like the Minister of External Affairs to explain to us in what manner they are going to modify the policy so as to suit the changed situation in world affairs. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we have had some very enlightening, interesting and, if I may say so, provocative speeches from some hon. Members. The Leader of the Opposition here, my friend, Mr. Mishra, started the debate.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Dr. Mishra.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is not a doctor. He started the debate with a rather crude attack on the Soviet Union and Indo-Soviet relations. But being an intelligent man, he did not indulge in the kind of anti-Sovietism which we come across in the Fascist and reactionary quarters. His target was cleverly chosen, Indo-Soviet relations, because he knows very well, being a very learned man that he is, that once the Indo-Soviet relationship and co-operation between these two countries are disrupted, wrecked and sabotaged, the rest will follow. It may not take India long to be delivered to the parlour of the imperialist powers.

That is why the entire strategy of the United States in regard to our country, as far as foreign policy is concerned, is one of constantly subverting and undermining Indo-Soviet friendship and co-operation. So, I am not surprised that our friend, Mr. Mishra, should have taken the somewhat discredited line. We are accustomed to it.

Ever since Indian foreign policy came to be known as non-alignment and a policy of peace and freedom, it was attacked precisely from the plank of anti-Sovietism in the sense that always India was accused of selling her national interests and independence to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been accused of trying to enmesh India in its sphere of influence, as they say. The same thing we have heard to-day. Now, Mr. Chagla spoke. What my friend, Mr. Mishra, spoke with brutality, Mr. Chagla spoke with studied eloquence. He sought modifications of the foreign policy but not by indulging in antics or by overtly taking the position of the right reactionary camp in this country. What he has actually preached is really that India's foreign policy should now be so changed that it comes away from the moorings of co-operation with the Soviet

Union and other socialist countries and non-aligned countries like the U.A.R., and seeks some other moorings. That is what it really amounts to. I think it would be a sad day if India were to take this course. It would indeed mean reversal of our foreign policy, at least the beginning of its process.

My friend, Mr. Goray, developed another interesting thesis. But the premise on which he built it up is entirely wrong. We have never understood Indian foreign policy as being a policy of neutrality. Is it war between two countries that we have to think in terms of neutrality? Never did Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru encourage this description or definition of foreign policy. Indian foreign policy is one of peace and non-alignment.

Now the question is whether the world is so changed as to make the policy of non-alignment irrelevant or harmful. That is the issue before us. A suggestion has been made that the United States and the Soviet Union have come together because they are discussing some of the things sometimes and they have reached certain agreement on certain proposals like the proposal in regard to the Middle-East and so on. If that were so, then the Soviet Union and the United States had on many previous occasions come to common agreement with regard to this or that proposal. For example, the non-proliferation treaty or the Partial Test Ban Treaty and many other instances from the United Nations Organisation, or otherwise in bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, could be cited to show that they had come together and hence the policy of non-alignment had become irrelevant. That would be entirely wrong.

The world is not divided between big powers like that, or shared between the big powers like that. Our policy was not formulated on the basis of two powers occupying two opposite positions. Here was a world in which certain fundamental changes had taken place. On the one hand, there was, and there is, a world dominated by the imperialist powers, still trading on colonialism and neo-colonialism, belonging to the world capitalist system. On the other hand, there has emerged as a result of the Second World War, and the revolutionary movements of nations which came in its wake, a new world, a socialist world, a community of socialist countries. And there was competition, political, ideological, moral and in every other way between the world systems. The question arose as to where a country like India, which had newly won independence and belonged to the developing nations, should find its place. In our wisdom we chose that we should take a non-aligned position between the two world camps although we have succumbed

to the pressures of the imperialist forces many a time, and we have spurned in the earlier days the co-operation of the world of socialism and freedom, the world that is now most friendly to us headed by the Soviet Union. Today can we say that this fundamental picture in the world has changed? We cannot say so, hence the validity of the policy of non-alignment, of friendship and peace, of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, has not become outdated. In fact, it has to be strengthened and carried forward.

Now I should come to some of the points that I wanted to make. Many of the points I have made in my seventy-eight amendments and I have made them clear to the honourable Members of the House. Still I would like to make some points.

First of all, my main criticism against this Government is this that the Indian Government today has no perspective in the sphere of foreign policy. It lives from hand to mouth, so to say, and it is living on the left-over of what was bequeathed to it by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It has lost its character and dynamism. It has no sense of direction either. It is tossed about, depending upon the pressures. The moment the rightist pressure in the country was mounted, immediately a declaration was made that we have banned entry of the Soviet map although I do not know how many encyclopaedias come to this country from the Soviet Union. I do not think even three encyclopaedias come here. Yet a declaration was made to placate our rightist friends, but they have not been placated, as it is clear, from the speech of Mr. Mishra. At the same time nothing was done about the United States of America or other countries which have been showing chunks of Indian territory as the territory of other countries and to which a reference has been made by my friend, Mr. Arjun Arora. Therefore, this kind of an attempt to play between the two and trying to placate and appease our rightist friends—and there are many rightists in the Government also, and around the Government—will not take them very far. So, first of all, develop a sense of perspective in regard to your foreign policy and then try to work out in the light of this perspective a clear and concrete direction for our foreign policy. Our External Affairs Ministry and our Government as a whole, including the Prime Minister, have proved singularly incompetent to give either a sense of purpose or a sense of direction to the foreign policy in the changed situation in which the world is marching today. This is my first point.

The second point that I would like to make is I am a little surprised that though our friend spoke so much on foreign policy, the world has boiled down to the Soviet

encyclopaedia map. Here is a war going on in Vietnam where our Asians are fighting with courage against the forces of American neo-colonialism and aggression. While the popular concern against the Nixon Administration and in support of the Vietnamese freedom fighters could be heard in the American Senate and the American House of Representatives, here the Leader of the Opposition did not have even a word to say on this subject. And yet he is our esteemable Leader of the Opposition. I am surprised what Fullbright says or what Mansfield says, living so far away, when their country is attacking Vietnam. My criticism is not even of what was said by my friends of the Syndicate party. Well, it is enough for me to say what an incorrect comprehension of foreign policy my friends have. Yet, today let it be known that the Vietnamese are fighting not only for their own sake, for if they had been fighting for their sake only, there would not have been such an immense interest in all continents, in all the countries, including the United States of America.

Thousands of American citizens, men, women and children, are demonstrating against the American war of aggression in Vietnam and 220 university campuses have declared their voice of protest in a mighty manner against the Nixon policy. If that is not convincing for them, what else can convince them? Though we are a newly liberated country and though we have our friendship and cultural ties with the Indo-Chinese people and though we have carried these relations down the ages till today, we do not say anything about them. That shows the degradation in the thinking of some people who are obsessed with the idea of creating a situation where they will be able to harass this Government from the point of view of narrow partisan politics. We are not a party to that.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Americans have spent 125,000 million dollars on the Vietnamese war and even today nearly 100,000 American troops are there in the Vietnamese soil equipped with all modern weapons such as weapons of destruction of all kinds, napalm bombs, and so on. Even now American bombers are flying over Laos and Cambodia threatening the security and peace of these people. Still my friend did not say anything against that. What has happened to our Indian friends of imperialism?

There was a time, even before our independence, when at the Calcutta Congress in 1927 we invited the Vietnamese freedom fighters to stand side by side with us. Immediately after independence, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru took the initiative of calling a conference on the freedom of the countries of that region and that was held in Delhi in 1947. But in the year of grace 1970, when

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

the great Vietnamese people are fighting with so much courage which would be a pride to any country, we do not even have a word of sympathy for them, let alone support and solidarity. Yet we talk about foreign policy.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should like to point out one thing to the Government in this connection. The Government should take very serious note of the policy of "Vietnamisation of the war." What does it mean? It means prolongation of war. It means revival of the Dulles doctrine of making Asians fight Asians. Shri Chagla said or Shri Ajit Prasad Jain said that SEATO is dead as Dulles is. Yes, Dulles is dead. But Dulles's spirit and Dulles's doctrine are in Nixon's policies and that is why we have found the revival of the slogan of Vietnamisation of the war. It means: let Asians fight Asians. It means prolongation of this devastating war where Asians will fight Asians.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, in Cambodia, South Vietnamese puppet troops were sent in their thousands to attack their neutrality. It is an open, naked invasion conducted by 40,000 United States troops. That is why we say that the United States are still engaged in attacking the liberation forces in Laos and helping their enemies with military equipment and other weapons. And this is being opposed even by the people in the United States of America. Why not say something about that? I should like to know why you do not raise your voice in protest against that? Well, I expected the Leader of the Opposition or others from this side to say something about the freedom for which the Vietnamese are fighting. Probably freedom has been banished from their thinking. We are not for that kind of comprehension or understanding of the foreign policy.

A lot was said about Russia. Many points have been made by our friends here about the map. I should like to say that all wrong maps should be corrected. My friend talked about the other maps. You should talk about all maps. I am all in favour of correction of all maps. It is very desirable and this correction of maps should be according to our Indian maps and not maps prepared elsewhere outside the Indian territory.

What about the other things? Now, you will be surprised to know that Americans do not even admit that Goa is a part of India. Goa is considered by the USA even today, even when I am speaking here, as a part of Portugal, a province of Portugal. But, never have I heard a protest, a voice of protest, nor do I see the elegant face of Smt. Tarakeshwari Sinha appearing before the American Embassy to protest against such a thing. That also I should like to know. Let Smt. Tarakeshwari Sinha go wherever she likes to.

But, certainly she should protest against this!

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): She is not a Member of this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But Dulles is not a Member of this House; Nixon is not a Member of this House.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Is the word 'elegant' unparliamentary? It is only complimentary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is why I say it is a political perversion used in matters of executing the foreign policy. Those who do not protest against those things forfeit their right to protest against the other things and the Government should not listen to them. But, as you know, the Jan Sangh-Swatantra-Syndicate alliance is there!

Sir, I demand here the recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government. Why is it not being given? I should like to know that. Four-fifth of Vietnam is under their control; four-fifth of the population is under their control. But the puppet regime is there.

Why the decision which had been taken earlier for upgrading our Hanoi Mission to ambassadorial level was shelved? I cannot understand that. I also do not know this: A decision was more or less taken for giving full diplomatic recognition to the GDR; but, it has been down-graded to Consular level. Why? Obviously it has been not due to the qualms of conscience of the people, the Treasury Benches, but due to the pressures of the Americans and the West Germans. I say these things because there are many people in the Foreign Ministry who behave, who function, more or less in consultation with the Western diplomats and the Western powers secretly or otherwise. Everybody knows it. Therefore, I demand this thing also.

Now, as far as the Commonwealth is concerned, where do we stand with regard to the Commonwealth? Nothing is being said. Here, that gentleman has come, the Torv Leader has come to power with the vote based mainly on the racist propaganda of Enoch Powell. Nothing is being said about it. I think the Government should withdraw from the Commonwealth. It is an insult to be there. You, some of you, may like to be photographed together. But we do not like it. Even the Queen does not like to be photographed.

Therefore, I ask why you are not coming out of the Commonwealth. I say that we should withdraw from the Commonwealth Secretariat. There is much involvement in the Commonwealth in many ways. Sir, I give you one instance. Shri Krishnamachari was there negotiating the entry into the

Commonwealth Secretariat when Shri Lal Bahadur was the Prime Minister at that time. I talked to him and asked why Shri Krishnamachari was doing such a thing. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri felt surprised and said that he should not have done that, but added that since an expert was doing it, there must be some reason for it. I do not know whether it was due to absent-mindedness that he said so. He went to the Secretariat because of some of our officials and some of our Ministers and still they are not coming out of it. Sir, this is also a question of capitulation in the matter of the foreign policy.

Now, a suggestion has been made that we should have gone to the Djakarta Conference. I think our Government did well by not going there. It was a now-piece put up by the Americans and it has been exposed and it proved absolutely useless to solve any of the problems created by the Americans themselves. I think the Government should be congratulated for once at least having taken a right decision of not going to the Djakarta Conference.

There is talk about the so-called activation of the ICC in Indo-China. There cannot be any activation of the Commission so long as the Americans continue their aggression in this manner, go on bombing the Indo-Chinese countries and so on. Therefore this idea should be abandoned. There is also a suggestion that there should be a new type of Geneva Conference on Indo-China. That has no validity when America is mounting its aggression in the name of Vietnamisation of the war, when they are spreading the war and prolonging it on the Indo-China side, when they accepted to take their stand on what is called, the policy of the position of strength, when they have deadlocked the Paris talks in the name of implementing their policy of position of strength.

It is absurd to make the suggestion that India should support any proposal for the so-called new Geneva type of conference to solve the Indo-China problem or any other problem. India should come out with open, sharp, categorical denunciation of the American war of aggression and call upon the Americans to withdraw lock stock and barrel from the Indo-China soil and that is how India should contribute to bringing peace to that part of the world.

As far as Lusaka is concerned, many suggestions have been made and I also want to make one. I think this Conference will be successful to the extent India and other countries play a constructive and bold part and you can make it a successful one only by taking a firm stand on anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism. That should be the basis. There, Cambodia should be represented by the Prince Sihanouk Government

and India should support it. There the PRG of the Republic of South Vietnam should be allowed to represent. South Vietnam is the only authentic, legal representative and the Government should support it. There the Government should work out a common line of action in concrete terms against American aggression, against the American war, against the policy of blackmail, threat and neo-colonialism and India should seek the cooperation of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with a view to serving the common end.

I welcome the Treaty which has been signed between West Germany and the Soviet Union. It is a great contribution to the detente in Europe, to the cause of European security and general improvement in the international situation. I would like to remind my friend that now the Social Democratic Government is in power. Mr. Brandt is in power, neither Adenauer nor the others who had been there always standing in the way of any kind of understanding and talk with the Soviet Union.

So, before I sit down I urge upon the Government not to succumb to the pressures on the foreign policy by the rightist forces. This is the thin end of the wedge and they want to attack you in the name of foreign policy in order that they can disgrace you and throw you out, in order that they can come to occupy your position. The foreign policy to-day has become a handy weapon for domestic consumption of the forces of right reaction in order to push through the right reactionary aims to the nation as a whole.

Therefore, I demand, that the Central Government should not yield to their pressures. It should on the contrary conform to the foreign policy, give up vacillation and inconsistency, give up the traditional cowardice in the matter of implementation and give a proper, consistent, bold direction for the implementation of the foreign policy for advancing the cause of world peace, national independence and world progress and prosperity. That should be the line and I hope the Congress Members to-day will understand why the rightists are attacking and showing so much interest in the foreign policy. They are trying to rouse passions. That is why they are protesting in front of the Soviet Embassy.

Internally their policy is known to the people and they stand discredited before the eyes of the entire people. That is why the country's foreign policy is being seized by them with a view to creating tension, with a view to whipping up a kind of jingoism so that they may gain respectability. Therefore I warn the Congress Government against any kind of surrender to the Rightist pressure. The Rightists have to be fought if you have

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

to espouse and uphold your foreign policy. The foreign policy has got to be defended, upheld and safeguarded by defeating the Rightist forces, which today have taken this position of a direct and open attack on the foreign policy relying mainly on anti-Sovietism.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): When Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is guiding the Government of India with regard to its policies, even the Chair has to stand and remain standing helplessly listening to him.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will not be able to provide the House with either the eloquence of Mr. S. N. Mishra or that of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. (Interruptions) I would like to state certain facts to the House, and as we have listened to them silently, I would beg of them, particularly the charming lady from Andhra, to listen to me, to have that much patience to listen to me.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I promise to listen to him without an interruption because he will have nothing worth saying.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Sir, it was a few months ago, even during this Session last year, that we were sitting here together. If I remember the date aright, it was on the 16th of November, 1969, that we sat apart. He and his followers began sitting there, and we have been sitting where we had been sitting for the last so many years. (Interruptions) I never made any remark, Mr. Mishra. You may also please keep quiet, and in spite of our differences, I love and treat you as my younger brother. Keep up that tradition. I beg of you.

Sir, during these ten months and a few days much water has flown under the Jumna. Many things have happened, and there has been a certain polarisation in the country, and the spectacles with which we see things have changed because I see that, so far as the map is concerned, from 1956, Russia has been doing it, and all of us, were, till this September-October Session, sitting here. Twenty times the Government of India had made representations since 1956. It is not a new thing, and I would like to inform the House that not only the map of Soviet Russia, as my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, alleged, not only the map of Soviet Russia has been banned; all the maps, which give wrong drawings of India, they have been banned. Not alone the map of Soviet Russia, all the maps have been banned, whether it is from the U.S.A., whether it is from Britain, whether it is from Soviet Russia or from any other country. Just now Mr. Arora drew attention about the map from the UNO. I think that also stands

banned. Sir, he said one thing, which pinched me and distressed me very much, that the Government of India has become—I won't take up all the points that he has covered because the time at my disposal is limited; it distressed me a great deal coming as it did from my erstwhile colleague and friend—that we have become subservient to Soviet Russia.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I said there was such an 'impression'.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: If we say so, we are not doing justice to our country. We may fight the Government; the convention in all the democratic countries is that in domestic affairs they differ a great deal. But in foreign affairs they try to be as near each other as possible.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

In 1927, Pandit Nehru had been to Muzaffarpur, my home District and he addressed a youth conference. There I asked him a question: Sir, what is the attitude of the Labour Party of Great Britain? He said: my dear young man, so far as their internal politics is concerned the conservatives have their own policy; the labour have their own but when they deal with India both are imperialists. Thus he told me in 1927. Now when the Leader of the Opposition says that we are subservient to Soviet Russia, it brings down the image of the country to the extent his personality allows it in the eyes of the world. And what crime have we done during these ten months and a half I want to know. During this period have we not refused to sign the non-proliferation treaty? Have we not protested again and again very loudly about their assistance to Pakistan? Have we not banned their map? But if friendship is possible with Soviet Russia why should we not have it? Are they not a sort of our neighbour beyond the Himalayas? We are accused of turning everybody into our enemies. Now if someone is becoming our friend, and a deeper and deeper friendship grows between us, why should we refuse it? Sir, it was said that we are moving into the clutches of Soviet Russia and the entire case of Mr. Mishra stood demolished when he himself admitted that in the matter of military hardware the West has let us down. I think I am quoting him correctly. Now, the West having let us down what other course was left to us than to purchase these things from Soviet Russia? Suppose we had purchased them, where is the question of subservience? Rather we have served our country.

Then, Sir, Soviet Russia is a country where communism has come to a stage where it has taken certain democratic colour. (Interruptions). This is my view. It is a very

affluent society now, next to America. My friends have gone there; I never had been there. Though I have been a Member of Parliament all these years I have never cared to go anywhere outside our country except to Khatmandu. I am such a homesick person. Though I have had many opportunities I have not gone. Now those who have gone there have seen a sense of freedom in the young men there. And what happened here in India? He said that because we depend on the Communist Party for support therefore we are trying to be friendly with Soviet Russia and be even subservient to it. Perhaps he has forgotten history. In 1962, when China invaded us the Communist Party of India led by Mr. Dange said that this is an invasion of the country. No Communist Party anywhere in the world had ever criticised a sister Communist Party like that. So under the leadership of Mr. Dange the patriotic elements of the Communist Party of India came out and the others who were looking to China said that McMahon Line was a British creation and that it was not an invasion when the Chinese were killing our armies in thousands. They then formed themselves into another party and they did not come into the Communist Party led by Mr. Dange. So this Communist Party has shown that it is a patriotic party. And besides that, have they not opposed us? Only the other day hand in glove with my friend Mr. Mishra they blocked the withdrawal of the Advocates Bill. In the other House, three or four times, they have voted against us on many important issues. During this session, on the no-trust motion they voted for us because it suited them as it was the electoral matter of Kerala. So, they are following an independent line. We are following an independent line. (*Interruption*). My dear lady, I request you to listen to me with patience. You have been in Parliament for years. Let us develop that sort of conditioning to listen to others even if we do not like to hear. I did not like even a word of what Mr. Mishra said, but I listened to him. (*Interruption*). I thought that you have got some respect for me. Because I love him I expected something better, but he accused our party, our Government and our Prime Minister that they are settling their domestic scores through their foreign policy. I say they are settling their domestic scores by hitting us below the belt in our foreign policy. That is my charge against them. I thought that he was incapable of it, but today he has shown that he is capable of doing that. It has distressed me. When I was the Secretary of the BPCC in 1948 a bright young man, leaving college, going to jail and becoming a professor, he came to us and worked with us heart and soul. A very able man, an intellectual type of man, but what has happened his thinking? That is what I am surprised at. I entirely agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta when he says that the

day of organised right reaction in India has set in. What we stand for is not only to demolish the status quo, but to go forward. You see the voting in the Lok Sabha, PSP is sometimes with us and sometimes neutral. But they have never gone against us on crucial issues because we have progressive policies. Even in regard to the SSP, one of their pronounced leaders in the House, has been inimical personally towards the Prime Minister talking all sorts of things under the sun. Another Member is not talking so loudly. Many members of the SSP have been my friends. I am a congress socialist. I have had the honour to be one of the founder-members of the Congress Socialist Party in Bihar, after the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in 1930 and subsequently A.I.C.S.P. in 1934.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, I want you to be the grave-digger of right reaction here.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: No, I believe that one day he will realise it and come here. I am a Gandhian and I am an incorrigible optimist. I do not easily give up my younger brothers. My love for them is greater than anything else.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मिह साहब, आपको कांग्रेस छोड़ कर मांजलिस्ट पार्टी बनाने की जरूरत क्या पड़ी ?

(*Interruption*)

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Acharya Narendra Dev, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Yusuf Meharali came to me in April, 1948 and asked me in April, 1948 to leave the Congress. I respectfully said "No. Congress is like mother to me, I cannot leave the organisation." I was a Congress socialist then. I am a Congress socialist now and I will die a Congress socialist.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Do not die.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: I would beg of him, let him not settle scores with the party in foreign policy matters. Let us have our internal differences. These will go on and the people of India one day will decide whether they are with him or with us. That is another matter, but in respect of foreign policy they should not hit the Government below the belt. My esteemed friend, Mr. Goray, for whom I have great regard made some error. He said neutrality. I would like to tell my very esteemed friend, for whose friendship I rather pine—I have been always his guest in

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha]

Poona—that our policy is a positive policy. Non-alignment is not neutrality. It only means not to be involved in military blocs. It is taking independent decisions and not seeing things through others' eyes. We are friends of Soviet Russia. We are friends of America and so many other countries. We might have differences with America. We might have differences with Soviet Russia and with other countries also, but we see to the good of our country. The biggest aid we have got is from America. The difference between me and my friends, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Mr. Chatterjee and others, lies in this.

They do not speak a sentence without saying imperialist America. But that does harm to our country, because whenever America does a wrong thing either in North Vietnam or in Cambodia or anywhere, we come out with criticism, and you must see that democratic attitude of America that in spite of this criticism they are the country who gave us the greatest help and we cannot be an ungrateful nation. When China invaded us, Mr. Khrushchev had all friendship for us, but because of the mutual assistance pact with China he could not give us hardware. It was America, it was England, which gave us hardware. We cannot forget that. When we fought Pakistan, it was Soviet Russia who helped us. We cannot forget that also. So, if you say against our friendship with America, we are not going to listen to that. If you say against our friendship with Soviet Russia, we are not going to listen to that. I assure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that we are not going to be pressurised by rightist or ultra-leftist forces. We are going to follow, as Buddha said, the middle path whatever happens.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Sir, during the entire course of the debate a kind of miasma has been sought to be created, a kind of mist has been sought to be created to the effect that as far as the foreign policy of the Indian Government is concerned that foreign policy is progressive, and to that misconception or misleading idea my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has also added a lot. Sir, I do not know who plays the game, the Congress ruling party or the Congress organisation, because they say that they are progressive, and the Congress organisation says in spite of what Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha has said praising Americans, "No, no, whatever you say, you are too pro-Soviet". I do not know who plays the game for whom. The point is this. If we had an analysis of the history of the foreign relations of India, we find that the attitude of India at the foreign relations level has been consistently pro-imperialist. There is not a shade of progressivism in it. I shall give you one instance after another.

Sir, going back to the question of Congo, does the country forget, have the people of this country forgotten that when the Belgian imperialists wanted to stage a come-back in Congo with the help of the local reactionaries, it was our Indian troops—shame of it—who stood by and saw to it that Mr. Lumumba was handed over to that gangster Tshombe, and it was our Indian troops who stood by and saw Mr. Lumumba assassinated? Sir, is that an anti-imperialist attitude or is it an attitude of connivance at imperialist slaughter and murder of the patriots in that part of the World? That is one instance.

Look at another instance also. Look at the history of the struggle in South Vietnam or in Vietnam itself. I am referring to Vietnam with particular emphasis because Vietnam is the crucible in which you can test who is pro-imperialist and who is anti-imperialist. In Vietnam we have found when the so-called lackey Government of South Vietnam invited the American and tried to massacre the patriotic forces there, do you know what happened in 1962? In 1962 in the summer there was a large-scale protest of public opinion against interference of American forces in the internal affairs of Vietnam. There was pressure on the American Government so that the American forces should withdraw from there. At that time Lord Home of the British Government asked the International Control Commission to give immediately a report, and on 2nd June, 1962, as the Indian Government dances to the tune of the imperialists, the interim report came and in interim report, contrary to what has been said in all the other eleven reports that went before it, contrary to the content of all those eleven reports, in this report the Indian Government representative and the Canadian Government representative said that North Vietnam was committing aggression in South Vietnam, because if that were not said, Lord Home or President Kennedy of America would not have been able to satisfy American opinion that it was necessary to keep the American forces there. Lord Home wanted a report and the lackey that the Indian Government was, its representative prepared the Interim Report, the Report of June 2, 1962. And the allegations were vague allegations, contrary to the North Vietnam's allegation that the South Vietnamese Government was inviting the American troops, American tanks and American planes. In the External Affairs Ministry's Report of 1965-66, I think some well-meaning gentleman operating or working in the Foreign Office said that as far as South Vietnam is concerned, the stand of the Indian Government is this that the American forces must be withdrawn. I have got that Report with me. You know, Sir—immediately thereafter there was a furore and I think that poor gentleman who wrote that perhaps in the belief that the Indian Government means what it says, has been, we understand, removed from the Foreign

Office for writing that. And in the succeeding Reports of the External Affairs Ministry you know, Sir, that that particular passage has been deleted. And we do not find in any of the Reports of the External Affairs Ministry that particular sentence any longer that the American forces have to be withdrawn from Vietnam.

Then, again, we are talking of non-alignment. What is non-alignment? It is merely a talk. If it is non-alignment, why do we dance to the tune of the American imperialists? Why do we obey their dictates and mandates when they said, "Do not trade with North Vietnam", when they told the Indian Government not to trade with North Vietnam, when they told the Indian Government not to trade with Cuba? And we are following the dictates of the American imperialists. If we were really non-aligned, if it was true that we would not take any sides, then what prevented us from disobeying the American mandate and what prevented us from disobeying the order of the American imperialists that we should not trade with Cuba or that we should not trade with North Vietnam? But then the Americans ordered and we obeyed, and still we have to hear voices from those Benches, though in a different key, that the Indian Government's policy has throughout been anti-imperialist.

Then, again, what about the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam? There has been many dragging of the feet as far as this question is concerned. Now, in a fit of generosity, I do not know why the Indian Government invited Madame Binh of South Vietnam. And immediately when Madame Binh came to India, well, Sardar Swaran Singh who was then the External Affairs Minister, began to develop cold feet and the gentleman . . . Well, he was certainly a gentleman unless objective situations or tenets, according to our theory, no man is a gentleman unless objective situations or objective conditions compel him to be a gentleman. The objective conditions at that particular moment were that the American imperialists would not like us to invite Madame Binh and would not like us to give a proper treatment to her. And so what happened? Sardar Swaran Singh, though she was the guest of the External Affairs Minister, did not have the courage to go and meet and receive Madame Binh.

Now, Sir, we have heard so far that as far as the Indian delegation from South Vietnam is concerned, the Indian delegation was not received by the Prime Minister. That was a pose of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister knows how to strike poses. It was also a pose. It was quite clear that even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who says so much on so many occasions in favour of the Government, even he also criticised her on the floor of the House that Mrs. Gandhi refused

to be photographed with Madame Binh. Mrs. Gandhi was willing to be photographed with Nabakumar Sain in Burdwan who, according to many of us, is not a good social element, according to us an anti-social element. She was willing to be photographed with a man like that.

But as far as Madam Binh was concerned, Mrs. Gandhi was not willing even to be photographed. Even Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has criticised that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not mention that thing today.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: You have mentioned it earlier. Look at the way in which the American forces have over-run Cambodia. The American forces made a massive invasion on Cambodia on the floor of the House. In spite of political differences, many persons here have spoken for Cambodia, how Cambodia was invaded by America in a massive way. But, Sir, when we asked Mr. Swaran Singh here on the floor of the House whether he is going to continue the recognition of the Simhanouk Government, is he going to withdraw the representation to the Lon Nol Government, Mr. Swaran Singh kept silent, would not even reply to this. Are these signs of anti-imperialist attitude?

Look at also the question of raising the Consular representation in North Vietnam to the Ambassadorial level. We have been crying hoarse over it. But the Indian Government would not do it. Why? Because the Indian Government knows that if it does that, they will make them American masters angry. I am using the word "masters" deliberately. It is true, as Mr. Awadheshwara Prasad Sinha said, because America is giving them very big aid. Therefore, they cannot afford to make the Americans angry. They cannot afford to incur their displeasure by raising the status of the Indian Mission to the Ambassadorial level in Vietnam.

Sir, this is not all. Look at the way in which Rhodesia and the South African Government are conducting themselves. Rhodesia and South Africa are under racist regimes. Unheard of cruelties are being perpetrated. Even then the Indian Government has not the courage to come out of the British Commonwealth. They must sit in the same British Commonwealth with the racist regime heads like Mr. Smith and others of the South African Government who indulge in murder and racist cruelties against the African population there. I am saying all these things in order to show that the Indian Government has never had to its credit any anti-imperialist action. It has always compromised with the imperialists. If it has gone sometimes to the Soviet Union,

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

it has gone to the Soviet Union for material help. When the Suharto regime was installed in Indonesia, it came into force on the heaps of the dead that he murdered there. The Suharto regime was embraced with obvious glee and joy by the Indian Government. But we say that the Indian Government is against imperialism. This is the kind of mistaken notion that is given to us. I do not know in whose interest.

As far as I am concerned, Sir, I think that the C.P.I. may have a design in saying so. I wonder if the C.P.I. would say that they do not understand it. It understands that the Indian Government has no anti-imperialist attitude. But then the C.P.I. is sliding down the path of revisionism. They say that since Mr. Haksar is the Principal Secretary of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, it must be a socialist Government. If a renegade communist is made the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, it is taken as if the judiciary is a socialist judiciary. That is the theory. The whole point is this. This came out in a speech of one of the hon'ble Members there. Why actually the Indian Government is not as anti-imperialist as it should be? Look at the South Vietnam situation. In the South Vietnam we find that the Indian commercial community control the entire textile business. They control the entire import-export business in South Vietnam. This Indian big business, the Indian trading class, in South Vietnam are reactionaries. Their interest coincides with the reactionary interest of the American imperialists. These Ministers in the Government, whom do they represent?

They do not represent the toiling people. I think that nobody on that bench will say that the Indian Government here represents the toiling people. They certainly represent the monopoly interests of the country. The Congress (Organisation) is representing one set of monopoly interests and the Ruling Congress is representing another set of monopoly interests. Therefore, when the Indian Government is representing the monopoly interests and the big bourgeois of India, at least a certain section of the big bourgeois of India, that Government cannot have any progressive foreign policy. It must have the foreign policy of the class which it represents. And that class is the class of the monopolists, the class of the big bourgeois, the class of the big capitalists.

I am concluding by saying that I have found in this House a conspiracy, a conspiracy of silence or a conspiracy of abetment, and in this conspiracy, I found that the Opposition and with the Ruling Congress in trying to create an atmosphere of make-believe, as if the Indian Government is following a progressive, anti-imperialist

foreign policy. That is a conspiracy which is meant to deceive the people of India. I know they are feeling the pinch of what I say. On behalf of my party, I have to say that it is a misleading attitude, created by them and abetted by the CPI, the Congress (Organisation) and others. I think, Sir, the people of India will know what is what and what is the kind of foreign policy this Government is pursuing.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while standing to speak for the first time...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Arun Prakash Chatterjee does not seem to have read carefully their own party programme.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No interruptions.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is his maiden speech.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: So, while standing to speak for the first time in this national forum, enjoying as it does an unlimited right of speech and sovereign authority, I may be pardoned if I still reflect mundane ideas of a common man outside because neither have I the political passion and the sanction which goes with that passion, nor have I the mass base which is needed probably in a system of parliamentary democracy. But what I have I submit with all modesty in order to strike a balance in this debate of extreme importance.

Sir, what is needed at the moment probably is that the foreign policy, as the Leader of the Opposition has rightly pointed out, has to be restored back to its national prestige and importance. One of the outstanding needs of our times is to see that certain policies become policies of National consensus, policies of agreement at least on the essential ingredients. National interest is uppermost in the mind of every party. And I should imagine that in this age when the politics of India is the politics of national reconstruction of modernisation and change, and of building civilisation on egalitarian foundations, it is possible to find some common consensus, provided objective attempts are made by all parties, of all ideological hues and shades. It is a tragedy—at least it looks so from the outside—that people here do not attach importance to some of the operative principles of a parliamentary democracy, like considering certain policies as being above party lines. Bi-partisanship has been one of the strong planks of a traditional democracy like the United States of America, for instance.

Even in India during the first phase, that is, from 1917 to 1959 foreign policy had

acquired a form of national consensus. I should, therefore, very strongly plead that the politics of sensationalism and polemical passion should give way to a policy of sober evaluation and of realistic appraisal of the foreign policy as a basic commitment of all the parties. The parliamentary system is based unavoidably on the interaction of all ideological parties and groups. In the formulation of any foreign policy by any Government belonging to any party, the opinions particularly of organised groups, organised interests, organised parties, are taken into account.

Sometimes I feel that probably the luxury which we are affording of running a parliamentary government has to be appreciated by those who are the sovereign representatives of the people sitting here and in the other House because we just cannot sidetrack the main issues and emphasise issues which are only of peripheral or partisan value. My own impression is that if we have a cost analysis made of the time and money spent on this sovereign Parliament, probably, we shall not be able to feel happy and complimented by the results.

Much time is occasionally taken on issues which are of trivial importance. With due respect to the Opposition parties, I may say, for example, the question of the map in the Soviet encyclopaedia which has been mentioned here has taken far too much of our time. It is true and it is very unfortunate that even a country which has been our biggest supporter in the international forum—let us remember that fact as it is not a fact of low importance—should have issued such a map. But as a point of operational politics I would like to ask: should we allow our foreign policy to be impaired only because of certain excesses on the part of the otherwise friendly Soviet Union? From a logical point of view it can be argued differently. When the United Nations maps have shown, even with an explanatory footnote which has been read out in this House, certain parts of India as disputed territories, and not as an integral part of the sovereign identity of India, then as a loyal member of the UN, the Soviet Union is exactly doing what others might well be expected to do. I am just drawing attention to the fact that one might argue in that line. But the whole point is: should so much of time be spent on such obviously tertiary issues? Should so much of time be spent, for instance, on references in Professor Galbraith's book?

May I now draw the attention of the House to what I would like to call as the futile crescendo of sentimentalist nationalists, pampered by certain political coteries demanding manufacture of nuclear bombs. I feel unhappy and alarmed with the whole

proposition that the policy of the Government of India should be directed towards nuclearization of the defence structure. On the contrary, I submit that the Government's basic policy should be based on the identification of national interests, on the maximization of national interests, rather than on less basic issues. It is strange that the otherwise sophisticated minds who ought to know better, in season and out of season, implore that India must explode an atom bomb. They seem to say that the entire prestige of India, the entire stability of India as a world power, depends on the explosion of the nuclear device. Let us carefully examine this approach. It is from one angle inconsequential. As a matter of fact, one might attempt to question the wisdom of China in this regard, though they had their own specific problems, and one might try to question the wisdom of those powers who are exploding atom bombs, rather ourselves succumb to this approach than emulate them. All this talk appears somewhat unrealistic also particularly when we remember that the cost of nuclear war-heads is too high. In India some learned professor has calculated it as Rs. 750 crores as if it is too small an amount. Another professor has calculated it as Rs. 1250 crores as if it is not too large an amount. The whole point is even if we have a delivery system, even if we have intercontinental ballistic missiles, how is it going to solve our national problems? Are we thinking seriously that we shall use the atom bombs on any country? Are we sincerely thinking that it is possible for any other country to use the atom bomb on us? I would say that this sensationalism will build an atmosphere of psychosis of war, an atmosphere of national alarm and needless unhappiness. We have been always comparing ourselves with Japan in terms of economic development. Why are we not emulating the example of Japan in terms of its policy towards nuclear armament? The prestige of a country, the power potential of a country, is not equivalent to its fighting power in terms of force. One has to make a distinction between 'power' and 'force'.

Now, let me mention another point. There is a diminution in our Afro-Asian image due to our hesitancy in taking initiatives on larger problems and needless extrication from major challenges, like the completion of the de-colonization process. By a mechanistic interpretation of non-alignment we have needlessly withdrawn from our Afro-Asian involvement. Alignment is neither isolationism, nor withdrawal from responsibility, nor neutrality in the classical sense of the word, but a capacity for creative role in international politics. Non-alignment has been the framework of our foreign policy, but not a substitute for a foreign policy itself. Now at a time when the operational

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

validity of non-alignment is more apparent, when the world has changed from unilinear bipolar block system, to polycentric multi-polar system, non-alignment as a framework has acquired a new perspective.

6 P.M.

We have sometimes abstained from taking a very active part as was expected of us in the Afro-Asian affairs. I feel that probably the mechanistic interpretation of India's foreign policy has made us somewhat shy in our attempts to take a bold initiative. I am not particularly thinking of West Asia at this moment. Even in other areas, for instance, in the countries of South East Asia where part of their culture and civilization has an Indian origin, we ought to take a more positive interest. There are certain schools of thought and certain political parties which have certain views about India's involvement in West Asia due to their reservations about the Arabs in particular and the Islamic world in general. For this reason, some people think that the Islamic world or the Arab bloc is not to be made a very important part of our foreign policy operation. Well, I don't agree with this, but let us pass on to South East Asia. We are not taking the type of initiative which is expected of us even in Cambodia, Laos or Vietnam. Either we take initiative out of all proportions to the specific need of the areas, which are not called for, or we suddenly shy away from taking any initiative at all.

There is, therefore, the necessity of building up, as Shri Bhupesh Gupta has pointed out, a national perspective and a macro-approach for the conduct of our foreign policy. If in a parliamentary democracy, the political elite is to formulate the policy and bureaucracy is to implement it, then we cannot depend entirely on the notings of the bureaucracy for all the time. What we are now following is, if I may say so, *ad hocism* and piecemeal approaches based on the impulses of the moment. It is time that with all the available wisdom and understanding certain actions are taken. But unless we have a broad macro-view of India's national interest and what ought to be India's regional policies and what ought to be her global strategies, we can neither expect the political elite to formulate a coherent foreign policy nor the bureaucracy to implement it meaningfully.

In the end I would emphasise on the desirability of building up a regional image which ought to occupy a very important part of our foreign policy. My own feeling is that in Asia particularly not to speak of Afro-Asia or the entire under-developed world, we have to build a credible image. It can be built on two counts. It can be built when we are able to creatively identify our national interest with the expanding power

equation in the world. It can also be built when we are capable of linking up our national interests with the larger interests of the developing world struggling against remnants of colonialism, and by building India as a force in the vanguard of modernisation, by building India as an alternative model of growth and by building India as a peaceful democratic country whose strength and power shall not rest on the explosion of atom bombs.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I want to be very brief in my observations. A number of issues have been raised in this debate. There was a reference to the forthcoming Lusaka conference. My hon. friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta mentioned that the main issue should be to build up an anti-imperialist front. While I quite agree with him that imperialism is evident in Africa and in Vietnam, we should not get over-obsessed with it as African nations had been with this problem of colonialism and anti-imperialism. The main issue before the conference would be to find a reasonable and exact solution for the middle-east dispute. As far as the Middle-East issue is concerned, it is well known that left to himself, unharassed by his critics and opponents, President Nasser would like to reach a just and reasonable settlement with Israel. I do not think that India should gang up with other people in denouncing him. We have to tell Israel to vacate the areas occupied by them in the six-day war, but we must also advise the Arab nations to recognise realities, namely that Israel has come to stay, it cannot be wished away and it cannot be destroyed. That is the first point I would like to make in the debate.

The second point is this: I have tabled an amendment regarding the treatment of Indians in Great Britain. I want to read only two or three lines from the "Statesman" which is a paper, associated with the British for a long time:

"... The number of those who get past the immigration barrier without too much difficulty is decreasing while a growing number are subjected to harassing cross-examinations and even deportation without apparent reason..."

I am told that the Indian High Commissioner in London has been making protests, strong, mild or feeble. I do not think that we can rest content with these protests.

According to a survey conducted by the Race Relations Board in Great Britain, it is expected that the persons of Indian origin in 1986 would be in the region of about 8,00,000. There are about 2,00,000 persons of Indian origin in the U.K. We do not want to have a third class status in the Commonwealth. If, for any reason, we are unable to see that Indians in Great Britain are spared from indignities or if they are

asked to reside in segregated areas, then Britain is also following the policy of *apartheid* and we should make it clear that we do not want to stay in the Commonwealth. At least this warning should be uttered by our Government in the interest of our national honour and self-respect. There is very little left in the Commonwealth after Mr. Heath's frantic attempt to enter the ECM. We are going to sell tea to Great Britain, whether we are in the Commonwealth or out of it.

And, the third point I would like to make is this: It is the closing down of the libraries run by Embassies in certain centres as a result of an unfortunate mishap to an unauthorised Soviet building in Trivandrum. Sir, on this point I feel that I would have no objection to the Soviet Union having Information Centres in various parts of the country, I would also like the American Embassy to have its Information Centres and I understand that the closure of the American Information Centres in various States has already created serious problems in Indo-American relations and that talks are going on between the Ambassador, Mr. Keating and our Foreign Minister, about removing the difficulties that have arisen. I feel that in the interest of better international understanding, we should re-open these libraries. A large number of persons are depending on these libraries for reading material and it will be a very sad day if our relations with the USA get worsened as a result of the closure of the libraries which has led actually to the Government taking action on the protest made in various parts of the country.

Sir, in this House, a reference was made by my hon. friend, Shri Mariwamy, to the BBC correspondent. I thoroughly disapprove and deplore the screening of that film, that horrible film, about Calcutta.—I have not seen that—on the TV in Great Britain. But, as a journalist, I believe in free information. I object to what the "Radio Peace and Progress" says. But, I would not like the correspondent to be expelled. If we think of asking the BBC to wind up their show here and asking their representative to leave this country, I think we will create a very bad image outside India, namely, that we are at heart not a democratic country. I want the Moscow Radio; I want the Tass representative also to be here; I want the BBC representative also to send his versions to the BBC network, however inconvenient it may be to us.

You are also a journalist. You remember how we journalists did not like these restrictions on the free flow of information. We hope the Minister of Foreign Affairs will not be stampeded by outcries in England and in our own country into taking a false step which will create a very bad impression of India as a free country in the democratic

part of the world. These were the three observations that I wanted to make and—I have confined myself to the time-limit which you have kindly prescribed for me.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD (Kerala):

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the international policy of any country would definitely reflect the policy of the world itself. Foreign affairs is the concern of the nation as a whole. The lives of the common people all over the world have become inter-connected to-day. The strength of the country does not belong to military strength but the economic strength, its industrial development, its technology and other all-round development of the country definitely would be the strength of the country as a whole. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the founder of our foreign policy, it is he who has laid down the foreign policy of India. His main theme was 'Live and let live' and his message of peace was spread throughout the length and breadth of the world when he lived. Even though to-day he is no more, his message of peace and his message of 'Live and let live' is quite fresh in the memory of every Indian, every boy or girl. Economic cooperation between nations is absolutely necessary for the success of the peaceful co-existence. In moulding the foreign policy of India, the interests of our country should be the foremost. We need not mould our foreign policy to suit Russia or America. We will have to mould our foreign policy and our international policy not only to suit our conditions but to suit to the policy which would take India to the topmost place of the world map. That policy alone could survive and Pandit Nehru had rightly adopted the policy of non-alignment. Many have said that the world has changed, things are changing and we should also change our foreign policy. I am rightly of the view that even though the world is changing, the time has not come for us to change our foreign policy. Our non-alignment policy should continue. Our policy of co-existence should continue so that our country would go to the topmost of the world map. Much has been said about Russia and many have said that we have become the tool of Russia. I am not able to agree with that view. It is true that we are friendly with Russia and it is that country that has helped us when we were desperate with regard to the Kashmir issue. Russia was with us when no other country was helping us and when one country is helping us, definitely in return we should also extend our helping hand to that country. Becoming friendly with one country does not mean that we have become the slave of that country and I am of the view that we should maintain our friendship with Russia so that, as pointed out by learned Mr. Chagla here, it has some tradition, it has history as to how both Russia and India became friends.

That tradition should be maintained for our own benefit.

[Shri Hamid Ali Schamnad]

One word about Pakistan. Sir, it is unfortunate that, in spite of our earnest desire, Pakistan has not extended a friendly hand towards India. Our leaders have done their utmost to be friendly with Pakistan, our next door neighbour, and it is in the interests of Pakistan, Sir, to be friendly with India, so that Pakistan and India could go together hand in hand. Then only both the people of the countries of Pakistan and India could go to the topmost, and it is in the interests of Pakistan that they should extend their hand of friendship, but at the same time I appeal to the Government of India not to sacrifice their fundamental principles, not to sacrifice their basic principles when they go for any talks with Pakistan. Let me also hope that Russia will influence Pakistan. They are today very friendly with Pakistan. So let me hope that they will definitely make use of their position and see that Pakistan come round and they also extend their hand of friendship to India. Let me fully support the stand taken by the Government of India today, and say that the time has not come for us to change our non-alignment policy.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir I have always been a supporter of the non-alignment policy. I believe in it and I think it is the only policy that India could have accepted. Friends who have spoken before me have advanced many arguments in favour of non-alignment. But there is another fundamental argument also in favour of it and that is that we accepted socialism and democracy as our ideals, as our objectives. Then, in this world there are the two blocs of powers. On one side there is the bloc of socialists but democracy is not there. On the other side democracy is there but socialism is not there. If we believe in democracy and socialism, both, we, on ideological basis also would not align ourselves with either this Bloc or that Bloc. Therefore this is a fundamental question. It is not a question of this advantage or that advantage, or this conference or that conference. This is a fundamental question of our ideals, which we cannot forgo. I remember that this policy was very much appreciated in Europe in 1949, 1950 and 1951, when I used to go there, because the Europeans thought that the third World War was nearer and the gap between the Second World War and the Third World War will not be as long as that between the First World War and the Second World War. Fortunately, we have passed twenty-five years of peace in that sense, and the credit must go and goes to India also for creating that atmosphere. Sir, at that time, when we adopted this non-alignment policy there was a strong section in India which used to say, "Why should we not align ourselves with this Bloc or that

Bloc?" And there was some sense in it which we could have understood. After the last World War, West Germany became more devastated than India, but West Germany has built itself up economically more rapidly than India. (Interruptions) But India has not been able to do it. There are more than one reason for this, I know. Among other reasons, one reason is that West Germany did not spend much money on its defence, while India had to. Because we were non-aligned, therefore we had to spend money. And if that money had not to be provided in the Budget of the Defence, if that money could be saved and put to use on developmental works, then India might have economically progressed much faster than what has been the case.

But that time is gone. Now the question of an alternative to non-alignment is not there because the world is not in a position and we are not in a position to align ourselves with anybody. So far as the question of policy is concerned I agree with it. But so far as its implementation is concerned, so far as the details are concerned, there are so many lapses, so many weaknesses and so many defects. I will not go into those details because I have no time to give all those details just now. But what is the fundamental reason that our voice is not heard with that attention and respect with which it used to be heard, that we are unable to influence the opinion of the world as we used to do? To me there are two reasons and both of them can be linked into one also. One is that we are not as strong as we should have been. If we were strong enough then the world might have listened to us with more attention. In India today politically we are not strong. There are eight or ten political parties, no party with a clear majority, no party in a position to implement what it says; we are politically weak and economically we have not developed that much of strength that the world will listen to us. Therefore the implementation of our policy is bound to be defective or bound to go by default. Now, another reason is this: What are the instruments for implementing our foreign policy? In the beginning when we won independence we selected as our ambassadors good public men who could express freely without caring what the Government of India thinks of it and who were prepared to suffer the consequences but lately the process has been that in every walk of life the ICS people have replaced all of them. Take for example the ambassadors; a pretty large number of them are there. This is not an administrative job, this is a political job. What I mean to say is that an ambassador must have the confidence of expressing himself even if the Government of India differs from it. We cannot expect this from the ICS people. They have not been trained for it; they were not recruited for it.

They were recruited. You will excuse my strong language if it is—before independence and what were the terms between the employer and the employees? The terms were that they will help the Britishers, support them, allow them to rule over this country and continue to keep this country slave. These were the terms between the employer and the employees and how can we expect these ICS people to go to other countries, become ambassadors and report from there that the policy followed and pursued by the Government of India is not liked by the people of those countries? I will give you one instance. At the time of the Suez Canal dispute the attitude that we took up was very much disliked by the Britishers, the public as a whole. They will spit at our faces if they found us in the streets. Now a public man could give the report even if Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru did not like it that our policy has not been appreciated by the people of England but can we expect the ICS people to write like that? They will say that it has been appreciated; only a small section is not in favour; that kind of thing they will say. It is a two-way traffic. Unless the Foreign Office in Delhi gets correct reports from those countries, unless they get the impressions of those Governments correctly, they are bound to commit mistakes while framing their policies.

Therefore, mistakes are committed. Firstly, we are not strong enough either politically or economically. Secondly, the formulation of policy is dependant on these people. Now, we find there are ICS people. Then, we have taken a fancy to Judges. Absolutely two mentalities are there. A Judge, a man trained in the judiciary as a Judge, cannot be a diplomat to the extent that we want him. When they fail as diplomats we appoint them as Governors and as Governors also they will fail because Judges are not trained either as administrators or as politicians. They will take the balance, the symbol of the judiciary, the Supreme Court. Then, they will start weighing and by the time the whole thing is over and the balance only will be there. Therefore, they are not trained that way. I take strong objection to the employment of the Judges of the Supreme Court and the High Court during the last three years the Government of India have employed 36 retired Judges in different jobs. I think it is corrupting the judiciary. They should not be given any job after retirement. We can raise their age of retirement. Why should a Judge of the High Court retire at 62 when a Judge of the Supreme Court retires at 65? Is it because a Judge of the Supreme Court is expected to be less alert than a Judge of the High Court? A High Court Judge has to retire at 62. When a Government servant is not good enough at 58, he is good enough to be the Judge of a High Court up to 62. When he is not good enough to be a High Court Judge

after 62, he is good enough to be a Judge of the Supreme Court till 65.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM: I am concluding. I do not want to go into the details, as some of my friends have done. Mr. Arjun Arora gave a list of half-a-dozen lapses on the part of the Government. I think he was supporting indirectly Mr. S. N. Mishra. Mr. Mishra is not so well acquainted and well informed as to give all the information about the lapses of the Government of India. The Leader of the Opposition was not as well informed about the lapses of the Government of India and the Members of the Treasury Benches and he supplied that information.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I really do not know how much I should say, as my speech is starting at 6.30 P.M., but in deference to the desire of the House I will try to cover as many points as possible. May be, I would be taxing the patience of hon. Members who have been sitting long hours and who have been devoting so much time to this debate. Before I say anything, I would like to say, in all humility, that I have been greatly impressed by the level of the debate. This House has not debated, for some years, foreign affairs, although certain specific issues have come up here from time to time. Now, after several years it has been a full-dress debate.

I myself remember having discussed external affairs in the upper House when I held charge for some years and after a long time I have heard some very informative and valuable speeches from the leaders of the various parties in the House.

Another thing, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that I would like to say is that except for some exceptions generally the approach has been very balanced and an attempt has been made to highlight important aspects of our foreign policy and very concrete suggestions have been thrown up for which I am extremely grateful, and I will study all these various aspects in depth and I must say that I have greatly benefited by this debate. There have of course been extremes and I will not start by mentioning the extremes on either side. But if I may say that the Jan Sangh spokesman, my dear friend Shri Niranjan Varma, assisted by the Swatantra leader, Shri Mariswamy, on one extreme of the spectrum and Mr. Chatterjee on the other—although I must apologize that I was not here to listen to his speech, but I have very carefully gone through the copious notes that have been kept of his speech—if I may say that by applying even the normal mathematical norm of striking a

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

mean, that is, if Mr. Nirajan Varma plus Mr. Mariswamy plus Mr. Chatterjee, if that is divided by three, then probably. . .

SHRI S. D. MISRA: How can you do that?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Have you forgotten even elementary mathematics? If we did that, probably the truth would be somewhere near that. So, I would like the three speeches to be put in one box and try to sort out their differences because to my mind they are so irreconcilable that it will be futile for me to go into each and every item and then try to contradict the extreme statements that have been made on one side or the other. But it does leave an impression in my mind that such extreme suggestions made on either side do throw up a situation where the realities of the situation are not properly appreciated, and sometimes although Government is blamed of carrying on a policy and not modulating it or changing it with the changed circumstances, one is amazed at some of these hardened attitudes taken by some of our extremist parties of the right and the left—if I may say, violet on one side and red on the other; if my physics is correct, I think violet is the shortest wavelength and red is the longest wavelength, and somehow the extreme ends of the spectrum do not appear ever to coincide—one feels amazed at the repetition of catch-phrases some of which are found in plenty in foreign news papers of the parties whose slogans influence their judgment, and they repeat absolutely *ad nauseum* some of those catch-phrases and clichés with which all of us are familiar. I have no intention to indulge in any clichés or slogans and I will try to present as impersonal a picture of the present international situation as possible, and I will also touch upon some of our national interests connected with external affairs and with the foreign policy that we are pursuing.

Several hon. Members have laid stress on improving our relations with neighbours. I would like to say that this aspect is of the highest importance for India and I am personally greatly involved in this thinking and this philosophy. I ardently believe that the central theme in our policy should be to have the best of relations with our neighbours. Let us now see our present state of relationship with our neighbours. We have got on the eastern side Burma. I am very happy to report to the House that our relations with Burma are excellent.

His Excellency, Chairman Ne Win, visited us only a few weeks back and he exchanged ideas with our Prime Minister and other leaders in a very frank manner. And there are no problems between India and

Burma and we are living as good neighbours, cooperating with each other in every possible manner. The boundary between India and Burma is being demarcated and there is no boundary dispute between our two countries, and it is a happy thing for me to report that our relations with Burma are in every way excellent. We are cooperating in a variety of ways. Even in the matter of tackling our own problems in our north eastern part which are not very dissimilar to the problems which Burma faces in their northern region, there is an exchange of information and understanding between our two countries on all these issues.

On the northern side we have got Nepal. The House is no doubt aware that the Foreign Minister of Nepal accepted my invitation and he was with us along with a strong team of Secretaries to Government, and we had occasion to discuss matters of mutual interest. We have, as the House is no doubt aware, a unique relationship with Nepal. Our border with Nepal is an open border and Indians can go into Nepal without any restriction, without any passport. And the Nepalese can come to India without any restriction, without any passport. There is free movement of goods between the two countries. And our Treaty on Transit and Trade is due to expire by the end of October and the two countries are now negotiating the Treaty and I have every reason to hope that there will be agreement which will be mutually acceptable to both the countries and which will be to the mutual benefit of the two countries. We are close neighbours and there are old cultural relations, and we are involved in the economic development and industrial growth of Nepal and we will do everything that we can to strengthen this relationship and to work together for the mutual benefit of the two countries. We respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nepal, and whatever may be their system, we, as good neighbours, have got excellent relations with Nepal.

About Ceylon, we have also very friendly relations with them. I am sorry that one hon. Member talked in a manner about Ceylon which does not reflect our traditional friendship with Ceylon. Ceylon, like us, is following a democratic way of life, and which party comes into power there, is their own concern, and we should be prepared to deal in a friendly, good neighbourly manner with whatever may be the government. Mrs. Bandaranaike had been Prime Minister before. And one of the most crucial matters which had been defying solution, the problem of persons of Indian origin, was settled when Mrs. Bandaranaike was the Prime Minister, and she and our late Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, signed an agreement about the future of persons of Indian origin there. And we hope, that, this matter having been satisfactorily concluded in the form of an agreement, that

our relations in the economic field and in the political field in every way will grow from strength to strength.

I am sorry that some hon. Members tried to show that there are likely to be any difficulties. I will beg of them not to say things of the type which might unnecessarily create suspicion in the minds of our good neighbours, the Ceylonese. We have traditional friendship with them, and that—is the spirit in which we should always deal with our neighbours and we should never give the impression that we are trying either to dominate them or that we are not careful about their susceptibilities.

Then we have got Afghanistan and Iran on the Western side beyond Pakistan. I am purposely not mentioning two countries about which I will have to say something in detail later. Our relations with Afghanistan, as the House is no doubt aware, have always been very friendly and we have always admired the brave Afghan for their bravery and for their patriotism and for their fervour for national independence which we greatly admire. It is true that with Iran our relations had not been as close some years back. But I would like to say that we have over the last few years, established some very valuable links in the economic field with Iran. His Imperial Majesty, the Shah of Iran, paid a visit to us some time back. We have several projects of collaboration between our two countries in oil, and in several other fields, and this is creating a sense of understanding between our two countries. It is no doubt correct that Iran and Pakistan and Turkey are close to each other and they have, what is called, a Regional Co-operation Union formed between these three countries. There may also be a military content of that. But there is no reason why we should not try to establish and normalise our relations with those countries who may be friendly and close to Pakistan. And in this category I place Iran and Turkey. We are definitely improving our relations with Iran and I can say that they are much closer, and I do not see why this friendship cannot grow whatever may be their relationship with Pakistan.

I have accepted an invitation of the Turkish Foreign Minister to pay a visit to Turkey and I intend to go to Turkey in the course of the next two or three months. This is how we intend to improve our relations with the Asian countries.

I would also like to add what was commented upon by my very esteemed friend, Mr. Chagla, who has been my colleague in the Government, that I attach, just as he does, the highest importance to developing close relations with Asian countries, and it will be my endeavour to pursue a line which would strengthen our relations not only with the immediate neighbour but

also with other Asian countries in South-East Asia as also in West Asia.

I would also like to mention in this connection the recent visit of the Foreign Minister of Japan. He was here with us for three days and I had long discussions with him extending over several hours. We exchanged views on political problems of Asia and also on problems of world peace. We also went into bilateral relations and also economic relations between our two countries. The Foreign Minister, on return to his country, after paying a visit to Pakistan, has made very good statements about his stay here and about his talks and discussions with us. We are trying to establish close relations with all Asian countries.

While on this issue, I would like to dispose of one point which has been mentioned by several hon'ble Members as this relates to this region. They asked why we did not go to Jakarta when some of our Asian friends convened a conference. I would like to say, Your Excellency . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Mr. Deputy Chairman.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: As Foreign Minister I use the words "Your Excellency" too much. So sometimes I can take the liberty of addressing the Chair as Your Excellency.

SHRI A. D. MANI: He is real Excellency.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: You will put up with me, Mr. Deputy Chairman. An explanation is due as to why we did not go to Jakarta. Mr. Chagla—he is an old friend and a colleague of mine—wanted to give an impression that I am not responsible for that decision because I was not Foreign Minister at that time.

I will be quite candid. I do not want to take shelter behind that plea. I was in the Government and I am responsible just as my predecessor, Shri Dinesh Singh, was responsible, for the Governmental decision, not to go to Jakarta. And the more I think of the decision, the more I am feeling convinced that that was the correct decision and we would have been in a great difficulty and our capacity to do anything substantive and anything effective in relation to Indo-China would not have been there if we had attended the Jakarta Conference, whatever the reasons may be. First, I would say that it was not an easy decision to take, particularly because Indonesia which is a friendly country was the host, and other friendly countries were attending it. Then, why did we take this decision? The answer is simple and obvious. We found that Asian countries like Burma, Ceylon, Afghanistan, Nepal and even Pakistan were not attending it. Secondly, the principal parties to the dispute in Cambodia were not attending the conference. Could such a conference, however well-intentioned it may be attended by parties

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

which were heavily weighted in one direction, produce anything worthwhile which might make a move towards restoration of peace in that troubled part, Cambodia? We weighed this very carefully and we came to the conclusion that going there might give us the satisfaction of participation, we might subscribe to a formula, we might be a party to a formulation which is not easy to trot out when important diplomats of countries get together, but it will not take the situation even an inch towards peace. I wish we were incorrect because we are more interested in peace. But the cruel reality is that our assessment has turned out to be correct. Although the formulation from Jakarta appears to be unexceptionable, Cambodia has not moved towards peace. Still civil war continues there. The Americans have made a statement that they have withdrawn their forces. Our information also points to the same fact that they have withdrawn.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: American planes are flying there.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: American land forces have been withdrawn. But there is information that even now there are foreign troops in Cambodia itself. We have information that there are South Vietnamese troops there, there are Thai troops there. They are our friends. But it is to be seen that both Thailand and South Vietnam are signatories to the Jakarta Conference formulation and they say that all foreign troops should be withdrawn. But their own troops are inside Cambodia. So, when a situation of that type arises, I would leave it to the judgment of the hon. House as to whether it was proper for us to go to a conference of that nature, or it was proper for us to preserve our capacity to play an effective role at the crucial moment. When I say that, I would like to remind this hon. House that we are in the position of having our contacts with all parties to the dispute in Indo-China. We are in contact with the Lon Nol Government. We have got our mission in Phnom Penh. We are also in contact with the representatives of Prince Sihanouk in Peking because we have our mission there and he is functioning from there.

Now, there are two parties to the dispute in South Viet Nam—the Government in Saigon and the Provisional Revolutionary Government which at one time used to be the National Liberation Front. I would like to say that it is wrong to suggest that this is a new recognition that we are giving to that party which is a very relevant party to the South Vietnam dispute. They are participating in the discussions in Paris. Therefore, they are very much a relevant party. I was searching some of the earlier statements that had been made and I now

find that when I attended the U.N. General Assembly, I had made a specific suggestion from the United Nations forum that bombing of North Vietnam should stop and a conference should take place to which the National Liberation Front should also be invited.

So I can recall with some satisfaction my feeble voice which I had raised at that time in New York and when I had urged that NLF should be represented in the conference. Today the NLF is represented...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Why feeble voice?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I prefer...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: You say the voice of India is feeble. You have brought India to that pass.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: India is powerful. I prefer to be modest rather than bombastic. I believe in achieving results and this is a way of expression. I think my saying that my voice is feeble is the strongest statement that I can make. But Mr. Chatterjee cannot understand these expressions.

I was saying that from the very beginning our attitude has been that the National Liberation Front is a necessary party for any satisfactory solution of the vexed problem of Vietnam. We are in touch with both of them. We have an Ambassador in Laos. We are also in touch with the Pathet Lao. At this stage I would like to inform the honourable House that there is some ray of hope in the Laotian situation because the two parties, the Pathet Lao and the Royal Laotian Government, appear to be willing to talk. I cannot say that they will talk about the substantive political issues straightway. But the very fact that the two of them are prepared to talk, this time most probably in Laos rather than in Paris or in any other part of the world, is definitely a positive sign in the Laotian situation which we should welcome. And in this our Chairman of the International Control Commission in Laos is playing a very good role and the International Control Commission as a whole is providing all possible facilities for the two parties to get together and to start a dialogue. Some contact has already been established and it is hoped that this might develop into a full-fledged dialogue in which not only the procedural issues, but in course of time even the substantive political issues, may be discussed. Similarly, we are in touch with North Vietnam. I have mentioned all this because some honourable Members have tried to depict a picture in which it is suggested that we are not in the picture, that nobody asks us, that we have no role. That is entirely incorrect. We have about half a dozen representatives of a fairly high level

in all these regions of Indo-China. We are the only Asian country, I can claim, who are in touch with all the parties, with all the relevant parties, to the dispute in Indo-China...

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Are you going to activate the Commission?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Are you in touch with both the aggressor and the aggressed?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We are in touch with all the parties to the dispute. May be, you are not...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: We are against the aggressor.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am not one-sided as the party to which my honourable friend belongs...

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: We are one-sided. We are against the aggressor.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I concede that. I am only supporting you.

So, Sir, we have to play a role by which we can restore peace in these regions whereas if his views are accepted, he wants an interminable struggle, he wants this struggle to continue, he wants that the Vietnamese should go on fighting the Vietnamese, that the Laotians should go on fighting the Laotians, that the Cambodians should go on fighting the Cambodians. But we want the restoration of peace and it has been our consistent policy... (Interruptions). We have been pursuing that policy consistently. And I feel that this is the correct policy to be pursued in Indo-China. If we make any strong statement, that might satisfy ourselves, but that does not help the situation. What is most important is that it is the Asian blood, I am pained to report to the House, that is spilled there. It is the Vietnamese blood, it is the Laotian blood and it is the Cambodian blood that is being spilt. I feel that we should do something to end this terrible war which has gripped our brethren in Indo-China. Ever since the French colonial rule ended, they have not enjoyed even a moment of peace and tranquillity and we should be with all the forces that might be conducive to taking the whole problem from the battle field to the conference table. We have been of the view that the problems have got so much interlinked that the Vietnamese problem has become the kingpin in the whole problem. This is being discussed in Vietnam where all the parties are there and we continue to hold the view that the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam starting with the American troops followed by a slightly broad-based Government in South Vietnam can open up a situation where the

Paris peace talks may make progress. It is in that connection that we have never hesitated to express our viewpoints to all the parties. It is not our policy to say one thing to one party and another thing to other parties. What we say publicly is also what we say in private and in diplomatic encounters with all the parties. This is our considered opinion. Otherwise, the whole thing will go on and I do not see any other prospect of restoration of peace.

The situation in South East Asia, as I have said, has got some little tinge of hope, particularly in Laos. The fact that the Americans have nominated a new Ambassador for the Paris talks and the talks are continuing are all hopeful signs. But the situation in Cambodia still continues to be a matter of great anxiety and a great deal of patient work will have to be done before the situation takes a shape where one could say with some measure of confidence that we are moving towards peace.

The situation, in West Asia, however, as several hon. Members have noted with satisfaction, has of late shown signs of improvement and let us hope that the cease-fire which is at the moment a temporary cease-fire will get stabilised and the talks, already started in New York under the auspices of the United Nations, will bear fruit. We have already taken the view that the Security Council resolution of 1967, which spells out the essential elements which have to be fulfilled if peace is to be restored will have to be implemented. Let us hope that these talks will lead to the implementation of the Security Council resolution and thus release the Arab lands which are under the illegal occupation of Israel and restore them to the countries whose rightful lands they are. It is only by implementing the Security Council resolution that lasting peace can be restored to West Asia.

I agree with several hon. Members who have noted with satisfaction the conclusion of the treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and U.S.S.R. at Moscow. I have already made a statement expressing our satisfaction and happiness at the conclusion of this treaty. I agree with my esteemed friend Shri Chagla when he described this treaty as really historical. These two countries have a long history of hostility and even today the gory tales and memories of the great devastation of wars grip the minds of the generation. If those two countries, casting aside their past history of hostility, in a genuine spirit of give and take, conclude a treaty which, both of them feel, does guarantee to them the essentials which are necessary for the two countries to normalise their relations, it is a great achievement.

P.M.

And, in this, our admiration should go to the Soviet leaders and also to Chancellor

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

Willy Brandt who has shown a great deal of imagination and this has also been reciprocated by the Soviet leader. In the history of difficult negotiations in the world, I think this Treaty will be a landmark, not only in regard to the contents of the Treaty, but in regard to the speed with which it has been negotiated, which means that the two sides were determined to find a common ground, and it is good not only for those two countries, not only for Europe, but to the entire world in that in the place where unfortunately in our own generation two bloody Wars were generated, there is now a realisation that countries with different ideologies, countries having even difficult problems awaiting settlement, can resolve their difficulties or, at any rate, conclude treaties, which surmount some of the biggest obstacles known to history. This is a very positive development and we should all welcome this development.

Several hon. Members, quite naturally, have made a mention of our two neighbours, besides the four or five that I mentioned in the opening remarks of mine. They are Pakistan and China.

In relation to Pakistan, I would like to say that after the Tashkent Declaration, we on our side have done our best to make not only oral suggestions, but also we have taken concrete decisions, sometimes even unilaterally and sometimes at the cost of being criticised by friends like Shri Niranjan Varma and others, so that the principal objective of normalising the relations might be achieved. But, I am sorry to report that we have not succeeded. We said that we are prepared to resume trade, we are prepared to resume communications between the two countries and we are prepared to arrange flights from one country to another, by airline and whatever may be the other means, even by rail or by boats. But, unfortunately, we have not succeeded.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why don't you make a concrete suggestion that trade between East Pakistan and West Bengal should be resumed?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am in full agreement with the suggestion made by Shri Bhupesh Gupta, but it is not only between East Pakistan and West Bengal or Assam, but between the two countries as a whole, because both the countries stand to gain and no country stands to lose. Sometimes one hears stories that Pakistan is paying for its coal four times or three times the price that they will have to pay if they had purchased it from us. Our West Bengal friends are so fond of eating fish and have to pay a high price as East Pakistanis cannot bring fish to West Bengal for consumption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta and others. So, there are several other matters in which Pakistan is adopting policies which are

sterile and which do not yield any result; but there it is. Sometimes one gets a very uncomfortable feeling that the leaders in Pakistan, some of them at any rate, have always harped on the atmosphere of confrontation. At this moment, to my thought comes the moving words which were uttered in the Central Hall of Parliament by one of our great leaders, Shri Tilokyanath Chakravarty and when I heard—I must confess, after a long time, a person speaking from his heart—I thought how ardently he felt about the importance of relations between India and Pakistan and how he described the new forces that are emerging in Pakistan, particularly in East Pakistan. I have no doubt in my mind and I can say, based on my experience of the Indo-Pakistan relations—and I was educated in a college which now is in Pakistan, Lahore, that the people of Pakistan and the people of India want to live in peace but somehow or the other, there are certain types of leaders in Pakistan who always keep up an atmosphere of confrontation. One feels amazed at the type of speeches that are made by certain leaders but we should be clear in our objectives. Whereas we should be prepared to meet any threat that we might face from any country including Pakistan, our objective should be to work patiently for improving the relations because we have got long borders and we are neighbours. Ultimately, we have to live in peace. If we look to other parts of the world, no two nations when they are close neighbours, have remained in perpetual enmity and I am very glad that once again some very sober voices from different sections of the House have to-day been raised which created hope in my mind that there is a general desire among the people in India that our relations with Pakistan should improve. Of course the relationship cannot improve by unilateral action. The other side has to reciprocate and it should be our endeavour to work in such a manner that the chances of the relations improving are brightened rather than they become dim and it is in this context that some times one has to view with concern certain extreme advice they might be giving when we are faced with particular problems that might be bedevilling the relation between the two countries.

There was mention of election taking place in Pakistan. It has been postponed but the election might take place.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: It will never be held.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not know. We have to deal with a Government which is in power. Just as other countries can live with certain equation, even though the ideologies may be different, even though the political systems may be different, even though the national objective may be different, but still a code of good-neighbourly relation can be worked out. This should be

our objective. I know some people might say that I am unnecessarily optimistic in this but in international relations, I am particularly reminded of the advice given by a very senior colleague of mine, Mr. Chagla. He said that in international affairs, we should not nurture illwill for long just as we should not take friendship for granted. We should adjust our attitudes with the changes that might be in the situation and should take advantage of whatever may be the favourable situation, so long as our objectives are clear and I am quite clear about our long-range objectives, even in regard to our relation with Pakistan.

A great deal has been mentioned about China. Some friends have said that we do not fully assess the situation that obtains to-day between India and China. I would like to assure that this is one matter about which we give anxious consideration almost constantly and we review the situation from time to time. There have been some indication, even press reports, and therefore, it is necessary for me to give our present assessment of the situation. In this connection I would say that we do notice a slight change in the attitude of China towards and propaganda against her neighbours, including India of late; but we have not yet seen any change in the substantive matter so far as Chinese stand towards India is concerned. We are always prepared to settle all matters with our neighbours including China, peacefully through bilateral negotiations on the basis of respect for our territorial integrity and sovereignty and the non-use of force or threat of force. We hope that China will sooner or later change her hostile attitude towards India and revert to the path of peace and reason.

Neither China nor India can change the geographical fact that both our countries have a long common border. It is in the interests of both countries to settle the border question peacefully and normalise relations in other fields as well. If and when China is willing to take any concrete steps in this direction, she will not find us lacking in response. However, should China use or threaten to use force, she will find us ready to defend every inch of our motherland.

This is broadly our present relationship with China and I would like you to view this with a certain measure of realism.

(Interruptions)

Besides these points, several other matters of a peripheral nature were also raised, and I would like to try, very briefly, to answer some of them. I know that within the short time at my disposal I cannot answer all of them.

I would like to thank first of all .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Why not continue tomorrow?

SHRI MUKLA GOVINDA REDDY: Let him continue tomorrow.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: It is a very good suggestion.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Now let us finish please.

I would like first of all to say that I was greatly impressed by the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, and he tried to analyse the situation and, but for the little contamination that he has contracted by being on the Opposition for about a year, the basic structure of his speech appeared to be correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. It is a reflection on the Opposition to say that he was contracted contamination on coming to the Opposition. Does it mean that he has contaminated the Opposition?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: He has not contaminated me or any body else.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: You have been contaminated by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta on the contrary.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I think Mr. Mishra should give me that much credit that I can resist, if not more, as much as he can, any such thing.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: The gap was never very wide. Is the gap shortening between you and him? The gap was never very wide between you and him.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: They are nearer to us than they are perhaps to you. There is no doubt about it. Even though you might enter into an alliance, you and they will never get together. It has become a fashion now—may be born out of the grand alliance, or other considerations—to trot out one idea, and this is the one point which, I think, has somehow or other, clouded the otherwise excellent speech of Shri Mishra, and this is what I may, for want of a better name, call some sort of Russian-phobia. This has gripped all the constituents of the grand alliance. In season and out of season they always try to trot out ..

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Grand alliance that was to be.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I stand corrected. Sir, on this issue I fail to understand—I have given very careful consideration to the various points that he has raised—I find that there is no substance at all in what he says.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: The pro-Sovietism of the Government in its foreign policy is the reason for the grand alliance.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I generally do not contradict a lady Member. So do not place me at a disadvantage.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: It is very obvious because it is a lady's Cabinet.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That may be one of the reasons.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Shri Mishra in his speech tried to mention certain matters and he tried to show that we are following a policy which, to use his words, is subservient to the Soviet Union. I would like just to remind him about one aspect. Unfortunately we parted company only about a year ago; I will not remind him of old memories because sometimes it is painful to remind people of old memories.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But it is pleasant to us.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: But I would like him to ponder as to what has happened during this year which has resulted in this great change in his presentation that he should use all his eloquence and erudition to specify that.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I have given two examples.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Take for instance the question of Soviet maps. That has been with us for a much longer period than it is with us alone; that has been with us ever since independence. In fact these maps are nothing but a reproduction of the Kuomintang maps. This is the research that we have made now. At that time they followed the Kuomintang Chinese maps and they are reproducing them again and again. At any rate to this question of maps I shall come again but the point is this question has been with us together after independence for—how many years—I should say 23 years and on the 24th year has this story of maps become so pungent that he should raise his heavy stick and try to beat me with it? I think it is not fair.

Then he mentioned about cultural centres. About cultural centres we are adopting a uniform policy; whether they are the cultural centres of the Soviet Union or of any other country, our considered approach is that they should not be established at places where those countries do not have either their consulates or their trade representatives or their embassies. If they are in other

places we close them. This is the position that we have taken. We are trying to work out a new framework and any cultural centre that fits in with that framework, whether it is of the Soviet Union or the United States or Germany or U.K., it will function; otherwise it will not be permitted to function.

Then mention has been made about a trade centre building which is coming up in Malabar Hill. This is a matter about which—because something has appeared in the press—I would like to take the House into confidence. With regard to this I would like to say .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is already late; we can have it tomorrow.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:... even without referring to any paper that this was an area which was leased by the Soviets quite some time back and it is known to everybody that there is no restriction on the purchase of land by foreign missions. Only they cannot purchase in prohibited areas. Thereafter they got the permission of the Corporation of Bombay for putting up a building. They submitted a plan like any individual and .

SHRI A. D. MANI: Very surprising.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH:... permission was granted to them. This was known to the Government of Maharashtra, this was known to the Corporation. And there are trade centres of other countries in all manner of localities and I do not see why there should be any objection to the USSR having a trade centre at that place. They have not contravened any law; they have not grabbed any land. They acquired the lease of the land, got the permission to construct a building and they are constructing it.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: The Maharashtra Government wrote to you one year back; what have you done with regard to that?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We wrote back to them; we are in touch with the Maharashtra Government.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Inform us about all that.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The law of the land is that land can be purchased at any place unless it is a prohibited area and mere proximity to the house of a dignitary, howsoever high he may be is no ground at all. I would like hon. Members to recall the juxtaposition of the Indonesian Embassy to the house which was occupied by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. It was just next door to that. There are several other ambassadorial buildings next to the houses of other people.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: So you do not find any point in the Maharashtra Government's protest?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: This is the law of the land and we should not try to import considerations which do not exist.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: Would you tell us whether there was any protest from the Maharashtra Government?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I will tell you later on. When the building came up, they did not look into the history of that and suddenly they thought that perhaps the juxtaposition of this was not here. Then, they said they would try and see whether anything could be done, but we pointed out clearly to them that this is the law of the land. They have purchased it openly. They got their plans approved by the Corporation and they constructed the building. By the time . . .

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मिश्र जी का कहना यह है कि महाराष्ट्र सरकार को आपत्ति क्या थी वह बता दीजिए ।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह : वर्मा जी, वह बहुत अच्छी तरह खुद कह सकते हैं । वह आपको वकील नहीं बनाना चाहते हैं ।

So, in the matter of their Trade Representative's building, it is a thing which is absolutely straightforward and, if I may say so, there is no inpropriety involved.

It is true that in the matter of the use of CD numbers, the Soviet journalists were not following the correct rules in this connection and as soon as this matter came to our notice we pointed it out to them. They have assured us three or four weeks back that they have discontinued that practice and they will not use it. Now, I appeal to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who has been my colleague, and we have worked together on several occasions, that in this background . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: What about the interview? Would you tell the American Ambassador that the kind of interview that he gave to the New York Times is not done and he should have behaved better?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am at the present moment on the Soviet Union. I will come to that just now. I might as well, at this stage, give my views about the Soviet maps also in a very brief manner, because this matter has been engaging the attention of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should please wind up now.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am winding up. This may be the last point that I am mentioning.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: What about my point?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I would like to say that in their depiction of the India-China boundary, the Soviet maps and atlases broadly follow the Chinese alignment. However, these maps have been consistently adhering merely to the pre-1947 Kuomintang alignment than to the alignment indicated in the maps published by People's China in 1953, 1956, 1962. The Russian maps thus show the Chang Chenmo valley within India, whereas the Chinese Communist maps push the alignment from the Karakoram Pass to Demchok further west to include more areas of India within China. With the exception, the Soviet maps follow generally the Chinese alignment of the boundary. I might bring to the attention of the House that all Soviet maps and atlases show Jammu and Kashmir entirely within India.

This erroneous depiction of India-China boundary is of deep concern to the Government of India. The Government had been taking it up at the appropriate level with the Soviet Government since 1956. Apart from several verbal representations made through diplomatic channels, both in Delhi and in Moscow, written representations had also been made to the Soviet Government in 1956, 1958, 1966 and 1968. Further, during official and ministerial visits, the Government have been urging the Soviet Government to correct these erroneous depictions even as recently as June, 1970. The Soviet Government have also been supplied with Survey of India maps on scale 1" = 70 miles. This Government have thus been utilising in a sustained manner diplomatic and official channels for representing or protesting to the Soviet Government on this question. It would, therefore, be wholly wrong to charge the Government with inaction in this matter. Even a few days ago, our Ambassador in Moscow took up the matter strongly with the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister and our Ministry took up with the Soviet Embassy here. The Soviet Government, in response to our representations, both verbal and written, have conveyed to us that delineation on the maps had no political significance and that there should be no doubt about the Soviet Union's respect for India's territorial integrity; they also promised to look into the matter further. The Government proposes to take up this question with the Soviet Government again and to convey to them the degree of feeling in

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

Parliament and in the public in this country on the wrong depiction of the Indian border in Soviet maps.

While we have every right to take objection to this wrong depiction and persevere with the Soviet Government to depict India's northern boundary in conformity with the Indian alignment, it is not in our national interest to mix up this issue with the general question of our relations with the Soviet Union. As Parliament is aware, we have extensive co-operation with Soviet Union in the field of economic and industrial development, in cultural and political matters, and in the defence fields. These constitute the substance of our relations with the Soviet Union and it would be unwise to undermine or endanger this basic friendship. At the same time this friendship and our desire to maintain and expand relations with the Soviet Union cannot inhibit or deter this Government from taking this question of wrong maps firmly and seriously.

A mention has been made of some other wrong foreign maps also. We have been taking up with the U.S. Government also the wrong depiction . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With regard to that also it may be kindly read out.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I may in this connection draw the attention of the House to the fact that all foreign maps and atlases which depict our boundaries erroneously, including those from the Soviet Union, attract the provisions of our laws which prohibit their entry into India. I would like to add that we have taken up strongly with the U.S. Government about the wrong depiction of our boundary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: U.S. maps show Goa as a Portuguese province.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Therefore, naturally we should express concern. But at the same time there should be some measure of balance while formulating our views in this matter. After all, mere depiction by third parties, howsoever irritating it might be, cannot alter the hard facts about our boundaries which we are determined to defend and which nobody can violate. So mere lines on other people's maps or portfolios should not excite our feelings beyond a point and should not be used to spoil relations which otherwise are of an excellent nature.

I know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that during this short period I have not been able to cover all matters.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about Goa which I specifically mentioned? America recognises Goa as a Portuguese province. It does not recognise, and it has

been reiterated, that Goa is a part of India.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Goa is a part of India. Whether anybody recognises it or not I do not care, just as I do not care what they depict in their maps. Goa is a part of India. Goa is represented in this Parliament. Why should we bother as to what other people talk about Goa?

SHRI S. D. MISRA: On a point of clarification . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Having said this, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not want to tire the patience of the House any more. I will accept amendment No. 1 and oppose every other amendment.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: One point . . .

SHRI S. D. MISRA: One important point has been omitted . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister is prepared to accept amendment No. 1 . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Are we having different scales here? If anybody from this side stands up, you are not able to give him any chance. I do not envy him, but the moment one of our men stands up . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not allowed him. I mentioned about amendment No. 1.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: There is a very important point which he is raising.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the contrary I have allowed more time for your group.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: Only one minute.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: It is very unfair . . .

SHRI S. D. MISRA: He will remember that the Leader of the Opposition has raised one very important point. Perhaps he has forgotten. That is about a secret arrangement being made about a security pact with Russia. What is that security arrangement?

(Interruption)

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I am very glad he has reminded me. It is an absolutely wrong suggestion for anybody to make that there is any pact, secret or otherwise, of a defence character with the Soviet Union or with any other country.

I have always said, and I would reiterate that we are prepared to get our equipment from any country, but we have no

defence pact or security pact; we have no secret pact with any country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am putting amendment No. 1 before the House. The question is:

1. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House reiterates its adherence to the policy of non-alignment and peace, anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, and recommends to the Government to further strengthen this policy and carry it forward.'"

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 2 to 8

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I want to . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Please say whether you withdraw them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have to say something . . . (*Interruption*) Don't shout. Then, I shall go on asking for division on everything.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will make only brief comments as to why you are withdrawing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These gentlemen are hungry. I can understand. I withdraw all the other amendments because . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: We cannot allow, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . they are commitment of the Government that they shall carry forward the policy of anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and the policy . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No, that will not do.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Amendment No. 10 should be put to vote.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Amendment No. 10 must be put to vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only No. 10? You have no objection to the withdrawal of the other amendment?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: We have.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Absolutely.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am afraid, Sir, that my Marxist friends are following revisionist trends in this matter,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 2 to 9. Is it the pleasure of the House to give permission for him to withdraw?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Niren Ghosh, what do you want to say?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I want amendment No. 6 to be put to vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about Nos. 2 to 9? You said, only 10 you want to be put to vote.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No. 6 should be put to vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about Nos. 1 to 5?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have the permission. I move that permission be given to withdraw all my amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Even if there is a dissenting voice, I think the amendment cannot be withdrawn. Amendment Nos. 2 to 5, you have no objection, Mr. Ghosh?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I want amendment No. 6 to be put to vote.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about Nos. 2 to 5? Is there any objection to amendment Nos. 2 to 5 being withdrawn?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No.

**(Amendment Nos. 2 to 5 were, by leave, withdrawn).*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

6. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House notes with great anxiety and apprehension the increasing activities of the CIA in this country in pursuance of the cloak-and-dagger diplomacy of the United States.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 7 to 9. There is no objection to withdraw them.

**(Amendment Nos. 7 to 9 were, by leave, withdrawn).*

**For text of amendments, vide col. 115 and 116 supra.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

10. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House expresses its disappointment that the Indian mission in Hanoi should not have yet been upgraded to the ambassadorial level.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 11 to 78.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: No. 11 we press.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: No. 11 we press.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

11. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House, while welcoming the establishment of the Consulate-level relation with the German Democratic Republic, however, regrets that the full diplomatic recognition to this first Socialist German State, which is striving for peace, and is friendly to India should have been denied.' "

The motion was negatived.

**(Amendment Nos. 12 to 81 were, by leave, withdrawn.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

82. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government have failed to stick to the non-aligned policy under the pressure of super-powers and have failed to improve the image of India in international field.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

83. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government have failed to develop closer relations with East and South-East Asian countries, which is very vital for the maintenance of peace in this region.' "

*For text of amendments, vide col. 116 to 127 *supra*.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

84. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government have failed to create world opinion against intrusion of super powers into Indian Ocean, which is desirable from the security point of view.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

85. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government have failed to protest against USSR's action in not revising the map in the Soviet Encyclopaedia and other government publications which show the north-western and north-eastern parts of India as Chinese territory.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

86. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government have failed to put sufficient pressure on the U.K. Government against its reported decision to supply arms to South Africa and to convene a conference of Commonwealth countries to prevent implementation of such action.' "

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

87. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government have failed to take adequate steps to put pressure on the Government of U.K. to change its immigration policy.' "

The Motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

88. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government have failed to raise their voice

of protest whenever the question of human freedom arose as was evident at the time of the Czechoslovakia crisis because of the aggression committed by USSR or at the time of invasion of Cambodia by the USA and Vietcong forces in collusion with North Vietnam and Communist China."

The Motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 89 to 9.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, you cannot put amendments in this way. You should put each amendment and ask whether hon'ble Members are prepared to vote or not, but not in this bulk method.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary. But if any Member wants that a particular amendment should be put before the House, I will do that.

The question is:

89. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that more independence and consideration of national interests are required to restore the original image of our foreign policy.'"

The Motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

90. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House expresses its concern at the diminishing national consensus behind our foreign policy.'"

The Motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 91. Those in favour will please say Aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those against will please say No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Division. I want division. Yes, I want division. I want to test how the Parliament stands by counting of heads with regard to amendment No. 91. I want division. I want division... (Interruption) What? I want division even if I voted for it. Sir, I want a clear decision. It is a ridicule...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Please listen. I asked the House to vote and I said, "Those in favour will please say Aye", and I think I said: "The Nocs have it".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you challenging my decision?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I challenge. Yes, I challenge. I challenge.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have voted in favour. Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Am I to understand that because you have voted in favour of this amendment, therefore, you are challenging it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I will not divulge my voting. How I vote you have no business to ask.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): It is a matter of procedure. Even if he has voted against the amendment he has every right to say that the vote should be recorded. The vote should be recorded. He has every right to assert that the vote should be recorded. It is for the public knowledge...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. It is a strange thing. It is because I submitted to your ruling? The moment you say that permission is not to be given, I at once get up...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is regarding withdrawal only.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where does it say? Division may be demanded by any Member irrespective of divulging or irrespective of how the House said Yes or No. The Rule does not say that if a Member in his voice vote says a particular thing he is debarred from asking for division.

So, Sir, the rule is that any Member in the House can ask for a division. Therefore, I am asking for a division on this. You cannot violate the rule.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I also ask for a division.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Irrespective of whether a Member says "Yes" or "No", he can ask for a division and I am exercising that right.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Sir, on a point of clarification. You have said "The Nocs have it." Supposing I ask for

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

a division, the question is, should I say "The Ayes have it" and ask for a division, or should I say "I agree with your ruling" and ask for a division? Either we disagree with your ruling and ask for a division or we agree with your ruling and ask for a division. Does Mr. Bhupesh Gupta say that the Ayes have it and ask for a division?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: It is implied.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: It is implied that he says that the Ayes have it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the rule is quite clear.

(Interruption)

SHRI M. N. KAUL: Sir, there is no doubt that according to parliamentary practice, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta can challenge the declaration of the Chair and thus have the votes recorded.

If a Member desires that the votes should be recorded, he must challenge the opinion of the Chair. This is the only means available to him to get the votes recorded.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So far as the rules are concerned, they say that a Member has to challenge . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: He is not challenging it. So he cannot demand a division. Only if he challenges it, he can ask for a division.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If he challenges it, he can ask for a division.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want a division. I want registration of votes. It is my inherent right.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is challenging . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Sir, before you give your ruling, I would like to say that the parliamentary practice should not be disturbed. Here the rule is very clear. I am referring to rule 252(3).

"If the opinion of the Chairman as to the decision of a question is challenged, he may, if he thinks fit, ask the members who are for "Aye" and those for "No" respectively to rise in their places and, on a count being taken, he may declare the determination of the Council. In such a case, the names of the voters shall not be recorded."

So, Sir, if the opinion of the Chair is challenged, he can ask those who are in favour of or against the question to stand.

Then if he thinks fit he can certainly order a division to take place, not otherwise. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, with due respect, I would say that this clear provision in the rules should not be forgotten.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is not a right way of interpreting the rules. It is quite clear that any Member can challenge it, and I have challenged it, the moment I asked for a division. As my friend, Mr. Kaul has said, it is immaterial how you vote. You have seen many divisions have taken place in this House after a massive "Yes" or "No". A division is required for the recording of votes. The whole rule has to be taken together.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the procedure that we have so far been following in this House is that immediately if any Member asks for a division, we allow a division. We do not ask Members to stand up to ascertain the votes and then call for a division. I am mentioning this because Mr. Dharia has pointed out that rule . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I have pointed out to the rules though I do understand the convention. When there is a specific rule, it should be followed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You only looked at sub-rule (3). Please read sub-rule (4) also. Therefore, irrespective of the fact that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta might have voted this side, or that side, when he is challenging that the indication . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, I am challenging it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: . . . that I had given that the Noes have it—he challenged that Noes are not having it—I think we have to have a division.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: No, Sir. We would like to draw your attention to this fact. He did not say that the Ayes have it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Irrespective of that, a vote has to be taken. I say I want a division. The moment I say that I want a division, you have to put it to a division.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: No, no. There was no challenge. I think you should stick to your ruling . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I have not given any ruling.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: The challenge did not come at the right time and it does not constitute a challenge. It does not constitute a challenge.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): On a point of order, Sir.

श्री ओम् मेहता आपने ही तो अमॅडमेंट दिया है ।

श्री श्याम नन्दन मिश्र : हमन दिया है । आप कल रखिये तो हम दिखा देगे ।

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I would request the honourable the Leader of the Opposition that he should not lose his temper too often in this House. Such bullying tactics are not going to cut any ice.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: When he was saying something to me I had to take note of it and respond to it. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Mr. Om Mehta, was saying something to me and should I not respond to what he said?

So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, if we go on like this, it will be mid-night. The main point is . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mishra, let me hear him first.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: But I have been on my legs. As said, the challenge has to come in a particular form and at a particular time. Then alone it constitutes a challenge. Here it has not come in the required form, that is, when you said the Noes have it, the Noes have it, the Noes have it. After that only the voting comes. So it does not constitute a challenge. What I am submitting is that neither has the form been observed nor the point of time has been adhered to. Therefore, we would like to have the text of your ruling at that time. The text must be made available to us and then alone we can judge this issue objectively because you made certain remarks. Unless we get the text of your ruling, it would be difficult for us to judge a matter of procedure.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, whatever may be the sequence, your ruling is final. I support Shri Bhupesh Gupta's contention for division in order to expose the politics of camouflage. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition who claims to be a sincere and a very forthright politician is opposing the demand for division which, from any standard of decent democratic

life and democratic functioning, should not be challenged at least by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition who is conscious of his position has very conveniently forgotten that the demand for division is being opposed by him because he has one standard outside the House and another inside the House. The demand of Shri Bhupesh Gupta is supported by persons like me to expose his politics of double standard . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am surprised that you are taking so much of time over a matter like this. You never said that I did not challenge at the right moment. Sir, always a challenge is made after you say "Ayes have it" or "Noes have it". Only at that point one challenges, because one has to challenge something. I challenged your order. Therefore, you have to ask for the division. My friend's argument that the challenge had not come at the right moment, is not correct.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. D. MISRA: We want to see the proceedings of what you announced. Then only we will proceed ahead. Let us see the proceedings. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: When you have given your ruling that you want to go according to rule 252(4). . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 252(3).

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Then it cannot be challenged. So, you have to announce your decision immediately. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. D. MISRA: It is they who are challenging the rule, not we. Let us know from the proceedings as to what was your ruling.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please say something.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Let us adjourn the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So far as I remember, when I put the question before the House and I said, "I think the Noes have it", there was an objection by Shri Bhupesh Gupta. He wanted division only.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Voting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Voting means division; it means the same thing and by implication he wanted to challenge the decision that it is not proper indication of the voting of the House, and the decision of

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

the House may be a different thing. So, even though he did not use the words "I think the Ayes have it", and he said only "voting" or "division", it means that he did not accept the indication given by me and, therefore, he wanted to have a division so that there could be a clear. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISRA: Let us see the proceedings of the House, in case you say something and you change your decision. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Sir, if you have a new decision today, . . . (Interruptions) . . . I must tell you the challenge comes when the Members disagree with your decision and this time it has not been a challenge. I do not mind what they were saying. I am not afraid of being . . . (Interruptions) exposed for my political views. If Shri Chandra Sekhar wants a voting, I agree. . . . (Interruptions). They are trying for an exposure. . . .

But the point is that when an hon. Member says that he wanted a division, Sir, in my years of experience in Parliament, it has been that the hon. Member who asks for a decision was against the ruling of the Chair or had a feeling that the ruling of the Chair was incorrect. But, in this case it has been obviously a political move on the part of Shri Chandra Sekhar to use this . . . (Interruptions). . . . It may be very unfair on the part of the Chair, it is wrong, to concede to a wrong convention. . . . (Interruptions). . . . Every day it is being done.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH): Sir, may I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the Chair asked Shri Bhupesh Gupta, "Do you challenge my decision?" and he said, "Yes"?

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. D. MISRA: It is not for him to say. . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Without having a look at the text, it will be difficult for us to speak.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: Let us get the proceedings of the House and we will be satisfied, or we will vote tomorrow. . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please. . . . (Interruptions). Of course, When I said immediately, "The Noes have it" he definitely said that he wanted a division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. no.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Voting or division means the same thing. . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: We are not going to leave it there. We will not leave at there.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: We want the proceedings and the tape-recording. . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, please . . . When I gave the indication that the Noes have it, Shri Bhupesh Gupta said, "No, no", and he wanted to have a division again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. . . . (Interruptions).

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Sir, may I point out one thing to the House?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not want

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Sir, with your permission. . . . (Interruptions). Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is not necessary to say "division". According to the Rules, if the opinion of the Chairman is that the decision is challenged, then, immediately the Chairman can take the decision of division. So you have expressed in the open House, "Are you challenging my ruling?". You have asked the question and there is no question of. . . (Interruptions) . . . saying "division", whether it is voting or division. It is absolutely not necessary. The Rules also do not say. So, you can take the ruling and let us proceed further. . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, please. . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please say something.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: Sir, it is a legitimate request from us.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: We may discuss it tomorrow, but what about the ruling? And that would be on the basis of the record.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When I said, "I think, the Noes have it", I do not think I said that the ruling is final. Shri Bhupesh Gupta immediately said that he wanted a division.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Why not have this much of patience? The tape-recording is there.

SHRI S. D. MISRA: The tape-recording is there. . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: When you have order

8 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In this matter any ruling we will accept. You are asking for the tape-recording. In future, I shall get the tape-recording on every point. Even now I am challenging because you have not disposed of the amendment. The fact that you have not disposed of the amendment gives me the right to challenge even now.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Gupta is challenging in the House and every time it has happened and many a time the Chair even after giving a ruling has said: 'Now I think it is being challenged by a Member. So I order a division.' The hon. Member is here but because Mr. Mishra threatens not to cooperate, so the tape-recording is being asked for.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nobody has said about it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Even consulting the records of the reporter is wrong when the Member is present here and is asserting himself.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am challenging even now.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am on my legs. My point is that it is a disrespect to the dignity of the Member concerned. When the Member is challenging the ruling again and again the Member is present here, it is a disrespect to Mr. Gupta. If a Member says the thing, whatever may be the record, he has always the right to amend his previous stand. Under the circumstances any consultation of record is out of place, against parliamentary practice and against all canons of parliamentary practice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We shall not allow anything to be uttered without being challenged. I am making this demand. All-right bring the record. Suppose the record does not say theoretically, but I say I maintain it, who will prevail?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: If half an hour more was to be spent, I would have spoken for half an hour more. Now we have other things to do. The best thing is for you to do something.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: The rules are very clear as to when to call for a division. I have a small point to make for your kind decision. Here when does the Chair say 'The Ayes have it' or 'The Nays have it'? When the voices are very clear, when about 100 voices say 'yes' and some say 'No', the

Chair says 'The Ayes have it' as he hears the voices. If any Member challenges the verdict of the Chair. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have understood your point.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: You have not caught it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have gone through the provision and I have understood it.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: If any Member challenges the verdict of the Chair, the second procedure for the Chair to follow is to ask the Members to stand in their seats. But this the Chair has not followed. If in spite of the first two procedures any Member wants to challenge the verdict of the Chair, then the Chair shall order a "Division". But here the second procedure has not been followed at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got your point. Please sit down. We have had enough discussion.

(Interruptions)

Please sit down, Mr. S. D. Misra.

श्री राम सहय (मध्य प्रदेश) : मेरा अर्थ करना यह है कि जब श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने "नौ" के साथ वोटिंग किया है "नौ" को अपना डिवाइलियर किया है, तो वे कैसे चैलेन्ज कर सकते हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have understood the point raised by all the hon. Members here, and I am quite sure that I had not disposed of the point finally, and there was no voting result finally announced. And before announcing the final decision on the voting, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had challenged the indication that I had given and now, as the hon. Member is demanding a "Division", I order a "Division".

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: As a protest against calling a "Division" in this case and in this manner we stage a walk-out.

(Some opposition groups then walked out of the House)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

91. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House expresses its concern at the steady erosion of non-alignment in our foreign policy which has affected our independence of policy and action.'"

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—Nil;
Noes—71.

Alva, Shri Joachim.
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
Appan, Shri G. A.
Arora, Shri Arjun.
Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
Baharul Islam, Shri.
Basu, Shri Chitta.
Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.
Bobdey, Shri S. B.
Brat, Sardar Narindar Singh.
Chandra Shekhar, Shri.
Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad.
Das, Shri Balram.
Das, Shri Bipinpal.
Dass, Shri Mahabir.
Dharia, Shri M. M.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
Gujral, Shri I. K.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.
Hussain, Shri Sved.
Kaul, Shri M. N.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
Kollur, Shri M. L.
Krishan Kant, Shri.
Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
Kurup, Shri G. Sankara.
Madani, Shri M. Asad.
Mani, Shri A. D.
Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.).
Mani, Shri A. D.
Maragatham Chandrasekhar, Shrimati.
Mehta, Shri Om.
Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas.
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar.
Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
Narayani Devi Manaklal, Shrimati
Neki Ram, Shri.
Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
Panjharari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
Patil, Shri P. S.
Punabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati.
Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh.
Puri, Shri Dev Datt.
Raju, Shri V. B.
Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Roshan Lal, Shri.
Rov, Shri Biren.
Salig Ram, Dr.
Sangma, Shri E. M.
Shah, Shri K. K.
Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad.
Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
Singh, Shri Dalpat.
Singh, Shri Jogendra.
Singh, Shri S. K.

Singh, Raja Shankar Pratap.
Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad.
Sinha, Shri Rejendra Pratap.
Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh.
Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad.
Tohra, Sardar Gurcharan Singh.
Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi.
Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

The motion was negatived.

*[Amendments Nos. 92 to 94 were, by
leave, withdrawn.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The ques-
tion is:—

95. "That at the end of the motion, the
following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this
House is of opinion that the entire for-
eign policy betrays surrender on the
part of the Government in many impor-
tant matters to the Anglo-American im-
perialists and that the immediate essen-
tial first steps to be taken for coming out
of the Anglo-American tutelage are—

(a) recognition of the Provisional
Revolutionary Government of South
Vietnam,

(b) upgrading to Ambassadorial level
of the Indian diplomatic mission at
Hanoi,

(c) diplomatic recognition of Ger-
man Democratic Republic; and

(d) severance of relations with the
British Commonwealth."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The ques-
tion is:

"That the present international situa-
tion and the policy of the Government of
India in relation thereto be taken into
consideration and having considered the
same, this House reiterates its adherence
to the policy of non-alignment and peace;
anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, and
recommends to the Government to further
strengthen this policy and carry it for-
ward."

The motion, as amended, was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House
stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at twelve
minutes past eight of the clock till
eleven of the clock on Thursday,
the 27th August, 1970.

*For text and amendments, vide col. 129
supra.