

YIP

CHAVAN

SELECTED SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT



EDITOR : R. D. PRADHAN

Y. B. CHAVAN

SELECTED SPEECHES
IN PARLIAMENT

VOLUME IV

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER
LEADER OF OPPOSITION
&
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT
(1975 - 1984)

Editor
R. D. Pradhan

AMEYA PRAKASHAN

© Y. B. Chavan Pratishthan

Publisher

Ulhas Latkar
Ameya Prakashan
474 B, Sadashiv Peth,
Tilak Road,
Pune 30.

Printer

Ulhas Latkar
Kalpana Mudranalaya

Pune

First Edition
February 1999

Ebooks

Sanganak Prakashan

ISBN - 81 - 86172 - 58 - 0



FOREWORD

It is with a sense of fulfillment that I write this Foreword to the 3rd and 4th volumes of late Shri Y. B. Chavan's speeches in Parliament. These volumes contain Shri Chavan's speeches as the Finance Minister of India, as the Minister of External Affairs and also as the Leader of Opposition in Lok Sabha. The publication of these volumes marks the conclusion of the project undertaken by the Yashwantrao Chavan Pratishthan to publish selected speeches of late Shri Y. B. Chavan in the Parliament. I must thank Shri R.D. Pradhan who has edited all the four volumes, for his hard work, tenacity and perspicacity in going through all the speeches, selecting the important ones and editing them for the benefit of readers and scholars. I am sure that these volumes will prove to be of invaluable assistance to any serious student of free India's political history.

Shri. Y.B. Chavan was a bright star in the firmament of Indian politics. His life is the story of the rise of a poor boy in Deorashtra to Chief Minister of Maharashtra and then to the high office of Deputy Prime Minister of India. It is an inspiring saga which is all the more remarkable because he himself was the architect of his overarching achievement. His political philosophy had evolved in the crucible of freedom movement. Throughout his life he cherished the ideals of democracy, secularism and socialism. A firm believer in the empowerment of the common people, he ushered in democratic decentralisation

in Maharashtra. His style of governance was characterised by a certain grace, sincere effort to understand others' view points and gentle persuasion. He liked to govern by consensus rather than diktat. Long years in office and positions of power did not blunt his literary sensibilities nor corrode the capacity for spontaneous response to the conditions and concerns of the poor. He could be assertive in the matter of political convictions but he always tried to accommodate differing points of view and to carry all sections of people with him. He had a sense of being a part of independent India's unfolding history and by his steady, dedicated work, inspired by a vision of strong India, he has earned for himself an important place in the history of Maharashtra and India. I am sure that these various facets of his personality will shine through the speeches in these volumes, though they were often made in response to concerns and crisis of those particular times.

With these words. I offer these volumes to the people, the Parliamentarians, scholars and future historians.

Sharad Pawar
President
Y.B. Chavan Pratishthan

EDITORIAL NOTE

This is the fourth and final Volume of the Selected Speeches of late Shri.Y.B.Chavan in the Parliament. It covers ten years period between 1974-84. Chavan became the Minister for External Affairs of India on October 11, 1974. By that time, he had already been in the Lok Sabha for twelve years. His contribution in the Parliament shows Chavan, not only as a good debater, but also as a mature political statesman.

The volume has been divided into three parts. Part I includes his speeches as Minister for External Affairs. Part II as the Leader of Opposition and also as a member, Part III includes the Obituary references made in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha on his death.

As the External Affairs Minister, Chavan stood for firm commitment to non-alignment and fully supported the process of detente between the two superpowers that had then just begun. He visualised the non-aligned movement as a dynamic force and an important instrument for preserving the independence of newly liberated countries and for strengthening the liberation movements in struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism. He believed that the tremendous progress made by the Western world and accompanied by technological developments, especially in the field of weapon system, had placed certain restraint on the use of their military power and was in fact leading them towards the Detente.

Y. B.Chavan paid special attention to relations with the People Republic of China. He pointed out that geography had put China and India, two land masses, nearer each other and the two must continue making efforts to improve their mutual relations. According to him, India's efforts ought to be governed by certain principles, Viz. friendship, world peace and non-alignment. Chavan's tenure as the Foreign Minister witnessed deterioration in the Indo-Pakistan relations. He repeatedly expressed the Government of India's sense of disappointment and frustration at the US decision to resume supply of arms to Pakistan. He did not accept the justification offered by the US Administration and bluntly stated, "Either you are deceiving yourself or you are trying to deceive us. It is either of the two."

Following the defeat of the Indian National Congress in the general elections held at the beginning of 1977, Chavan as the leader of the Congress in the Lok Sabha was the first one to be designated formally as the Leader of Opposition. In his very first speech he conceded that the result of general elections was a vote against the Emergency. His party had accepted a lesson that delegation of power without adequate checks and controls, either to the policial executive or to the bureaucracy, is apt to be abused. He declared : I would like to tell my countrymen and partymen that Emergency was not part of tradition

or ideology of the Congress. Congress stood for democracy, individual liberty and individual freedom. At the same time, Congress stood for social justice, economic equality and socialism. We have said good bye to it. Good-bye for ever.

As the Leader of the Opposition, Chavan showed remarkable skills in handling debates on development, law and order as well as the external affairs. On development issues, he clearly put forth that there were three fundamental problems: of poverty, of inequality, both social and economic, and the problem of modernising manpower and agriculture with the help of science and technology. On law & order and external affairs he drew upon his rich experience. As a member of the Lok Sabha he actively participated in the problems relating to northeast, especially the agitation in Assam. His speeches show a depth of understanding and emotional involvement, in the problems of the northeast.

Y. B. Chavan moved in the Lok Sabha a motion of 'No Confidence in the Council of Ministers', on July 11, 1979. The speech delivered by Chavan was perhaps the most important one that he made in his political career. His last speech was in the background of the Blue Star Operations in the Punjab. He supported strong action by the Central Government to deal with the situation and warned against holy places of

worship being allowed to be used by the militants. He warned that "If allowed in Punjab, the same thing could happen in other States".

The Obituary References made in the two Houses are reproduced in Part III. About his participation, the Rajya Sabha noted : "The debates of Lok Sabha bear witness to the valuable contributions made by Shri Chavan during his tenure as a Minister and as a Member of the Opposition in upholding democratic values of the Parliamentary system of Government. All Sections of the House respected and heard him in silence."

I take this opportunity to thank the Pratishthan, in particular, Shri Sharad Pawar, President for having entrusted this task to me. I have received over years excellent cooperation from the office bearers of the Pratishthan. I am specially appreciative of the assistance given to me by Vidyadhar K. Kandalgaonkar, who worked long hours in giving shape to these publications. This task has been a labour of love for me and represents my tribute to one who gave me his trust and affection.

January 1, 1999

R.D. PRADHAN

VOLUME - IV

PART I

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SECTION 1- FOREIGN POLICY

Editorial Note

1. Demands for Grants 1975 - 76
Lok Sabha, 16 April 1975
2. Debate on the President's Address
Lok Sabha 8 January 1976
3. Demands for Grants 1976 - 77
Lok Sabha, 8 April 1976
4. Working of the Ministry
Rajya Sabha, 25 May 1976

SECTION 2 - INDO-PAK AFFAIRS

Editorial Note

5. U. S. Decision to Resume
Arms Supply to Pakistan
Rajya Sabha, 18 February 1975
6. Reply to Discussion on U.S. Decision to
supply Arms to Pakistan
Rajya Sabha, 10 March 1975
7. Statement Regarding Indo-Pakistan Talks
Rajya Sabha, 18 May 1976

SECTION 3 - SIKKIM

Editorial Note

8. Statement on the Situation in Sikkim
Lok Sabha, 11 April 1975
9. Constitution (38 Amendment) Bill - Regarding Sikkim
Lok Sabha, 23 April 1975

SECTION 4 - MISCELLANEOUS

10. Entry of US Naval Force into Indian Ocean
Lok Sabha, 15 November 1974
11. Statement Regarding Meeting of Foreign
Ministers in Havana
Lok Sabha, 7 April 1975
12. Statement Regarding Recent Developments in
India's 91 Relation with the Peoples Republic of China.
Lok Sabha, 15 April 1976

PART II

LEADER OF OPPOSITION IN LOK SABHA

Editorial Note 9 5

13. Motion of Thanks - Discussion on Address
by Vice-President acting as President
Lok Sabha, 31 March 1977
14. Debate on Finance Bill (No. 2), 1977
Lok Sabha, 15 July 1977
15. Debate on Amendments Recommended
by Rajya Sabha.
Finance Bill 1977
Lok Sabha, 2 August 1977
16. Fast for Rights of Neo-Buddhists
Lok Sabha, 21 November 1977

17. Motion of Thanks on President's Address
Lok Sabha, 2 March 1977
18. Motion Regarding Atrocities on Harijans
Lok Sabha, 7 April 1978
19. Recent Communal Riots
Lok Sabha, 4 December 1978
20. Obituary References to Jai Prakash Narayan
Lok Sabha, 22 March 1978
21. Demands for Grants of MEA
Lok Sabha, 2 April 1979
22. Adjournment Motion Regarding Aligarh
Muslim University
Lok Sabha, 15 May 1979
23. Motion of No Confidence in the Council of Ministers
Lok Sabha, 11 July 1979
24. Budget (Maharashtra), 1980-81
Lok Sabha, 17 March 1980
25. Continuance of President's Rule in Assam.
Lok Sabha, 10 June 1980
26. Demands for Grants of MEA, 1980-81
Lok Sabha, 8 July 1980
27. Motion Regarding Rise in Prices of
Essential Commodities
Lok Sabha, 25 November 1980
28. Demands for Grants of MEA, 1981-82
Lok Sabha, 31 March 1981
29. General Budget Discussion, 1982-83
Lok Sabha, 6 March 1982
30. Motion of No Confidence in Council of Ministers
Lok Sabha, 16 August 1982
31. Discussion on White Paper on Punjab Agitation
Lok Sabha, 25 July 1984

PART III

Obituary References to late Shri. Y B. Chavan

i. The Lok Sabha

Obituary References

ii. Rajya Sabha

VOLUME - IV

PART I

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SECTION - 1

DEMANDS OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EDITORIAL NOTE

This is the first major policy speech delivered by Y. B. Chavan as the Minister for External Affairs in which Chavan set out his own perception about basics of Indian Foreign Policy and India's role in international affairs.

As a devotee of the Parliamentary democracy, at the outset, he welcomed review of India's foreign policy and stated : "In this era of people's diplomacy, it is very right and necessary that the foreign policy of a country is reviewed in this forum, people's forum, from time to time." Emphasizing that India's policy is rooted in non-alignment, he pointed out that non-alignment is a dynamic living organism. Underlining the progress of detente he warned that there was need for vigilance and solidarity among the non-aligned countries in guarding against the tendency of big powers to carve out spheres of influence.

Speaking about neighbouring countries, he recalled what Pandit Nehru had said in the Asian Relation

Conference held on 23. 1. 1947 in New Delhi. Nehru said :

All over Asia we are passing through trials and tribulations This is inevitable in age of mighty transition. There are often creative impulses and a new vitality in all the peoples in Asia. The masses are awake and they demand their heritage. The strong winds are playing all over Asia. Let us not be afraid of them, but rather welcome them, only with their help can we build, a new age of our dreams let us, above all, have faith in the human spirit which Asia symbolized for long ages past.

According to Chavan, the awakening of Asia, emergence of the Third World, the move of the Third World countries to assert their sovereignty and the right to fix the prices of its own raw materials, were the three factors that were influencing the international scene.



CHAPTER - 1

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1975-76

Lok Sabha, 16 April 1975

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in the debate for the last 6 hours. I have listened with great care to most of the speeches. Those which I have not heard, I took care to read very carefully. Some of the members have made very constructive suggestions and I must pay my compliments for the high caliber of the debate. The constructive suggestions that they have made should certainly be borne in mind by the Government and I can assure the Hon. Members, Shri Unnikrishnan who spoke last, that in this era of people's diplomacy as he called it, it is very right and necessary that the foreign policy of a country is reviewed in this forum, people's forum, from time to time. I would like to point out, with your permission that immediately after I took over, I myself had sent a motion for considering the foreign policy of the country so that I would have, to begin with, some mandate, some direction, some instructions, some suggestions from this Hon. House and I might launch on my new duties with a little more support. Unfortunately the House did not find time to consider it. So far as the Government is concerned, the Government is always willing to consider the problems of foreign affairs in this House because it not only helps the Government to review its own policies but also gives some new directions in the light of the position in the world today.

In this debate I would like to make a general review of the

international scene as we see it today. The international situation is in an important and crucial stage of evolution and many developments that are taking place vitally affect us also. Hon. Members would naturally wish to know how we see the international situation, what are the major features of the trends that affect us, and how it is that we are going to meet this evolving situation by anticipating events, by taking the initiative and also be reacting to events.

As most of the Hon. Members have pointed out, the international scene today has moved quite a bit from what it was two years ago. As we all know, the present era is also called an era of detente. Formerly, there was an atmosphere of confrontation which is being increasingly replaced by an attitude of co-operation. I am saying that it is a trend, it has not still become a full reality, but certainly it is a trend. The world today is not as it was before, a bi-polar world, but it is multi polar world and it is in this world that we have to watch the new developments and trends.

As we see it, both Soviet Russia and the U. S. A. which are the two Super Powers are adopting a policy of co-operation and with all the strains and difficulties in the way, it seems that they are making slow but definite progress in that direction which we welcome. As we see it, they have succeeded to a certain extent, because despite many problems which we see today in West Asia, Cyprus etc., they have succeeded in avoiding any confrontation. Some people say that this detente is also another way of managing political crisis. It may be so. That is another way of looking at it, but the point is that certainly a new trend of co-operation instead of confrontation has come to stay and we welcome it, we support it.

There is also another very important factor in the international scene, and I that is the relationship of China with these two major powers. We see that there is slow but definite understanding between China and U. S. A. It may be halting, it may be sometimes ambiguous, but I see a definite trend of understanding between

the USA and China on the one hand. On the other hand the relationship between China and the USSR is clouded with suspicion and mistrust. I am merely mentioning certain major facts which ultimately influence the international scene. As to how these events affect us, to that we will come a little later. But let us first of all take into consideration the major situations.

There is also another very positive factor which has come into force in the international scene today, on which was in a very detailed and eloquent manner mentioned yesterday by many hon. Members. Prof. Mukerjee and our friend Shri Dinesh Singh and many other Members from this side made mention of the new rising tide of people's success in Asia particularly. And this is something which is very significant. I was tempted to see what Panditji thought about these new trends immediately after independence, how he saw it, because there is no doubt that the greatest contribution to the world and to India that was made by Pandit Nehru was that he made a very accurate judgement, a very precise judgement, of the new world that was emerging after the Second World War. That was much more important and it is in that view that he laid down certain basic fundamental policies for the foreign policy of this country, on the basis of which we are evolving our foreign policy. Some people say that it is weak, some people say that it is one-sided, but really speaking they have not tried to understand the real urges and the real inspiration which have been the foundations of this policy. I would like to quote a passage from the speech of Pandit Nehru which he delivered 28 years ago. It was his inaugural speech at the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi held on 23rd March, 1947 and this is the last paragraph which I would like to read.

'All over Asia we are passing through trials and tribulations. In India also you see conflict and trouble. Let us not be disheartened by this. This is inevitable in an age of mighty transition. There are often creative impulses and a new vitality in all the peoples in Asia. The masses are awake and they demand their heritage. Strong

winds are blowing all over Asia. Let us not be afraid of them, but rather welcome them, for only with their help can we build, a new age of our dreams. Let us have faith in these great new forces and the dream which is taking place. Let us, above all, have faith in the human spirit which Asia symbolised for long ages past."

So this was assessment of Pandit Nehru 28 years ago and what has happened in the last 28 years has not only supported this, but it has shown that people in Latin America, Africa and Asia, all people who were under the domination of imperialism were on the march and struggle against these evil forces. We see from year to year that these forces are marching forward from one triumph to another.

We have seen what has happened in Cambodia; what is happening in South Vietnam. We have seen what has happened in South Africa, in the African continent and what has happened in Portugal. These are the new forces, the people's forces, in Africa and Asia which, certainly, have made a great impact on the international scene today. This is one of the most important realities. I am mentioning this thing because this is the most important element which will shape the foreign policy of the world trends in the year to come.

Another important thing that has happened is the emergence of the third world. Not merely it has liberated or it has come into its own but it has organised certain institutional forums also to assert itself. One feature of it is the non-aligned movement. The non-aligned movement today is one of the important forces with which the world has to work, recognise and accept as an important fact. We have seen that most of the non-aligned countries are developing countries and most of them belong to the third world. What have we seen in the last year? oth the Special Session of the General Assembly Session of the U. N. demonstrated that this third world and the peoples of the third world are not merely struggling to come into their own but are asserting their rights; they are asserting to achieve justice and equity. They are not merely

asking for justice but they are finding out ways and instruments to achieve justice and equity.

These are the basic elements in the international scene today. Of course, there is another reality also which we have to take into account and that is the very acute economic situation that has overtaken the world in the last two or three years, particularly, in the form of inflationary conditions, the prices of certain raw materials and the price of imports in developing countries and their effect on the economy of those countries. This is also a new reality that we have to take into account.

We have seen in the last year or so, in different international forums, many important matters regarding raw materials, regarding petrol prices, regarding transfer of real resources from developed countries to developing countries, regarding monetary crises and the solutions for them coming up. There are many aspects of the economic situation which are being discussed.

There was a question of confrontation between the oil consumers and the oil producers. Naturally, we as a developing country and as a non-aligned country took a line that even the oil producing countries have a certain right, as sovereign States, to fix the prices of oil even though it certainly cost us more. Even then, we took a principled position and we supported that. At the same time we have also pointed out to the world that it has had a rather harmful effect on our economy for which certain solutions must be found. Instead of taking an approach of confrontation, we can certainly take an approach and an attitude of co-operation. It is on those lines that we have worked at different international forums. Even now, in Paris, I think, our representative is meeting in a preparatory meeting for a conference between the consumers and producers and most seriously affected countries. I hope, with this approach of co-operation, it might help us to go ahead.

I mention in detail these economic matters because the present economic problems, monetary problems and the economic crisis,

all these things, are also factors in the international scene which are going to influence policy making in the foreign affairs field. You cannot separate economic matters from political matters. We saw what happened in the 1973 war in West Asia. It really created the present acute problems as a result of the political situation there. They are increasingly getting integrated with each other. It is very difficult to separate one from the other. Therefore, this is an important factor on the world scene today that is going to affect the thinking in all the countries, of which both the developed countries and the developing countries have to take note as a part of their policy-making affairs.

I was talking about non-alignment. In the non-alignment movement also, in order to maintain the solidarity of the non-aligned countries, we will have to find out the areas of co-operation whereby, taking into consideration the complementarity of the economies of these countries, we could build bridges of co-operation with non-aligned countries, the developing countries, the third world countries. And this solidarity of the non-aligned countries is the greatest guarantee of the progressive forces in the world. This is the major point that I wanted to make about this particular aspect.

Non-alignment, as I have said, is movement. I was asked the other day whether non-aligned was not becoming a mantra, and I pointed out to my interviewer that 'non-alignment is a dynamic, living organism'. Notwithstanding the progress of detente, which all of us welcome and to which we subscribe in our own attitudes, there is need for vigilance and solidarity among the non-aligned countries in guarding against the tendency to carve out spheres of influence or settle matters over the heads of others. The importance of such solidarity was reiterated at the recent Ministerial meeting of the Co-ordination Bureau of the non-aligned at Havana. The aims and principles of non-alignment continue to have a great validity in order to ensure genuine independence, peace and international security for the majority of the world's population, and India will

continue to play its due role in furthering these principles. What has happened in Cyprus underlines the importance of solidarity among the non-aligned. We firmly support the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and non-aligned status of Cyprus. We endorse the various U. N. Resolutions on Cyprus which, while reiterating the above-mentioned principles, call for an end to foreign military presence of interference and for talks between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities in order to achieve a mutually acceptable political and constitutional settlement. For the sake of peace in that region and of the welfare of the people of Cyprus who have already suffered so much, we earnestly hope that all concerned will avoid doing anything that might delay or endanger the prospects of such a settlement. We are glad to note that there is likelihood of the talks between the two communities being resumed shortly.

I have mentioned the economic and monetary crises. I would like to refer to what Mr. Naik has said. I would request him to reconsider the proposition that he had made...

An Hon. Member : What did he say?

Shri Y. B. Chavan : I do not want to repeat what he had said.

Prof. Madhu Dandavate (Rajapur) : Why not tell him that it is not a mantra but a tantra?

Shri Y B. Chavan : I am sure he has followed argument. We have certainly supported the oil producing countries in this. It is basically a very correct position to take, because this had been the basis of exploitation by the colonialists.

We talk about colonialism. Ultimately what is colonialism? They try to exploit the raw materials of undeveloped countries, and further process them, and it is this processing part that, really speaking, gives the economic strength.

Therefore, the right of a sovereign country to fix the prices of its own raw materials is a very fundamental principle which we

must support. But, all the same time, I am quite aware that it has created certain problems which we are, very frankly, discussing with the non-aligned, oil-producing and oil-exporting countries that it is their duty also to keep the solidarity of the non-aligned world, that they must see that they too try to co-operate with the developing countries in order that these countries are not ultimately affected.

Our basic position in international affairs is - and I should say that that is the major plank of our foreign policy - to build our friendship on very strong foundations as far as our neighbouring countries are concerned. Therefore, you will permit me to go country by country because this is important.... (Interruptions). that is the major plank of our policy in the neighbouring countries in which I include the Gulf countries, the South-East Asian countries and also the countries in the North. I know the hon. Member over there has sent me a chit. He wants to ask me a question. But before he asks the question, I will try to answer it and I am sure I will not be able to convince him...

Let us take the case of Pakistan first because it is a neighbour and it is in the minds of many members who have made a mention. I read the speeches and I would like to assure hon. member, Shri Madhavrao Scindia. He sent to note yesterday that I should be present when he spoke, I am sorry I had to go away to attend a Cabinet Committee meeting urgently. But I have taken care to read his speech very carefully. About Pakistan he has made criticisms against our foreign policy. As he is a young and new member, I do not want to be critical about him. I certainly would like to appreciate his participation in the debate and the contribution he has made. I must tell him that he has not followed the real foreign policy principles behind what happened in the Simla Agreement
....

What happened in 1971 was something bigger than merely Indo-Pakistan relations. The result of the success of 1971 has to be seen in the emergence of a sovereign Bangladesh, in India's

effort to go to the aid of a struggling people who were striving hard to get independence to go to the aid of people who were being ruthlessly and brutally driven from their homes in their own country. This is the context in which you will have to see what happened later on. What was really being tried through Simla Agreement was not merely to solve the temporary issues that had given rise to particular problems. Naturally Pakistan along with many other friends have come to recognise Bangladesh. Then, we had to solve certain humanitarian problems involved in it. We had to solve the problem of the Pakistan prisoners-of-war. What the Simla Agreement has done is that it has certainly given a framework of detente in the sub-continent, if I may use that word. It is something which is a very basic. Ultimately you cannot see a region in isolation if you are talking about world peace. It is something which is a very basic. Ultimately you cannot see a region in isolation if you are talking about world peace and friendly relations and co-existence in the whole world. You cannot think in other terms as far as your own region is concerned.

.... What is the way one has to look? I know there are certain more hurdles in the way. I do not think it is very easy. Some of the things cannot be merely wished away. Wishful thinking is not going to be helpful to anybody. We should better see the significance and the force behind what really speaking took place there. Well, afterwards, Pakistan has taken a zig-zag attitude, to use their own words. I do not want to go over the details of what we did in case of trade, communication agreements, etc. Certainly Pakistan has to accept this position that it has to build up good relations with India and efforts have been made, but there are certain inherent attitudes in Pakistan which have to be cured by their own efforts. Possibly we have to help them to cure it, and possibly history will also cure it. The first difficult position that they took was immediately after May 1974 when India exploded a nuclear device. They tried to misinterpret India and carried on propaganda against India all over the world, but, without much

impact. A large number of countries have accepted the bonafides of India in its affirmation that this nuclear explosion was made for peaceful purposes. Even USA accepted this position. So, their attempts did not make much impact on world opinion.

Then, the most important step that we have taken in the last few months is the agreement with Sheikh Abdullah about Kashmir. Shri Bhutto tried to make capital out of it and started campaigning against that. But I do not think he has made any impact. But he has certainly tried to create difficulties in this process of normalisation. We have made it clear to him that this agreement with Sheikh Abdullah is an internal matter of India. Kashmir is an integral part of India and the understanding with Sheikh Abdullah is certainly going to help normalisation of relations with Pakistan. I hope that Shri Bhutto will see the wisdom in this regard and continue this process. We are expecting their Foreign Secretary to come here and discuss further the question of civil aviation, over-flight etc. and this process will continue.

Shri Samar Guha : The earth under the feet is already gone, now you are trying to build up the aerial nexus with Pakistan.

Shri Y B. Chavan : Well, civil aviation also ultimately comes down on the earth! What has happened to you Mr. Samar Guha? You are a great revolutionary; you have become such a pessimist and lost all your idealism. What has happened to you? The main point is this. The old process was going on in a proper way; something happened in between; then our relations with Pakistan were gradually, slowly, may be haltingly, making progress and then at that time this thing happened; And, what a time was chosen by the USA! The United States of American decided to lift the embargo which in their own wisdom they had placed some ten years before. But this is the time they chose to lift the embargo. It could, really speaking, affect both the processes, normalisation process With Pakistan and normalisation of our relations with USA also. Somebody said that we must have our bridges of friendship with all the big powers. ` So, this also came in the way.

It is not again - let me make it clear - a question of merely giving a few weapons here or there which will make a change. What is it that we are objecting to? I would like them to understand our objection. What we are objecting to today is the politics behind supplying arms just to create a balance of power. This has been followed by them for the last couple of decades.

I think they have now realized it. There seems to be some sort of a curse of American arms that wherever they go, defeat follows them. It looks like that. One sometimes becomes superstitious. I am not a superstitious person. Some times this is what it looks like. There is an absolute limitation to what arms can do or what the militarists can do. In both Africa and Asia and possibly, in all parts of the world, nationalism is still an important force to be reckoned with and the awakened masses are also to be reckoned with. Their urges and their aspirations have all to be taken into account. This is one thing which these big countries do not take note of. And that, really speaking, is creating problems for themselves and creating problems for the world.

I think Shri Madhavrao Scindia has criticised America. But, I think, he could not do anything else because now America is supporting Pakistan (Interruptions).

Shri Madhavrao Scindia : What I want to ask you is this. You said that Bangladesh war should be looked at in the context of the emergence of Sovereign Bangladesh. I take it that when war took place, the Government of India had entirely dismissed from their mind the recovery of occupied land in Kashmir. Has the Govt. written off Kashmir? This is my first point. Secondly, I take it that the brave jawans died only for Bangladesh and for their country. How can you conduct a war in compartments. Am I to take it that in this war, the jawans fought and died only for Bangladesh and not for our country?

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Look, Pakistan made an aggression against us. When was it started? Don't forget the history of Bangladesh.

What Bangbandhu Mujibur Rehman was doing was a different thing. But, India entered into war only when there was aggression against India. Do not forget this. You will please re-read the Simla Agreement. You will know that we have not given up this position. Naturally, we have said that these questions will have to be peacefully negotiated to which Mr. Bhutto is a party. (Interruptions). I do not want to enter into a dialogue on this here. Sometimes we can meet and discuss when we can try to convince you. So, the point I was making was this. As far as Pakistan is concerned, unfortunately, they have taken a wrong position. The reason is the supply of arms to them. That certainly has created certain difficulties. But, still, it is our policy that despite our difficulties, we shall continue to make efforts to normalise our relations with Pakistan because we believe in friendship with Pakistan and our efforts will be deliberately and consciously towards strengthening our relations in that direction.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, I think I have made our own position very I would like to say that in our policy towards South-East Asia, we have consistently endeavoured to explore the possibilities of mutually beneficial co-operation in the countries in this region. I think we can claim a measure of success in this effort. I would, for instance, refer you to the continental shelf boundary agreement concluded in the year 1974 with Indonesia which is an example of mutually beneficial co-operation in the waters separating the countries in the region. Even with other countries in South-East Asia we have been able to identify and, to some extent, develop co-operation in the areas of mutual interest and we propose to continue our efforts in this direction. Further afield in the South Pacific, we have been able to evolve a similarity of interest with Australia and New Zealand - an example of this is the valuable change in the Australian attitude on the question of the Indian Ocean as a 'Zone of peace'.

Our bilateral relations with almost all the countries in Asia have been developing satisfactorily. Of course, the question that

was argued yesterday - and it is a very important question of finding certain forum through which we can develop an Asian identity is a very important point made by all the members. Some of them showed some ignorance when they said there was no forum where anything could be discussed. It is not so. There are certain institutions in the economic field which are working in the form of ESCAP, Asian Development Bank, etc. But I would like to add that we have been conscious of a certain lack of institutional arrangements for consultations among Asian countries which could provide an opportunity to ensure that their interests are adequately promoted in various international forums. While we are aware that a variety of political and other reasons somewhat inhibit the creation of a regional consultative organization for Asia, we are nevertheless exploring various avenues to foster a sense of Asian identity. Towards this end Government has been undertaking consultation with several friendly Asian Governments whose response has been generally encouraging. It is hoped that these exchanges can be widened and will eventually lead to the emergence of a greater sense of unity in Asia.

My Colleague, the ex-Foreign Minister, Mr. Dinesh Singh, particularly laid emphasis on this aspect and made a mention of the Asian Ministers council. Some meetings of this council took place. The last one was held in 1970. Afterwards it was not possible to hold them but in this matter our judgement is that you cannot force the pace. There are certain regional and internal contradictions which you cannot forcibly solve. This can be done by building bilateral co-operation and when you work out some sort of network of bilateral relations, as I mentioned, multilateral relationship may emerge. We will have to make very cautious though urgent efforts in this direction. Professor Mukherjee and Shri Daschowdhury also made a mention about it.

Recognising that the world grows more interdependent, politically as well as economically, we actively advocate and pursue a policy of international co-operation. This has been the guiding

principle of our attitude particularly towards our neighbours. I have already spoken about Pakistan. In recent months, in our relations with some other neighbours, we have been able to resolve some long standing issues which had defined solution for generations. I refer to the Agreements with Sri Lanka on Kachachativu and the future of persons of Indian origin.

I refer also to the agreement with Bangladesh about Indo-Bangladesh land boundary. In our dealings with all neighbours, we have invariably kept in mind the principle of mutual benefit and sovereign equality. Most of our neighbours now have a better understanding and appreciation of our policy of friendship and co-operation and realise that we have no intention of interfering in their internal affairs or posing any threat to them in any form.

The House is, of course, aware of the recent political and constitutional changes in Bangladesh. So far as we are concerned, they do not signify any change in Bangladesh's policy of friendship and cooperation with India and her non-aligned posture in foreign affairs. On our part, we shall continue to strike for the closest possible cooperation and friendship with that country. It is true that there are some outstanding issues such as the delimitation of maritime boundary and the Farakka barrage. But, we are confident that in the context of the genuine desire for amity and cooperation on both sides, a fair and amicable solution which safeguards the interests of both the countries will be reached.

In regard to Nepal, a country with which we have close and traditional ties of friendship, we are hopeful that a healthy relationship can be built up on the basis of mutual respect and a frank recognition by each country of the other's sensitivities. For our part, we have always done our best to respect Nepalese interest and wishes on a number of issues. We cherish our friendship with Nepal, but this relationship must depend for its growth and sustenance on common observance by both the countries of the elements of reciprocity, mutual benefit, mutual respect and non-intervention in each other's internal affairs. This is as far as Nepal

is concerned. Sir, the other areas are the areas of West Asia.

..... I had briefly touched upon the dangers of the situation in West Asia. Our attitude to the Arab Israeli problem is well-known. We have consistently supported the principle of denying the aggressor the fruits of his aggression and recognising the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Just peace in West Asia can be secured only on the basis of these principles. The Arab world, by and large, recognises that our support to them over to years has been based on principles and not on expediency. In turn, this has facilitated Indo-Arab co-operation in many fields to our mutual benefit. We have always supported the Palestinian cause and have accepted the Palestinian Liberation Organisation as the legitimate representative of the people of Palestine in their just cause. When the PLO recently asked for permission to open an office in Delhi, we readily agreed to that request. The office has started functioning already.

In this connection, I may also refer to the closer relations that we have been able to develop with the Gulf countries. This is a very important part of our neighbourhood. Several high level visits have been exchanged as a result of which fresh avenues of bilateral co-operation have been identified or developed. Saudi Arabia, under the late King Feisal, has played a dynamic role in West Asia and his tragic death has grieved us deeply. In the past few months, we were able to widen the areas of understanding and co-operation with that country. We look forward to developing this further.

I would like to say a few words about our relations with Iran and Iraq. In the last few years, Iran has shown greater understanding than before on a number of issues of concern to us and has also actively developed contact in the fields of economic co-operation. Iran has demonstrated its interest in the stability of the region. Its friendly relations with Pakistan need not hinder the further strengthening of our bilateral relations, and it is our hope and desire that Indo-Iranian friendship and cooperation will continue

to grow to mutual benefit.

With Iraq, our relations have been traditionally close and friendly. The Prime Minister was accorded a very cordial reception when she visited Iraq in January this year. Iraq was the first country to extend easy payment terms for oil when we were in need. In the circumstances, the news of an accord between Iran and Iraq in March this year over the boundary and other problems has been very welcome, and we hope that both these countries will work together in the interest of the whole region.

I had referred earlier in my speech to the threat of military intervention in this region .. I am talking about the west Asia region. Some contingencies will have to be faced by us with the confidence that gun-boat diplomacy is not an effective political instrument. The Suez misadventure of 1956 bears testimony to that. At the same time, we have to redouble our efforts to strengthen the solidarity of the entire non-aligned world, so that our unity and determination may serve as a warning to the potential interventionist.

While we shall continue to direct our efforts towards getting the developed world to better appreciate the point of view of the developing countries and towards promoting proposals for international co-operation, the safeguarding of our own security interests would naturally assume paramount importance. In that context, we have to continue to build up and strengthen our relations with these countries which would stand by us.

The only other country, to which I wanted to make a reference and which I have not been able to do, was Afghanistan. As you know, President Daud paid us a visit very recently. There were some good discussions between the president and the Prime Minister. I think I should have made a reference along with Pakistan to Afghanistan that Pakistan's recent attitude of belligerency towards Afghanistan is another matter which, really speaking, concerns us. Our relation with Afghanistan are very close and friendly and

We have the fullest sympathy with Afghanistan in the problems it faces. Of course, with Pakistan also, we went to be friendly....

.... When President Daud recently came here, we both felt that the U.S. decision on arms supplies to Pakistan would encourage the forces of confrontation and tension, retarding the process of normalisation in South Asia.

In this connection, I would like to mention one aspect to which many members made reference and that is regarding Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan is a person not belonging to one country or the other. He was a veteran freedom fighter and naturally his arrest has caused concern to us, and I share that concern.

... With regard to China, the fact that I refer to our relations with China in the end does not by any means signify that we attach less importance to that great country. In spite of what China has or has not done, we continue to have an open mind on the question of improving our relations with China. We have repeatedly made known our desire and willingness to do so. Unfortunately this thing cannot be a one way affair; there has to be a response from the other side as well. We do not have as yet any concrete evidence of a corresponding desire by China to improve its relations with us. In spite of the recent visit of the table tennis team and the optimistic statement by the Chinese Vice Premier who passed through Calcutta in February on his way to Kathmandu for the coronation of the King, the Chinese have shown no real change in attitude. On the contrary they have launched a fresh barrage of anti-Indian propaganda on well-worn themes like Kashmir, Pakistan, Sikkim, Nepal, etc.

I find two very interesting criticisms coming from two different Members of the opposition. Shri Mavalankar told us not to insist on rigid reciprocity, if I am quoting him correctly. If in relationships between two countries reciprocity is not to be maintained, what is to be taken care of? If reciprocity is considered rigidity, the only

thing is surrender.

.... That is one thing. On the other side my hon. friend Scindiaji said : do not go by the ping pong diplomacy (Interruptions). The word used was -- ping pong diplomacy. You said : let it be there; but not be the ball but be a bat. That is what he said. This word 'ping pong diplomacy' in connection with India has no meaning. It might have had some significance in relation to the United States because they had no other communication with China, they had no diplomatic relations; they had no embassy in peking nor had China and embassy in Washington in the United States. They had to depend upon some types of diplomacy... (Interruption).

Shri Madhvrao Scindia : Surely, you have not taken it literally. I do not mean that you go and play ping pong with Mao Tse Tung. That is just an expression.

Shri. Y B. Chavan : In this particular matter, we have to judge the facts. Our basic attitudes are clear. we certainly Would like to see what their attitude is going to be and respond to it in the proper manner when we get proper indications. That is what I wanted to say.

In the case of West European countries, I should like to say that our relations with those countries are good. Their economic cooperation is very important for us and I think our relations will continue to develop in the proper way in the years to come. The most important change that has happened in western Europe is the change in Portugal. After nearly four decades of fascist regime, democracy had asserted itself and it has not only liberated forces of democracy in Portugal but it has also liberated the forces in Africa, Angola and Mozambique. There are very important changes taking places not only in the former Portuguese colonies, but some optimistic signs of liberation and progressive forces making further progress are seen in some other countries in South Africa as well as in Zimbabwe and Namibia. In this region, the local statesmen like President Nyerere and President Kaunda are taking a lead in

constructive statementship.

An hon. member mentioned about Latin America. Our relationship with Latin American countries is also recognised to be a very important plank of foreign policy. May be what was true ten years before is not true today. We have got our Embassies there. I had particularly mentioned that this non-aligned meet at Havana had a special significance in the context of Latin American countries. The non-aligned movement is taking firmer roots in Latin America and they are participating in third world problems and identifying themselves with the third world, which is very good. As far as trade is concerned, trade with Latin America is not an easy matter. It is a matter of distance, but even then we have started making progress. A direct shipping service has been started. It goes to Surinam, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago and other places depending on cargo. There is possibility of another service to Panama and pacific ports of Latin America. Certainly these contacts will ultimately help the growth of trade and economic cooperation.

As far as East European countries and Soviet Russia are concerned, our relations are very friendly. Prof. Mukherjee suggested yesterday that by mistake sometimes people try to bracket the two super powers together. I think that is not at least our Government's attitude, because the two super power cannot be bracketed together. They are not only qualitatively different, but they are different from the point of views of our national interest. This is one fact we have to take note of. Whenever India was in difficulty Soviet Russia has stood by us. Certainly our relations with Soviet Russia are very friendly and they will grow from strength to strength. Our relations with the East European socialist countries are also very friendly. Only this year we have visits from three Prime Minsiters of East European countries and we have found that there is identity of views and similarity of approach in regard to many international matters. I think our trade and economic cooperation is also growing. Our relation with the East European

countries and the Soviet world is a very important matter of policy with us and I am sure it will grow from strength to strength.

As far as U.S.A. is concerned, Dr. Kissenger's visit created certain hopes, but the lifting of the embargo created difficulties and I had to postpone my visit to U.S.A. For future, we certainly hope to have good relations with them, but it will depend upon their showing sensitivity to our national concerns.

As far as Cambodia is concerned, we have recognised the Government of Prince Sihanouk. As for the PRG, I would like to assure the House that our sympathies are always with them in this matter. From the very beginning we have stood with the struggle of the Vietnamese people. After the Paris Agreement, we had discussions with the PRG's representatives, and it is with their agreement that we have accepted that their General delegation should be set up in India. Certain letters are expected to be exchanged. Certainly, a new situation is developing. I can only say that we are watching the changing situation. You can rest assured that we will do the right thing at the right time.....

As far as the Commonwealth is concerned, it is a very important forum for exchange of views. It is not a body which takes any policy decisions. It is not expected to do any such thing. But when heads of governments, coming from different regions at different levels of development come together, the exchange of views help each other. This has been my experience. Of course, I have not attended the Prime Ministers' Conference as yet, but I have experience of the conference of the Finance Ministers of the Commonwealth. I must say that it helps us to come into contact with the Carrebean countries, the African Countries and the South Asian countries, and this exchange of views certainly helps us to develop a sort of consensus. It is good that some of the developed countries like Britain, Australia and New Zealand are present. Sometimes their availing of the views of the third world help them, though I am not sure how far, in influencing the decision-making in other countries like America.

I think I have practically dealt with all the major problems that were raised.

Some hon. Members referred to the question of cultural diplomacy. I would like to say that cultural diplomacy is one of the instruments for promoting friendly relations with other countries. Strictly speaking, cultural agreements and cultural exchange programmes are the responsibility of the Department of Culture. However, as one of the implementing agencies, the Indian Council of Cultural Relations, which is under the administrative control of my ministry, has been carrying out active and increasingly wider programmes of cultural exchanges with other countries, within the constraints imposed by our limited foreign exchange resources.

Now two points remain. One is about our Embassies and Missions, which was a point made by some of the members, particularly by Shri. Mavalankar. I can say from my experience of the last six months, because I have travelled quite a bit in the last six months and I have come into contact with younger officers of the Foreign Service, that most of them are very eager, keen, intelligent and patriotic persons. Shri Mavalankar mentioned his experience sometime in the last decade. But things have changed. Certainly, there are some limitations on them. One is manpower availability. Some of our missions are small. But I quite agree that there is scope for improvement in the relations with the public. I will again bring to their notice the feeling in the House that they will have to be a little out-going in their relations with the Indians abroad, Indians on visit, and that they should certainly build up India's image in the countries in which they serve.

I trust I have been able to give the House some of the salient features of the present international situation and the manner in which we have tried to make our foreign policy a dynamic and flexible instrument for projecting India's views and safeguarding her interests. The objectives of Indian foreign policy are to promote the cause of peace and international co-operation, as we believe that this would secure the interests not only of India but also of

the entire international community.

In the global context, we welcome the world-wide trend towards detente and reduction of tensions. It is in this atmosphere that humanity can achieve social, economic and political progress. It is also in this context that we can take steps in their direction of general and complete disarmament. At the same time, we advocate strongly the sovereign equality of nations and we maintain that all countries, big or small, rich or poor, should have a voice in the working out of their destinies.

India, accordingly, believes that non-alignment plays a crucial role in the furtherance of these objectives. We continue to attach great importance to the unity and solidarity of the non-aligned countries in the interests of themselves, of the developing countries and of the international community as a whole. We remain firmly committed and totally opposed to all forms of colonialism, racism and discrimination in the world, where ever and in whatever form they might occur.

In the global context, we also believe firmly in the increasing interdependence of nations, particularly in the task of finding urgent solutions to some of the grave economic problems facing us, including those of inflation, imbalances and inequalities. We believe that there is an increasing awareness everywhere that no country, however great or powerful, can afford to regard a problem anywhere as being of no concern to it.

We have devoted our special attention to amity and cooperation in our region; we have made special efforts and taken various initiatives to strengthen our relations with all countries of the region, particularly our neighbours. It is only through friendship & cooperation, on the basis of sovereign equality and mutual benefit, that we can help each other to build regional peace and stability, and thus contribute to the relaxation of tensions around the world. We have, I think, achieved a substantial measure of success in strengthening our relations with many countries in the region on the basis of these principles. We have settled with them some of

the problems which had defied solutions for generations. I need hardly mention that our attitude to Pakistan too is guided by the same devotion to good neighbourly relations and willingness to settle all problem bilaterally and peacefully.

We attach paramount importance to promoting understanding and developing and strengthening bilateral cooperation in the political as well as economic and cultural fields. As I have said the conduct of our foreign policy has been directed at this objective bilaterally, regionally and globally, the objective of building bridges of friendship, cooperation and understanding.

CHAPTER - 2

DEBATE ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Lok Sabha, 8 January 1976

EDITORIAL NOTE

Intervening in the Debate, Y B. Chavan shared his thinking about the proclamation of the Emergency. He recalled that the country had accepted democracy as an instrument for bringing about socio-economic transformation. However, in the recent past, " I have felt, functioning on the Treasury Benches, functioning as a citizen of India, functioning as an old freedom fighter that there was a game of obstacles going on all around." That had created a sense of frustration in the country. According to Chavan, "if we allow a sense of frustration to be built up, I would say, that itself means an end of democracy in the country. This is the basic thing." He added, "Democracy means faith of people in themselves. The moment they feel that they cannot make any further progress through the institution that they have created, to which they are committed that is the end of democracy."

Speaking about India's external relations, Chavan stated that, "Foreign policy issues are organically linked with the internal policies.... They are practically the same thing, it is an indivisible entity."

Shri Y B. Chavan : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on my feet for a very brief intervention on the discussion on the motion of Thanks to the President. I must first of all, thank many of the Members who in

the course of their contribution referred to some of the important aspects of the foreign policy matters. They have certainly made a useful contribution and some constructive suggestions. Some times they were somewhat critical also. But looking to the contents of the speeches on the major issues, I get a very pleasant impression that I think, all of you will share it with me, that as far as the aims and objectives of the foreign , policy of this country are concerned, there appears to be a general consensus and that I think is one of the assets of our national strength.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of my brief intervention, I would like to deal with two aspects of the debate; one naturally deals with the foreign policy matters but ultimately foreign policy in way, is a reflection of internal political and economic policy as well. I will be dealing with both the subjects together.

As far as the important matter referred to in the speech of the president is concerned, I think, we have practically taken a review of the entire world situation. We have tried to refer some of the positive aspects and positive positions that are developing in the world today. And we have also made a reference to certain elements or forces which can be said to be of a negative character. In regard to the positive points, we have welcomed the successful culmination of the Helsinki Conference where the European countries had met to consider problems of their security. We have welcomed it as one the very positive elements among recent developments in the world, where two groups of Powers have accepted the principle of peaceful co-existence. They have committed themselves to make an effort to relax the tension both in political and economic matters as also to seek areas where they can cooperate with each other. Looking to the history of the last two decades, this is certainly a very positive development which we have welcomed. The other important development in the world situation is the successful end of the people's struggle in South-

East Asia, particularly the people's struggle in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos which have struggled for decades without the help of any big power. It was, really speaking, a demonstration of the very inherent strength of the people against the forces of imperialism and colonialism, when they depend on themselves and not on any other outside force. It has been demonstrated that if people fight with determination and patriotism, they can ultimately succeed. This certainly is some thing not only good for the people themselves in those countries, but it certainly gives a sense of confidence to the people at large. I would say that it gives a sense of confidence to the suffering humanity, that they certainly could have a bright future, provided they depend on their own strength, on their own strategy and on their own efforts. This is one more A important development that we see there. Another major political event to which we have made a reference is the African continent. There, the process of de-colonization started after, I would say, the defeat of fascism in Portugal itself. So, as a matter of fact the process of de-colonization started at home in Portugal; and then, this wave of de-colonization started in the African continent and we see that in a number of countries - mention of that has been made in the speech of the President - have declared their independence and have come into their own, which is a positive factor. But, if it were only these three factors, I would certainly have said that things were very rosy and that we should sit back relaxed and say : "Very well done and now very little remains to be done as far as our nation is concerned." But, unfortunately, that is not so. When these things are making progress, when nationalism has succeeded in certain areas, those forces which were defeated, have not accepted their defeat with any grace. They cannot, because it is not the forces but, really speaking, it is the interests which are defeated; and the vested interests never accept defeat so easily. That is the basic thing; and therefore they have now changed their fronts. They have changed their tactics and methods, they have changed their ways of doing things and changed the areas of functioning; and they have changed the

instruments also. That is what we have to see, because they are not going to accept that as the final word, because they are not only nations or only groups of people, they are dominating world interests which can depend only on their capacity to exploit, and if at all have to understand these world forces ultimately, we must understand them in their correct perspective. Therefore, they are trying to find out some other ways, some other methods.

When they saw that their army itself could not succeed, and would never succeed, - that is one thing that is very clear now - they have found out some other ways. The other way is trying to divide the developing countries, the nonaligned countries, trying to get those elements in those countries which are favourable to them. Here I would like to differ slightly from Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao. If I have understood him correctly there is nothing like internal Fascism alone. I do not believe in that sort of thing. Fascism is external as also internal. External Fascism has an opportunity to work mainly on internal base which is narrow. There is always some base of vested interest in socio-economic field in a country on which they try to build themselves. They make use of these forces also. That is exactly what is happening in Angola for example.

We have welcomed the independence of Angola. We have welcomed the independence of Mozambique. But what is happening in Mozambique and Angola today is an eye-opener. We find there the real representative of all world reactionaries, all reactionary philosophies, the imperialistic or neo-colonial economic policies, the racist policy. South Africa is the epitome of neo-colonialism. Today, South African forces are making an armed intervention in Angola. They are sending their armed forces to Angola. This is what is happening in Mozambique for example. In every colonial country, there are always certain elements. There is an army trained by the colonial powers. If that can be made use of, they certainly try to use it. There are some economic vested interests which can try to assert themselves. Because they have no further opportunity, they

would like to give last battle. That is what is happening. These are the negative elements to which I was making a reference, and these negative forces are not merely seen in the distant African continent. They are in the Indian Ocean, they are in South Asia, on our sub-continent. What is happening beyond the borders of our country and perhaps within our own country?

I heard arguments for and against the emergency, why it was necessary, why it was not necessary. Let us now take it for granted that it is a reality. Now we will have to find out why it came about. When you accept that it has come because of certain basic reasons, political, economic and social reasons, we have to accept that reality and try to make a creative use of the emergency. I would like to deal with that aspect along with other matters.

What was happening in the country? I heard with rapt attention the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Prasanabhai Mehta. He said that the whole thing was linked up with what happened in Gujarat. I would say, not only Gujarat; I would go even a little before that. What happened in the last few years in the country? I think, it is your and my responsibility, as representatives of the people and as advocates of democracy, to look back as to what was happening. Let me think aloud with you.

When we say that we accepted a new Constitution after Independence, when we say that there was a tryst with destiny, when we fondly quote our great leader Nehru, what were its implications? Its implications were not merely the transfer of British power to us. But it was a commitment to our own people for a socio-economic transformation. This is the tryst with destiny. For that matter, the Parliament was created. The sovereign Parliament is the expression of the will of the people. About some other democratic institutions in which all our members have faith, we have no less faith than what others claim to have in those democratic institutions. The political parties as such is another institution of democratic culture. The courts are in institution which

is necessary for the functioning of democracy. It is all right. But are you to go by only the forms of democracy? Are you going to take shadow for substance? What is the substance of democracy? What is the basic objective for which we have accepted democracy as an instrument in India. It is the socio-economic transformation.

What have we been observing in the last few years? Kindly excuse me if my phrase is not so elegant. I think, it is a common man's phrase if I may say so. At least, I have felt, functioning on the Treasury Benches, functioning as a citizen of India, functioning as an old freedom fighter that there was a game of obstacles going on, all around. This was all that was happening. These are many plus points in our internal situation. In the least 25 years, we certainly have created many important assets in our country, we have built up great talent in all fields, in the technical field, in the scientific field, in the agricultural field and so on. We have created new infra-structure, we have built a very big diversified industrial base in our country. We have developed some important institutions to which I made a reference. But having done all this ultimately; one was feeling that we were not exploiting or making use of all the potential strength and assets that we have built in our country.

What was building up was sense of frustration in the country. If we allow a sense of frustration to build up, I would say, that itself means an end of democracy in the country. This is a basic thing. If people feel that with all their strength and assets with all the democratic institutions they have got, they are not likely to make any progress towards socio-economic transformation, that is the end of democracy itself. Democracy means faith of people in themselves. The moment they feel that they cannot make any further progress through the institutions that they have created and to which they are committed, once they get that sort of feeling, that is the end of democracy.

Some people tried to see democracy in a particular sense, whether they are allowed to speak what they want, whether they

are allowed to function as they want. I think, the phrase in Hindi is Manmani. This is a very expressive and a very eloquent phrase that I have found in Hindi. If manmani means democracy, well, I must say, the time had come to say, stop it. Somebody had to say it, somebody required the courage to say it. Fortunately, in the person of Prime Minister, we found the great leader in India who could say that. So, it is not merely a question of what happened in Gujarat. But what happened in Gujarat is certainly, an illustration of it....

An Hon. Member : Stone-throwing.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Apart from stone-throwing, the violence as such is bad enough, and I am sure that Mr. Prasanabhai Mehta will not justify violence. Now, may I ask him another question? Even for right or wrong, can an elected representative of the people be forced to resign? Can you gherao a Member somewhere outside the house and ask him to resign? Will it be justifiable? If that happens, that is the end of democracy. What was happening was an organised attempt by very eminent people, because they were accepted as eminent people by some people, they had their own place in the political life of our country.

Shri P. M. Mehta : The point which I made was this : the movement was financed and encouraged by the Centre.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : You have made your point. Now, let me make my point. I am taking this only as an illustration. An organised effort was being made in the country to create a political vacuum. What was happening in Gujarat ! It was not happening merely in Gujarat. It was intended to be spread throughout India; it was supposed to be done in Bihar; it was expected that the same thing could travel from Ahmedabad to Bombay - a shorter distance. But Bombay proved to be little stronger for them. I must congratulate those people. The idea was not merely to confine themselves to State Legislatures, but if they could - and they wanted to - they had plans to ultimately reach the major, important sovereign body,

this august House. If a vacuum had been created in India, can anybody with his hand on his heart say that there would have been democracy in this country? And this, only because some people wanted it to happen that way !

What I was trying to draw attention of the House was that the major responsibility, the major commitment, was to achieve the socio-economic transformation. We must realise this. It is not merely that we are in the times of Emergency. Certainly, there are some good results which have come out of this; there is more discipline, there is more production, there is more orderliness. These are important things as they are, but I would say that these are elementary things. They have to be there, because without these things no democracy can ever succeed. We were thinking of democratic planning, and we have made an attempt at it; we have partly succeeded. What are the resources when we are planning. There are some tangible resources and there are some intangible resources. Money, men, electricity and water are tangible resources and they are to be made use of. But the intangible resource are equally important, and they are the unity of the people to make use of these resources in a planned manner and the determination to go in a particular way with a particular speed, , with the determination to achieve those targets. I think, because of this game of obstacles, these intangible resources, which are more vital than the tangible resources, were becoming scarce in our country. Discipline, and as a result of which I was very pleased to listen for the first time, the Steel Minister getting up and saying that the targets that we have fixed for this year have been completely fulfilled. It was a moment of joy, a moment of pride and I hope we get opportunities to say that for every achievement in every field, in the economic as well as the political field.

This was the situation that was developing in the country and if we had allowed this to proceed further, what sort of an image you could have in the international field? If at all you want to be

effective in the international world, you must be in a position to say that this is what we are able to achieve in our own country and this is what we are trying to achieve. During the last few weeks, a few months I would say, I had occasions to visit a few of the western democratic countries or, if I may be permitted to say, the so-called western democratic countries and I had occasion many times to discuss this question ; of emergency with them and I saw a sort of frenzied criticism a completely malicious and mis-informed criticism and sometimes they used to ask 'We are saying so and you do not think what we think about you is important.' I had to tell them very respectfully - naturally, our Foreign Minister has to be very respectful when he talks with others, even with you, Gentlemen, he must be respectful.

Shri Vasant Sathe (Akola) : That is natural.

Shri Y B. Chavan : Perhaps, yes. I told them, 'Certainly, yes. What you think about us is important and we care about it. But in our priority what we think about ourselves is more important for us. You may think, whether we are democratic or not, or whether we have got the freedom of speech, or whether we have got the so-called free press or not. This is what you think, but let us go and see what the large masses of India think about it.' Ultimately, that is the final proof. May be an individual here or there or some group of people here or there may criticise us. But, like a magic it was seen by the people, who said, 'Well, this is exactly what was needed to be done.' Sometimes, the politicians learn from the people. I think all the time the politicians learn from the people. In democracy, people are the great teacher and when this emergency was declared, we saw people saying, 'This was exactly what was needed to be done.' It is a good thing that this is done. That was the final verdict and a more important verdict against which you are complaining. All the speeches that I have heard on the other-side are not speeches against what the Government has done, but really speaking, they are complaining that the verdict of the

people has gone against them and they just cannot be justified. That is the basic thing.

Therefore I would say, what we are passing through according to me, is a very important phase of history or period of the post-independence India. It can be a great phase of history. This time we took a rather very hard look at ourselves, a hard look at our methods, a hard look at our institutions and hard look at our means and methods and as to how they should change. This is the time, as I told you, I am only thinging aloud with you - the emergency is continuing. Now, we have to see if we are prepared to get the results of this thing. It is not just an emergency. Emergency is just an occasion to have another look at things. Many members have said that and many others would have said it that if we had not done that, what happened in Bangladesh would have been repeated in this country. What has happened in Angola or Mozambique or any other country would have happened here. I tell you from my experience in the last one year. Let us take for example the non-alignment movement. What has happened to the non-alignment movement which is the most potent weapon of the progressive forces in the world today? Thanks to our great leaders like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Tito and his colleagues who thought of this movement, thought of this principle. They could do it because I think they had made a very correct judgment about the type of world that was going to emerge after the Second World War. There were progressive forces which were expanding and asserting themselves. They had created new hopes in mankind and there were forces which were after distributing the world, interested in status quo. At that time it was necessary, for liberated countries and independent countries, if they had to succeed in their achievements and in their strategies, to remain independent to follow their own methods. In order to do that they had to accept the principle of independent foreign policy based on acceptance of progressive socio-economic objectives. They had to transform the societies, create new societies based

on social justice and equality, remove the exploitation that existed in the colonial work, and if they had to do that, they had to follow independent national policies. They had to assert their liberty to act independently of others on merit and that is how this non-alignment movement grew.

There were countries which were laughing at non-alignment countries in the beginning. There were individuals, even in our country and in Parliament, and you can find their speeches ridiculing non-alignment. But, gradually, we found that non-alignment policy had been accepted as one of the very important planks of more than 100 countries in this world. It is something very interesting that when the big powers - big imperial powers, saw that this is making an impact, they have resorted to some different tactics now. There is an attempt of infiltration into the non-alignment movement. There is an attempt to dilute the principles of non-alignment. One has to be very careful about this. We find that the non-alignment movement made an impact as a result of deliberations in different forums. What they did in the sixth special session of U. N. for example. They gave a call for a new economic order and the one phrase that really speaking frightens the imperial powers in the world is 'a new economic order'. We are yet to put content in it, we are yet to organise it. But, after the acceptance by the U. N. the most important representative body of the world of the declaration for having a new economic order, they think there is a basic challenge now, and new and different tactics have been started. We have to be very careful about it. I must say that this new dialogue or new movement that has been supported by the developing countries in the world today of having a new economic order is something where we are taking an attitude of co-operation. We are trying as a matter of fact, to test the will of the developed countries- whether they are willing to accept certain programme of new economic order. This is going to be the final test for them. It has to be proved whether - besides paying good wishes or mere talk of co-operation, they want to make

sacrifices to bring about equality; because in our own country we are fighting for removal of the distance between the rich and the poor and we are emphasising equality in the country. The same problem is before the world today. As I have often said, to the world agenda today the first item is economic equality, removal of inequality between the rich and the poor nations. It is really speaking the basic problem of world. Is the basic problem of any individual country. This is, really speaking, the major problem that we face today. I would not use the word 'leaders' because that is a sensitive word, but as pioneers, it is our responsibility to see that the non-aligned movement remains committed to its basic principles so as to fight the process of exploitation, the process of de-stabilisation and the process of intervention. This is going to be our major policy. The negative forces which are operating are resorting to rather very interesting tactics. I do not want to go into the details now.

India is trying to build up good relations with our neighbours and this is the basic plank of our policy. We want to develop friendly relations with Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh, with Sri Lanka, Pakistan, West Asia, Afghanistan, Iran, -with everybody. What some of the big countries aim at is to plant the seeds of suspicion in the minds of small neighbouring countries. This is their strategy. India is big and we cannot shrink because somebody wants us to shrink. We are what we are. What are our objectives? We do not want to impose our will on anybody. We do not want to invade any country. If at all our army was used, it was used for the liberation of a country. If at all we had made use of our army, it has been used for peaceful missions in some countries. We sent our army to places like the Gaza and some other countries where there were wars. They functioned there as peace-keeping forces. This is our objective. We are certainly a nationalist country believing in our own independent foreign policy. We certainly have our own social and economic objectives. We are determined to achieve them whatever may be the difficulties in our way and I am sure

we will succeed in this matter. So far as Bangladesh is concerned, we were shocked by the brutal murder of their leadership there. But even so, we said, it is their internal matter. But a malicious campaign was started saying that India was interested in military intervention in Bangladesh. I would just give this as an illustration. This malicious propaganda was done to create suspicion in the minds of neighbours, among the non-aligned countries, because most of our neighbouring countries are non-aligned countries. The Delegation of Bangladesh had come here and we have had discussions with them. We want all good to Bangladesh. We welcome their independence. We want their sovereignty. We want them to have progressive, economic and foreign policies. We want them to be non-aligned. We want them to be their own masters. That is all that we want. We want them to remain peaceful with no-communalism, no-sectarian attitude. Their delegation is in India today and in the course of this week, we are discussing the problems of economic co-operation and trade co-operation. This is our basic policy. But how the other countries are looking at it is the most important thing now. This is a very complicated world and you can face this complicated world by your clear thinking, your clear judgment of the world situation and the internal situation, with determination, with faith in the programmes and the policies which we have accepted. This is the only way to get what we want to get. When I said, I was going to mention basic foreign policy issues, these are the foreign policy issues which I meant. But they are so organically linked with internal policies that sometimes I wonder how one can differentiate between foreign policy and internal policy. They are practically the same thing. It is an indivisible entity. It is said conventionally that they are the two sides of the same coin. I would say that is rather incorrect. It is the same coin and the same side. It is so together that you cannot take one position in international relations and another position in internal matters.

Shri Vasant Sathe : You can call it 'Advaita'.

Shri Y B. Chavan: I do not know this complication of 'Advaita' and 'Dvaita'. I better keep it aside., I quite agree as far as the different aspect of policy of the nation are concerned, there is complete 'Advaita'. You cannot make distinction between economic policy, political policy and international policy. These are not three different compartments. They are three faces of the same body - Trimurti. Possibly you can call it that way. This is what we have to think about at the present moment. The President's Address has taken the general review of the world situation and emphasised that we want to pursue our basic policies of supporting detente supporting non-aligned movement, supporting our neighbouring countries, supporting the progressive causes of Arabs, the cause of justice of Arabs, build up friendship with our Arab friends, with Iran, with neighbouring countries and even with Pakistan. We have said that Simla spirit is a basic plank of our foreign policy. We have made attempts and we will continue to make attempts. I would say, positive efforts to improve the relations. Well, I hope, as I said before that we will get a positive response from our Pakistani friends but it seems they are very slow in their response, whether by result of sheer habit or by their deliberate policy I do not know, because from what one can see from the speeches that the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Shri Bhutto made in Sri Lanka it looked as if he has still some reservations about India. But we have got patience because we believe in the Simla spirit. That is the only way we resolve our problems. Pakistan and we are so near to each other that we have no other way but to co-operate with each other. The problems of the people of Pakistan and the problems of the people of India are the same problems. Therefore, we have no other alternative but to be friends and to be co-operative with each other and this is exactly what we understand by the Simla spirit, by detente and by co-existence. Ultimately they are different names but it is the same policy of co-operation. We want to follow this policy in the international field. But let me warn the House again that this foreign policy will succeed provided we are strong

in economic and political policy in the country. A country which is strong at home can have better image outside India. Some people come and say what about your image ! This image theory is a very interesting theory. Your image can be what you are. As some great man told the artist to paint him as he is. Well, we will certainly be, what we are, but what we are, is not what we are outside the country. We are, what we are inside the country.

Therefore, Sir, with the other measures of policy that have been laid down and I think by making use of the new important phase in our national history, trying to do some creative thinking, and trying to take some creative steps so that this game of obstacles which was going on for some time and endangering the democracy will disappear, democracy in its real spirit will succeed ultimately.

CHAPTER - 3

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 1976-77

Lok Sabha, 8 April 1976

EDITORIAL NOTE

Reviewing the world situation, Chavan pointed out that the two big powers were moving toward detente. In the economic field both the Socialist world and the Western world have made tremendous progress in their industrial strength. Western World has seen unprecedented growth of trade. Along with these developments, the world was witnessing impact of technological developments. Rapid developments in the field of weapon system have made the two super powers realize limitation of their power and that had induced the process of detente.

Speaking about China, Chavan pointed out that geography had put China and India, two land masses, nearer each other. Our policy is to continue making efforts to improve relations with China. Our efforts will be governed by certain principles namely friendship, world peace and non-alignment.

This was Y. B. Chavan's second occasion to handle the debate on the Demands of Grants for the Ministry of External Affairs. His speech is an illustrative of the grasp that he had acquired over in handling of the India's

Foreign Policy. Shri Y. B. Chavan : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that I could not be present in the House throughout the day; I

missed the first two speeches but, I came to the third which is also an important speech; I could have the satisfaction of having heard pointedly the views of the Opposition.

I can assure those hon. Members whose good speeches I could not listen to as I was not there, that I have read them very carefully. I must compliment the Members for the quality of the debate and the constructive suggestions they have made in the course of the discussion.

Some Members mentioned here that they did not have an opportunity to discuss foreign affairs but I can assure them that I shall be willing to discuss that as many times as possible. As regards the discussion on the international situation, whenever the occasion arises, there will be no unwillingness on the part of myself or the Ministry of External Affairs to discuss this matter. Naturally, we meet quite often in the Consultative Committee where we have the advantage of listening to the views and suggestions of many of the leading members who are especially interested in the problems of foreign affairs. But I can understand that the debate in this House is much more important because it is not only a debate here but it is a debate that goes to the people of the country as well.

Therefore, Sir, the debate was very useful. The one important point that I always find in the debate - when I say 'always', I mean last time and this time because I have the experience of only two debates on foreign affairs - naturally because of the way the policy has been evolved in the course of last 25 or 30 years, transcends the division of parties in this house and reaches a sort of national consensus as far as the basic features of foreign policy are concerned. That is something very important.

I, therefore, have an easy task, because as far as the basic features of foreign policy are concerned they are not doubted. What are the basic features of our foreign policy? First and foremost is that we pursue an independent foreign policy based

on non-alignment; a basic urge emanating from our foreign policy is the ceaseless search for world peace and co-operation - I will explain it further again; we believe in friendship towards all and malic towards none; we have been in the vanguard of the struggle against colonialism, imperialism and racism; we have been active in our support for liberation movement whether in our bilateral relations or in multi-lateral forums. Our approach has always been one of constructive co-operation and not of confrontation or conflict. It is, therefore, very heartening to have reaffirmation of the broad consensus in support of this approach in the course of the debate.

With these introductory remarks would now emphasise two or three very' important aspects. I would not go into every detail for last 25-30 years but undertake a 'tour de horizon' as they call it. If we have to see the present status of the war and peace problem, as it is called, at the world level, it is better to review the international situation as it is today.

In order to do that one will have to take a synoptic view of the international situation as it has evolved since World War II in terms of its political problems, economic problems and technological development, because what is happening today, has something to do with progress and developments in these three basic areas.

My friend, Shri Dinesh Singh, referred to the problem of detente at Helsinki and possibly would be drifting towards the valley. This is a very picturesque assessment. I can tell you that maybe it is a drift towards a valley but a valley perhaps at a higher level.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore) : Higher than the peak !

Shri Y B. Chavan : Yes. I will tell you why. This is so because we believe as a nation that detente is in the interest of humanity; detente is in the interest of the world and detente is in the interest of the developing countries. May be what you say is right, in a way, because under the pressure of electioneering that is taking place in most of the western world, detente seems to have become a

rather unfashionable word. If not a dirty word. It has come to this stage. But detente is not just an accident. That is why I say it is much better to see the developments, the policies, the international situation, as they have evolved in the last 25-30 years.

In the economic field, what we have seen is that both the socialist world and the western world have made tremendous progress in their industrial strength and industrial power. Particularly, the western world, has seen unprecedented growth of trade. I think, at no time in the history of the world this has happened. The volume of the trade and the rate at which the trade has grown in the last 25-30 years is completely unprecedented. The unfortunate part of it is that the lion's share of it, more than lion's share of it, has gone to the big powers, the western powers. But the fact remains that this has happened, and this has created the problem. Division and inequality among the nations has widened with this growing trade, growing economic strength, and growing industrial power. Their concentration in the hands of a very few countries has certainly created conditions for further exploitation, though we have become free countries and independent countries. This is one aspect of the economic situation.

Secondly, the political situation. What has happened in the last 25 years ? We have seen that the classical, colonial powers have lost their power: I think the process started with India and proceeded further and we see today that most of the continents are completely free, except some pockets in South Africa, some pockets in the South Pacific, some islands in the Indian Ocean. But his liberation process has started. We have seen the last empire of Portugal dismantled and we see that it has created some new problems which we are facing and which we will have to face.

So in the political field, we have seen this dismantling of colonial empires as a result of the liberation struggles which started it. I would like to tell my hon'ble friend, Prof. Mukerjee, that I entirely agree with him, when we speak of national struggles. A national

struggle without its economic, progressive and political content cannot today be called a national struggle. When we use the words 'national struggle', we use it as a composite term in which all these elements are present. The peak of this national struggle, as we saw, was in Indo-China. For more than two decades, the people there fought heroically with faith in their national independence, faith in their people's progress, faith in socialism. And it was because of these things that they could succeed against a very big power. So this is the political picture which has emerged in these 25 years and because of this, we see a large number countries members of the UN etc.

The third aspect, which I think we should not forget, is the impact of technological development. I am not talking merely of technological development in industrial terms; I am talking in terms of the military-industrial complex in the western world or the technological development that has created an impact on the weapons system of the world. At the end of the second world war, we saw that the USA could say that they were the supreme power, the super power. They thought possibly they could dictate terms. But the other world also was not sleeping. They were also making efforts for their own technological progress. So a time is reached, when they know that they are not alone, and they are not the only people to make progress. USSR has made progress in this matter. They have proved that as far as the weapon system is concerned, they are also equally powerful. When they knew that there was a limitation of their power, the process of detente started. These are the technological imperatives, the political imperatives of detente. If there is relaxation of tension, it is not only detente among the two big powers. There should be relaxation of tensions amongst all the countries of all the continents. But there are the imperatives behind it. They just cannot afford not to have it. This is the basic factor and let us not forget it. This is the basic factor and let us not forget it. This is the background of detente. This is the situation that has developed and this is the world that we live in today.

Therefore, we will have to see how we place our relationships, what are our present day challenges and what are going to be our responses to them. When you talk about foreign policy, you have to find out your neighbourhood, you have to find out what are the reactions to the policies that the big powers are following in your area, what are the challenges it has thrown to our country and how you are going to respond to it. I think, if I answer these questions, possibly the purpose of my speech should have been served.

Coming to our relations with the big powers - when I use the term 'big powers', please do not take it in the wrong sense; it is now a routine phrase to describe certain realities. Our relations with the United States were referred to yesterday. Some reference was made to some sentences in the report. May be they are possibly capable of being misinterpreted. But I would like to say that I have made the position very clear. When we say that our relations with USA and USSR are good, we do not bracket USSR with USA, because qualitatively the relationship is different. I have no doubt about it.

...What I am saying is more important than the report. Possibly it is likely to be misinterpreted and therefore, I am trying to make this point very clear. It is not good to quote oneself, but sometimes it becomes useful for elucidation. I am not making this position clear for the first time. I made the same point last year also. I quote

'Again Prof. Mukherjee suggested yesterday that by mistake sometimes people try to bracket the two super powers together. I think that is not at least our Government's attitude, because the two super powers cannot be bracketed together. They are not only qualitatively different but they are different from the point of view of our national interests. This is one fact we have to take note of.'

So, I think I have made this point very clear. Having said this -

and he also concedes that point - even then, naturally, we should certainly try to make our relations friendly. This is exactly what we are doing. Somebody said that we have our national interests. When America's national interests are reflected in their global policy, we come into conflict. But even then we feel that despite that, there are areas where we can co-operate. Therefore, we are making efforts to improve these. You know what efforts have been made. I do not want to go into details.

With USSR, our relations are very good; it is an excellent and a warm relationship. There was a recent reference to it in their Twenty-fifth Congress; and what their Secretary-General then said is ample proof of it. They have stood by India in difficult times. They have helped India in its economic and industrial growth and progress. Our outlook on many international matters is similar. But that does not mean that we follow Soviet Russia in every matter. Our outlook is sometimes different. I can mention specific area; but this is no occasion to do it. Our relations with Soviet Russia, are certainly very good; and we look forward to improve them still further. Recently, you must have read that the Deputy Chairman of our Planning Commission was in Soviet Russia and they have agreed on new areas of co-operation and patterns of co-operation. I am sure it will strengthen not only our relations, but also the strength of India.

In the case of China, Shri Samar Mukherjee said that we should try to make some efforts to improve our relations. We are making efforts to improve relations. I hope there will be some response. I do not want to say anything more than that. That does not mean that China's policy has changed or that its attitude has completely changed or that it is likely to change. But certainly we should make efforts, because these are two land masses living together for centuries. Geography has put us near each other. I do not think we can select our neighbours. In the same manner as they say, "Great men are born", neighbours are also geographically born. One should make an effort to find out whether there are any

possibilities of improving the relations. India wants to do it. Prof. Mukherjee said : "Select your friends and find out your enemies." Well, I would say "Treat everybody as a friend and don't be gullible enough to forget that somebody can be your enemy." I would put it that way. You cannot say that everybody will always be your friend; and that your enemy will always remain so. If anybody wants to be an enemy, we should try to see that he does not remain so. That is why all our leaders from Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Nehru to Mrs. Gandhi have said on many occasions that with those who are our friends, we will try to develop, broaden and deepen our relations. With those who are not our friends, we will try to persuade them to take more interest in us. With those whose are hostile to us, we have to work in such a manner that their hostility is lessened and that at least there is some possibility of co-operation. That is what, I think any wise country would do. This is exactly what we are doing. They say that nations have interests. Yes nations have interests; but certainly nations also have principles. A nation which does not have any principles, sometimes does not understand its interests. What are our principles? As I have said, our principles are : friendship, world peace and non-alignment. What is the crux of the policy of non-alignment? I was a little pained to hear my friend, Mr. Naik, pained in a sense because he is a person who always makes very interesting speeches and I always like to listen to him. He talked of "selective alliance". I really do not know that that term "selective alliance" means. Anyway, he said one thing about non-alignment. Since this point has been argued many times here on the floor of this house I do not want to take more time of the house in saying that it is not a negative concept. It is an elementary sort of interpretation to say that because the word "non" is there in "non-alignment" so it is negative. It is a positive concept.

I would like my hon. friend to know what non-alignment really is. Right from the beginning, Jawaharlal Nehru conceived of non-alignment as a composite policy consisting of a number of

fundamental elements. actually once, in 1956, he said that non-alignment with military blocs "in itself is not a policy; it is only part of a policy. He added :

"The policy itself can only be a policy of acting according to our best judgment and following a particular objective and idea we have ... our foreign policy has this positive aspect of peace. The other positive aspects are enlargement of freedom in the world, replacement of colonialism by free and independent countries and a larger degree of cooperation among nations."

For Nehru non-alignment was a composite policy covering the search for peace, the struggle for independence, the fight against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racialism, the struggle for political and economic equality among nations and fight for a new just, peaceful, world order. His conception of non alignment was such that it remains entirely valid even today, as it included not only non-alignment with military blocks, but also basic questions of politics and economics including the adjustment of relation between developed and developing nations and the current theme of a new economic order.

I am again tempted to quote Nehru. He wrote an article "Changing India", which was published in Foreign Affairs, just a year before he died. In April 1963 he wrote an article, which I am quoting, because it is much better that we know what our policies are and what are the basic formulations of our policy. Nehru said:

"The twin policies which have guided us since independence are, broadly, democratic planning for development at home and externally, 'non-alignment'. Like the basic policies of most countries, these are not the product of any inspiration or arbitrary choice, but have their roots in our past history and way of thinking as well as in fundamental national exigencies. India's over-riding and most urgent task is to raise the standard of living of her people, and in order to achieve this, to carry out structural and

organizational reforms not only as speedily as possible but with maximum popular support and participation. In foreign affairs, we had no interest other than to cultivate friendly cooperation with all countries and to help to keep world peace as the sine quo non of everything else. Our approach to these problems our attitude and ideas had inevitably been shaped by our own recent struggle for freedom, as well as by the accumulated experience of centuries and above all by Mahatma Gandhi's teachings."

I think I have said enough about non-alignment.

Shri B. V Naik (Kanara) : Does it not come in conflict with the Asian Collective Security scheme ?

Shri Y B. Chavan : No; do not confuse the issues. I am coming to the question of Asian identity. It is better I deal with this problem of Asian identity that has been mentioned by Shri Dinesh Singh. I think he is right there, because it is a very important concept, a very important issue about which we should constantly be aware at least and it is our responsibility to play our role whenever it is possible. As he knows, whenever any occasion has arisen we have tried to play our role.

The Government of India has always supported the concept of Asian solidarity. In 1946, India sponsored the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi and subsequently convened a conference of all independent Asian countries to mobilise them against Dutch police action against Indonesia. However, unlike other regions, Asia has to contend with many divisive forces - religious, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, economic and political. Asia is also too vast a continent to be readily responsive to a sense of solidarity which would encompass the entire continent from Beirut to Tokyo. She has also been the cockpit of imperialist rivalries in the era of Western dominance, which has left varying cultural impacts in various regions and, thus destroyed pre-existing links and alienated one region from another. However, there is no doubt that the goal of Asian solidarity, which should express itself in terms of a distinct

Asian identity and an Asian voice on international affairs, should not be given up. In concert with other countries and with a sense of cautious realism, India should actively pursue this objective through encouraging pan-Asian meetings, inter-governmental or non-governmental, in all fields where the Indian experience and the experience of other Asian countries are relevant and useful to each other. Such an exchange of experience would, in due course, form the core of the Asian personality. Recent initiatives in economic fields, such as the creation of the Pepper Community, the Coconut Community, the Association of Producer of Natural Rubber and, in a sub-regional context, the ASEAN, constitute steps in the right direction. As you know, we are also interested in many other Asian institutions like the Asian Clearing House, the Asian Development Bank etc.

So, I concede this concept, but let us not forget the point which I have made, namely that there are some contradictions which we cannot just wish away and hence our present approach, which I think is valid and wise and will yield results, is to make efforts for bilateral co-operation, both in the political and the economic fields.

Some of the Members mentioned the emergence of Indo-China and our duty towards those countries. I can assure them that we consider the emergence of Indo-China as a landmark, an event of historical significance. They are independent and progressive countries which are facing their own problems on the basis of co-operation with non-aligned countries. The re-unification of South and North Vietnams is going to be a very important event, and we welcome it. Whatever co-operation they need and we can give, we will certainly try to give. The same is the case with Laos and Cambodia. Cambodia is called by some other name now. Things are developing there. We have not yet established diplomatic relations though we have relations in the sense of recognising them. They are not in a position to receive foreign missions in that country. Possibly we will have to take our turn.

In South East Asia also, our efforts are to build our relations. There may be contradictions in Indo-China and South East Asian countries, some of the countries, because of outside intervention. We have to realistically take note of it and make an effort for bilateral development in those areas. I think, with patience, through this instrumentality of bilateralism and keeping our principle clearly in mind - if we pursue with friends - I am sure that a day would come when this idea will be a reality. This is about Asia.

Now, I must come to the immediate neighbourhood. As far as the immediate neighbourhood is concerned, fortunately, amongst us today is the Prime Minister of Nepal. We welcome him heartily. His discussions with our Prime Minister and other representatives of the Government are going on and I am sure the relations will become more productive, more useful in mutual interest, because I think geography has put us together and traditionally, culturally and historically both the countries must find ways to work together.

As far as Burma and Sri Lanka are concerned, I do not want to repeat that we have made some efforts at solving our problems and we have succeeded considerably in that. The most important change is in the case of Sri Lanka. I think in the last three or four years, there is a sea change in the relationship in the sense that a very small problem could have been developed into a tricky issue. But our Prime Minister took a very courageous initiative and at the present moment, whatever those problems were ... the Kachativu issue, the question of repatriates more particularly, in the contemporary sense, the question of delineation of the maritime boundary is a very very important matter. It can be a very tricky issue. And in the present context of things, persons who are adversely interested in India - I would not say enemies, but I would say people who are adversely interested in India - can develop some of the small issues into big and intricate issues. But only last month, we succeeded in finalising and completely delineating the maritime boundary with Sri Lanka. So, there is no

problem which remains, as far as that is concerned.

There are other countries like Bangladesh and Pakistan. Well, last year, when we discussed this question Bangladesh was different Bangladesh. Unfortunately, things have changed and a very eminent leader like Mujibur Rehman was assassinated. Though, as a nation, we took it as a shock, we conceded and ultimately accepted that it is their internal matter, because ultimately we have to live together as nations. We wish their people well. We continue to make efforts for co-operation, but, unfortunately, the response so far is not positive. I would say, to a certain extent, it is even negative. In the beginning, they said, "India is attempting to make military attacks and is poised for military action." We said, "That is not so. Why do you not please come and see?" They sent a delegation. Mr. Justice Satar came and had discussions. Not only that, we invited their military people. We said, "They should come and see if at all they feel that there is any military preparation or deployment which will lead ultimately to such an action." When they saw that it did not work, they kept quiet.

Farakka has been made an issue of anti-India propaganda. Well, this is an unfortunate development. But in that matter also we have taken unilateral steps and we have told them that it is a matter which can be discussed. As you know, the real problem in the Ganges is the floods. Every year, we suffer from floods. The problem was that during the fair weather the water of the Ganges comes to its lowest and there the question of distribution of water for Calcutta Port and Bangladesh arose.

As you know, in the last twelve years, we were working on the Farakka Barrage. We spent nearly Rs. 160 crores. Last year, we had discussions with Bangladesh when Mujibur Rehman was there. My senior colleague, Shri Jagjivan Ram, went to Bangladesh and had an agreement with them and the Farakka Barrage was opened. Now, they have taken a position that it is not only during the lean period but every month that water must be distributed.

It is a rather difficult situation. We are very firm as far as Farakka is concerned. We have not invested this much money for nothing. We have to look to the future of the Calcutta Port which is a very lively link for India's economic development and other things. At the same time, we took unilateral action and allowed ourselves to take less water so that there should not be any difficulty for them. But we told them, let technicians meet and discuss it. Unless we see the effects, what is use of making unrealistic demands and complicating the entire matter? Their main interest is to internationalise the issue. This is the difficulty.

In regard to some of the smaller issues, some of the countries are encouraged to internationalise them so that an opportunity is given to those countries which are adversely interested in India to exploit the issues. This is the position. I do not think I need spend more time on Bangladesh. I only wish that they respond to us in a mood of co-operation because the people of Bangladesh and the people of India have the same problems of economic development and poverty. We have to fight those problems. Concerted attention must be given to those problems and not to other non-priority problems that create division among ourselves.

Coming to Pakistan, it is a little complicated matter. I am using the words deliberately. For that matter, I must say, we have made a very constructive contribution. Ultimately, for the neighbouring problems we have evolved a certain policy framework. We had the Simla Agreement. You know how in a difficult situation, the Prime Minister took initiative at the summit meeting and arrived at the Simla Agreement. We have a policy framework for dealing with any neighbouring country. We cannot say that there will be no problems with any neighbouring country. As we are living together, there are bound to be some problems. What is the method for it? The method for it is that both the parties should sit together without the intervention of any third party and decide all the issues. This is the basic approach.

He said, yes; he went back. We took the initiative and sorted out

certain small issues, like travel permits and telecommunications. We signed certain trade agreements also. We also purchased cotton from them worth about Rs. 25 crore. They completely stopped there. Once in a while, we reminded them and they thought that they must do something. They have done some business worth about Rs. 7 lakhs. We told them, it is all right; it is a good beginning and let us try to continue it.

What is more important today is, and, we must not be unaware of it, to see what is happening in Asia, not only in this region. That is where the problems of Asia must be considered more carefully. Though detente is progressing in Europe, I must tell you, Asian problems are getting more complicated. Prof. Hiren Mukerjee wanted to know as to what is happening in West Asia. The West Asian problem is nowhere near solution today, but, at the same time, they will have to go by certain principles and those principles are, complete withdrawal from the occupied areas and the acceptance of the national rights of the Palestine people. There, we should try to prevent division. The unity of the Arab world is more important for us. We should not do or say anything, contrary to the concept. I want to make this one point very clear that we should not do or say anything which will go contrary to it. This is exactly what is happening. Now, take the tragedy of Lebanon; it is difficult to explain and we can only express our best wishes that they find a solution for it. Somebody asked what is the Asian approach to it. The Middle East issue is such that it arouses global interest; it is a global responsibility and we cannot really speak of an Asian approach. We find almost all the Asian countries wanting a solution, we are working on these lines in the U. N. and we hope we will succeed some time. But there are other matters also. There are contradictions, as was mentioned, in South East Asia; there are contradictions in the sub-continent - and some of them are being encouraged.

I must mention two things about Pakistan and the continuous anti-

India propaganda in which the leadership of Pakistan is engaged. Whenever they get an opportunity they have to say that India is expansionist. I don't know what we did to be called 'expansionist'. We supported the liberation of Bangladesh and you know what is happening in Bangladesh now; what is expansionist about it? Mr. Bhutto - I am mentioning his name - recently gave his latest theory about the partition of India. While addressing the National Assembly of Pakistan, he said that united India was a danger of Afghanistan and, therefore, in order to protect Afghanistan from that danger, they had created Pakistan ! We wish them good relations; we never wanted any bad relations.

I think the Simla Agreement was going on quite all right but it got halted because sophisticated weapons started coming. This is a curse to humanity. Whenever a country thinks that it can solve its national problems by sophisticated weapons coming from outside, that is the end of the national progress of that country.

The Prime Minister is ceaselessly warning the people about dangers in and around the country, and that is a reality. It is better, in these matters, that every citizen should be made aware of it. Unless every citizen is made aware of it and is conscious of it, it would become difficult. That is the only way in which we have to function in this country; we should not function in isolation. There should be the maximum participation and support of the people. I have read out Panditji's quotation in which he mentioned this as a fundamental aspect. We have to raise the maximum consciousness among the people because these are the challenges to us. Our challenges are that this is the world that is around us, this is the Asia we are living in, this is the neighbourhood we are living. There are some dangers in the Indian Ocean and Deogo Garcia. We have said that we are against it. It is not a bilateral issue because the littoral countries have passed a resolution and they have formed an ad hoc Committee to try and call a conference. There is no doubt that there is danger to the free countries of the Indian Ocean. How can we be indifferent to it, whether they like it

or not? I had discussions with an American representative and we categorically told him that we want co-operation in other matters but we are completely against this. Naturally they did not accept that proposition, but we must be, as a nation, aware of some of these dangers. These are the challenges and dangers, but these are the strengths also. Our strength is our own approach. In this evolving world we could stand on our own with confidence today because we followed certain basic policies of economic development and planning of our own strength. We do get co-operation from others. But let me make it clear that only seven per cent of the contribution is from other countries; almost 93 to 94 per cent of resources have been raised by us in this country, for the development of India. This is the reality. The technical talent, the technical competence that we have built in this country, is the greatest change; the younger generation, a new generation, has come. The discipline, the dedication and the determination that we have shown in the last few months have shown to the whole world that India of 1976 is a new India, a changing India, a different India, a strong India, and it can certainly meet the challenges. Our response to these challenges is the way we are trying to go today; and possibly we will have to pursue the same line, the same approach, in the days to come.

Sir, I have done.

CHAPTER - 4

WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Rajya Sabha, 25 May 1976

EDITORIAL NOTE

In his reply to the Debate, Y. B. Chavan reiterated India's firm commitment to non-alignment. Welcoming the detente, he stated that detente should really not be confined to one particular continent or one particular situation, that it should not become merely a technique of crisis management but that it should be a genuine movement which can be made applicable to all the continents and all the situations and all the tensions in the world.

In that context, the non-aligned movement had played a very important role in preserving independence of newly liberated countries and in strengthening the liberation movements in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism. The movement had also been in the vanguard of the struggle for securing a new and just international economic order.

Y. B. Chavan explained at length his perception of India's foreign policy which while looking after the India's national interest also worked within the international framework. For him, "The international framework of any foreign policy and its national framework, really speaking are organically inter-connected." Chavan explained at length India's relationships with Pakistan and assured the House that the Simla Agreement of 1972 was the only basis on which relations with Pakistan could be established on a

proper basis.

Chavan emphasized that the success and the strength of India's foreign policy depended upon the strength of our internal, economic and scientific policies. He stated, 'If we strengthen them, we will be strengthening India and the Indian people and it is the strength of the Indian people that would make the Indian foreign policy a strong foreign policy and a successful foreign policy.'

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it was a very happy experience of listen to the very interesting, instructive and useful debate on the foreign policy and on the working of the External Affairs Ministry for the last two days. I must say this, discussion was a discussion in depth, as they call it, taking into account all the aspects of our foreign policy. I must, therefore, compliment the Members. To say "compliment the Members" may rather appear presumptuous. I thank the Members for the interest they took in the problems of the foreign policy and, at the same time, for making their very constructive suggestions. I must also say that the debate was of a very high quality, which is quite befitting this honourable and learned House. I can assure the Members that we shall give serious consideration to the various suggestion they have made.

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

I must say it has been a pleasant experience to get bouquets all the way. But I would like to assure you that we will not be misled by it. We will always try to be vigilant and not be complacent. Whatever the good results that we have achieved, have been, the result of a very wise and far-seeing fundamental foreign policy that was laid down by the leaders of our country after independence. As a matter of fact, the roots of our foreign policy can be found even before independence. Yesterday, Shri Pande reminded us, and very rightly, that even during our freedom movement, namely the Indian National Congress had laid down certain aspects of our foreign policy. Naturally, with the changing world situation, some more aspects are added to it and sometimes, the presentation is changed. But the basic approaches have remained the same. I think this is the reason why we have always come to correct judgments and a correct assessment of situations. Therefore, if at all any tribute or compliment is to be paid, it should be paid to the founding fathers or the architects of our foreign policy. Naturally, the foreign policy of any country cannot be some sort of a static thing. It has to be dynamic because it is dealing with a dynamic situation. As we see in the world today, the situations are such that one has to be constantly vigilant about it. Therefore, the foreign policy of any country has to be equally dynamic. But even then, certain basic tenets remains as guiding factors.

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

The striving for peace in the world, willingness to work on the basis of coexistence and co-operation with all nations of the world, the aspirations for an equal and just economic order and an unflinching support to the struggle, to ensure freedom and human dignity, are the guiding principles of our foreign policy which draw sustenance and strength from our cultural traditions and our

freedom movement. This is really the basic thing that I wanted to say by way of introduction.

I was just wondering as to what points I should choose because nobody has made any specific criticism or suggested any options for our foreign policy. But certainly, some Members, did make suggestions. For the first time during this debate I have heard every speech-every sentence of every speech - and, it is very difficult to compare speeches. Naturally, some speeches contained some aspects and some speeches contained some other aspects. If I do not mention any names, please excuse me. Incidentally, I may mention some names, not by way of selection but because I may be required to refer to some of the points made by the member. There is one point that Prof. Dutt made, and as an academician, naturally, he has the facility of putting it in a very precise manner and in a very elegant language, I should say. I would like to read what he said - I got this "uncorrected copy" of his speech last night because I wanted to read and find out whether I heard him right. He said

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

This is his assessment and I would say, well, by and large, yes. Naturally, no country, particularly no country of India's status and experience can work its foreign policy without having an international framework for it. I would like to say that the foreign policy of India has, from the very beginning operating within this

international framework. Because, the policy of non-alignment, though it was meant for India, really speaking, has international ramifications. It is, in itself, an international framework and it has positive ingredients of anti-imperialism and anti-neo-colonialism, working for peace and disarmament. These are, really speaking international approaches and it , on this basis that the non-alignment movement has been built. When we say that our foreign policy is non-alignment, it is not something negative. It is a composite concept; consisting of certain positive elements in it and these positive elements, really speaking, are the international framework of the policy. Not that we have to now evolve some framework because the world is now evolving. I think, the international framework is there and the new elements of the international situations are certainly taken into consideration.

Just this morning, I was going through a booklet. Possibly some of you might have seen it. It is by one of our young diplomats. Certain articles on Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru appear in it. The booklet is called 'The Legacy of Nehru'. It is edited by Shri Natwar Singh. In it I came across tributes paid by Martin Luther King, Jr., famous leader of the black movement. As a matter of fact, he was a leader of humanity, though he was working for the cause of Black America. He was certainly a leader of mankind as a whole. He paid these tributes some time in 1965. I was rather amazed, when I saw the insight of the man, the way he looked at Pandit Nehru's life. I am mentioning this because it relates to foreign policy; it is not just to say something about Pandit Nehru. He said : "Jawaharlal Nehru was a man of three extraordinary epochs". I will only read a part of it; I do not want to read the whole of it. "He was a leader in the long anti-colonial struggle to free his own land and to inspire a fighting will in other lands under bondage."

This was his first epoch. The second epoch was : "He lived to see victory and to move then to another epochal confrontation - the fight for peace after World War II. In this climatic struggle he did not have Gandhi at his side, but he did have the Indian

people, now free in their own great Republic. It would be hard to overstate Nehru's and India's contributions in this period. It was time fraught with the constant threat of a devastating finality for mankind. There was no moment in this period free from the peril of atomic war. In these years, Nehru was a towering world force skillfully inserting the peace - will of India between the ranging antagonisms of the great powers of East and West."

And this third epoch was - I will read this out and I would like to invite your attention to this particularly - "The third epoch of Nehru's work in unfolding after his death. Even though his physical presence is gone, his spiritual influence retains a living force. The great powers are not yet in harmonious relationship to each other, but with the help of the non-aligned world they have learned to exercise a wise restraint. In this is the basis for a lasting detente. Beyond this, Nehru's example in daring to believe and act for peaceful co-existence gives mankind its most glowing hope."

This really speaking is the basis of our foreign policy and its international framework - this concept of non-alignment, the concept of anti-colonialism, the concept of anti-imperialism, the concept of working for peace, and, at the same time, believing in an anti-imperialist struggle, development of developing countries on these lines, he was also thinking of some mixed international arrangement. And this daring thinking and acting for peaceful co-existence really laid down the basis for the detente. At the present moment, we do see it. I had dealt with it in detail, when I spoke in the other House. I do not want to repeat it here. At present, the big powers are thinking in terms of detente because of many reasons. One of these is that the developing non-aligned countries have created a certain force, a certain condition in the world. This is one aspect. Secondly, there is a certain technological imperative. Naturally, the success in the technological development has reached a stage when nobody can say that they alone are tallest. There may be descriptions of the world today as 'bipolar' or 'tripolar' or 'five polar'. I do not know how many poles there are. Basically,

there seem to be two. But both the poles have come to realise that if there is a war, a nuclear war, nobody is going to be a winner. Therefore, there is no other alternative, but detente. This is the position. At the present moment, the word 'detente' has become - I do not say dirty - somewhat unfashionable; for the purpose of election they are making it unfashionable. But the fact remains that the technological revolution has created certain political compulsions in the international sphere. And one of them is that the powers with all powerful weapons have come to realise that they just cannot make use of those powerful weapons. Therefore, while we always consider detente as some sort of a very healthy development, and we welcome it, at the same time we say that detente should not really be confined to one particular continent or one particular situation, that it should not become merely a technique of crisis management but that it should be a genuine movement which can be made applicable to all the continents and all the situations and all the tensions-in the world. This is, what our foreign policy expects and this is one of the objectives that we have before us. Therefore, when we think of non-alignment, I would like to say that ' we should think Of non-alignment in a much more positive manner.

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

to be held at Colombo.

From the beginning, non-alignment was never a unidimensional concept; it was a composite policy consisting of a number of fundamental elements. In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, the objectives of non-alignment are

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

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

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

about military pacts would be incorrect. The world has changed, no doubt, since the first Non-aligned Summit met in Belgrade, in 1961. Yet we are far from a stage where the world is without war, without want and without conflict or tension. In this changed and constantly changing world, the versatile concept of non-alignment is even more relevant than it was in 1961. It is true that the powers which confronted each other earlier, have now embarked on the path of relaxation of tensions. I have not used the word detente because, some people, as I said, are becoming allergic to the word. We have welcomed this positive development. In fact, we have expressed the view that to be meaningful, detente must extend to other continents and areas of tension and conflict. In fact, in our own region we are constantly striving to build a structure of durable peace and friendly co-operation. Yet, military alliances are still a reality. In fact, some of the pacts which were so far dormant have been revived again. What is more important is that impelled by a vision of global scarcity of basic resources, raw materials and energy, an economic dimension is being added to the military groupings. My colleague, the Minister of Commerce, is sitting nearby and he may bear me out when I say these things.

Recent events in Africa and the intensification of efforts for domination of the Indian Ocean are symptomatic of the stresses and strains to which detente is subject. To a large extent, the logic of detente derives from what I earlier called the technological imperatives. It would, therefore, be premature and unwise for anyone to conclude that military pacts have become a thing of the past. The non-aligned movement has played a very important role in preserving the independence of newly-liberated countries, in sustaining and strengthening the liberation movements, in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism. The movement has also been in the vanguard of the struggle for securing a new and just international economic order. We, therefore, welcome the growing strength and the increasing appeal of the non-aligned movement. At the same time, it is essential to remember that the basic strength of the movement lies in unity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Here I would like to make one point. I am reminded of the argument made by Shri Prakash Veer Shastri yesterday. He said that since we have decided to improve our relationship with China, it was proved that we were following an independent policy. Whom are we trying to convince ? Do we need any proof to show that we are following an independent policy because we have taken a step towards China? We have always been having an independent

policy (Interruptions). Our friendship with the USSR has been deliberately misinterpreted by some people in other countries. Really speaking, there was no necessity of interpreting that and saying : 'Now you are a good boy, you are trying to do this.' So this logic, I did not like not from you, Mr. Prakash Veer Shastri. I just wanted to make this particular point.

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

I wish that he continues to remain in the same mood and does not start sniping at India again. I hope that this accord which we have arrived at is implemented in the same spirit in which we have reached it. This is a very important step and we are glad that the step that we had thought of has started to show results. As neighbours we are bound to have problems. Which country is not going to have problems? If we have problems, what are we supposed to do? We have to sit together, find out options, try to convince each other and find a solution. That is the Simla Agreement. Without any interference from any friend or foe, big or small, it has to be left to ourselves. We should sit down and discuss this matter. All the problems mentioned in the Simla Agreement have been solved by now. This is certainly a very positive development. I am specially making a mention of it, because everyone of you, the whole nation and I think most

of the countries in the world have appreciated this. Therefore, I thought I should mention this. This is exactly what we were trying to do from the very beginning. The Simla Agreement came in 1972. Well, its implementation was halted. Now, it has been put on its track. I hope, it proceeds further, without any unexpected difficulties because we want to improve our relations with Pakistan. We want to improve our relations with every nation around India. We want the same type of relations with Bangladesh. What has India not done for Bangladesh? From 1971 onwards, we have done everything that is possible. But unfortunately what happened in 1975 has created a different situation and a sort of anti-India propaganda has taken hold of the situation. First they said that India is about to intervene militarily. We invited their military people and told them to send their military delegation. They can come and see whether there is any preparation for that sort of thing. Then they discovered Farakka. Now, this has been used as some sort of an instrument of 'propaganda' against India. I think no one can put it better about Farakka than the Prime Minister herself. As she said this is not an insoluble question. We never thought that it is an insoluble question. Realistically speaking, we have laid down the way of solving that question. Well, if Bangladesh has got problems, certainly we can sit together and discuss these matters. We invited them. We said, Please come along and sit with us. But come with a desire and intention to solve the matters." We do not say Bangladesh has no problems about the waters of the Ganga. But we have also got some problems. Farakka was not just built because we had extra money. It is not merely a question of money. It is a question of the life of Calcutta and the people who live in Calcutta. As a matter of fact, it is question of the life of West Bengal. I should like to say, that it is the question of the life of the entire economy of India, because Calcutta port is not a port, for West Bengal only. It is a major port of India. It affects the economy of India. Therefore, naturally we have got problems. They have got problems. We can sit together and solve the problems. We asked them to send their technicians. Ultimately, they sent their

technicians. Our technicians also went. Let us see what happens. They say it is a political decision. I do not know how it is a political decision. If it is politically motivated. I do not know whether they will come to this decision. But, on our side, we are willing to discuss this matter and find a solution. There are no problems between two neighbours and between two nations which cannot be solved by understanding and negotiations if there is a willingness to solve the problems.

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

Sir, some Members reminded me about our relations with the Arabs. Particularly a Member from our side asked me what we are doing about the Arabs and why we did not mention in our Report about Kenya and the Arabs. He said that in 1974 - 75, it was mentioned. Well, I can tell him that our relations with the Arab countries and West Asian countries, not only the Arabs, the Iranians and the people of Turkey, and the whole of the Arab world, have been continuous and traditional. On the major issue of West Asia or the 'Middle East' as it is called, on the question of Palestine, for example, we have always supported the Arab cause. And Dr. Pande again yesterday mentioned the history of it and how Gandhiji reacted when it was decided to send the Israelis into Palestine. He was not sitting down in the conference of foreign affairs advisers and experts. As a leader of millions of masses, he

just naturally reacted. And I can tell you that, that is the basis of the foreign policy of India towards the Arab world since 1927 or 1928. Since then, it has become the policy of India. So, our relations with them are good and in the last few years, we have made much more progress with conscious efforts. Our relations with Iraq have been very friendly and positive. Our relations with Egypt have been traditionally good since the days of our independence. Our relations with Syria are good. Our relations with most of the Gulf countries are good. In the matter of economic co-operation with the UAE and other countries, we have got some common projects, and particularly there is a sea-change in our relationship with Iran. And I must say this is one of the very important areas where there are some positive results. Very recently, we had the visit of the Iranian Prime Minister, Mr. Hoveyda. And to quote him, sky is the limit for co-operation between India and Iran. This is how others are looking at it. This feeling is based on the mutuality of interests and confidence. On the basic issue of the Arab nations we have stood by them and we will continue to stand by them. The lands forcibly occupied by the Israelis must be vacated and, the national rights of Palestine people must be restored to them and this is the basic approach on which we are absolutely firm and we shall continue to be firm and make our own constructive, positive contribution in this particular area.

The events in Lebanon have saddened us and we can only hope that peace and harmony will return to that beautiful country. This is a thing that keeps us worrying. Well, I do not want to go more into that, the area of West Asia, is of most vital interest to us and we certainly will continue to work for cooperation in this area. Whether they vote for us in one particular election or not is not the ultimate test in this manner. Somebody just mentioned about the election, but I can say that even in that context, a large number of Arab countries voted for us. I would like to make my point clear because it would be rather misleading otherwise.

I think before I come to south-East Asia, I should mention our relationship with Nepal which is very important for us and there

has certainly been further progress on account of the visit of the Prime Minister of Nepal. Our relations are better than they were before and, I think, both sides have realised that they have to be realistic in this matter and it is that realism which has put this relationship in a still better condition. We have identified the areas of cooperation. I am sure, will certainly strengthen the political ties also.

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

Now, coming to South-East Asia, I would like to say that recently we welcomed the approach of the ASEAN States for peaceful and good-neighbourly relations in the region. Our relations with individual nations are good. I should say that with Malaysia we have got good economic relations and so is the case With Indonesia and Thailand. The most important thing that I would like to mention about South-East Asia is the emergence of Vietnam, the victory of North Vietnam. Their decision to reunify South Vietnam and North Vietnam is a very important development of 1976 for Asia. First of all, a small nation of nearly 45 million people, united nation - fought against the biggest power in the world and ultimately triumphed, showed that a determined people inspired by nationalism and progressive ideology, can fight like one man and ultimately succeed. I mention this thing because the emergence of a United Vietnam is a very important factor for peace and progress in Asia. We had recently the visit of the Foreign Minister of Vietnam. But I would not like to merely mention her as the Foreign Minister of Vietnam but as Madame Binh, who is one of the important leaders of Vietnam. Her visit gave us an idea that our outlook and our views on more important economic issues and international issues are, similar or identical. I am sure our co-operation will certainly and to the strength of the forces of peace

in Asia and the world.

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

Somebody read from the report of the External Affairs Ministry, one sentence that India looks at the world situation with hope and concern. I think that sums up the whole issue. Hopes are certainly there because there are forces of detente which are strengthening the non-aligned movement and its progress. The liberation and emergence of Vietnam, the liberation of Angola, the liberation of Mozambique, dismantling of the Portuguese empire and constructive discussions about the economic problems amongst the developing countries, are matters of hope. Then, there are matters of concern. What is happening in the Middle East ? What is happening in Diego Garcia? What is happening in Zimbabwe?

What is happening in the South Pacific? What is happening in other places? Somebody gave very interesting figures - I think it was Prof. Dutt - of nearly fifty per cent of the arms production going to certain areas. What about the huge defence budgets in the world for creating these sophisticated arms? When there are sophisticated arms, they do not lead towards peace. They always create tension and problems which may lead to something negative and not peace. So, these are all matters of concern. This African issue, as I said, is a matter of concern to us. We hope that the African countries will remain united and will stick to their rights. We hope that the forces of liberation will emerge successful as they did in parts of Asia. If they do so in Africa, certainly, the forces of progress will further be strengthened and this is what we have to work for.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta yesterday gave some suggestions and he said that we must make detente irreversible. This can be made irreversible only by making detente universal. This is the only way of making it irreversible. If it is only confined to Europe I must say it is hanging by a narrow thread. If this is the base of detente, it is a very narrow base. It will have to be extended further. This is the only way in which it can be extended further. This is the only way of doing it. This will have to be done carefully. There are many other points of concern in Africa. But this is the major question in regard to which we will have to be very watchful and wide awake in the days to come to see these problems through.

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

The other day I made a statement here on the policy of Canada in regard to the nuclear programme of India. We did say what we had to say. I do not want to add to it. I am merely taking it as an illustration. This is a new trend which is developing. This is a very

important thing which we have to take note of in a general sense. At the present moment, I have already said all that I had to say but one cannot think of it in isolation and therefore I consider it as an indication of a trend on this particular matter. This new trend is that the developed countries appear to have decided that they would not make it very easy for the developing countries to participate in the technological revolution. This is the basic thing.

.....

We should take it more as a challenge for action, for scientific and economic progress. I do not know what exactly is happening in the United States of America about supplies of uranium fuel which is before U. R. C. There seems to be some sort of an understanding among the developed countries in this regard only because India conducted a peaceful nuclear explosion. We have said that we do not want to make nuclear weapons. It is not our policy. But at the same time, we do not want to give up our right to have peaceful nuclear experiment because it is for peaceful purpose and this has been accepted by the scientists. This the trend. At one time, our Prime Minister made a very profound observation in this regard. She said that historically, we have missed the industrial revolution, but we do not want to miss the technological revolution. This is a very important observation. We missed the industrial revolution and came the dark era of imperialism and colonialism. This is the time when we should keep pace with the advancing technology. We should make our own efforts in this direction. We should not be deterred and we should pursue our policy and be partners in the technological revolution. This alone would keep India what it is today and this alone would make India what we want India to be. We do not want to become a power in the sense the word 'power' is used. We certainly want India to be strong. We certainly want India to live in peace and work for co-operation. But this can be done only through our participation in the technological revolution. Canada's attitude is certainly a warning in that direction. We should take note of this

warning and take it well. The developing countries should take it, not as a warning to India, but as a warning to all of them. My colleague has participated in certain international economic conferences. So have, I. We see them talk in very plausible terms, but when it comes to the question to taking decisions on very vital matters there are hesitations. There are hesitations on transfer of technology because technology also means, in economic terms, further development and expansion of trade and also allotting a fair share in that trade. And the developed nations do not want to make it easy for you to get your own share in the expanding world trade. I think the way world trade has expanded after the Second World War is unique. Therefore, developing countries and the non-alignment countries have to see that we are not denied our share of the technology. Nobody possibly would be too willing to give it to us and you cannot also take it by compulsion. I think as human beings we all have got talent, and capacities as people of developed countries have. But it is a question of time. They have got the advantage of early start of 200 years. That is our initial disadvantage. But I am sure that if we work hard towards this end and I think we will gear up our economic policy, our commerce policy and our foreign policy, ultimately we will succeed. I have said it before and I would like to repeat that ultimately the success and strength of our foreign policy depends upon the strength of our internal political, economic and scientific policies and, therefore, just as we take care of our foreign policy postures and our relations with the different countries we have to take care of these also and ultimately these are the basic forces of strength for India. If we strengthen them we will be strengthening India and the Indian people and it is the strength of the Indian people that would make the Indian foreign policy a strong foreign policy and a successful foreign policy.

SECTION -2

INDO-PAKISTAN AFFAIRS

EDITORIAL NOTE

This Section deals with discussions in the Parliament connected with Indo-Pakistan relations.

Chavan's Statement on the US decision to resume supply of arms to Pakistan is reproduced in Chapter 5. His reply to the discussion giving an expression to the Government's sense of disappointment and frustration at the US decision is in Chapter 6. In his reply, Chavan warned that the US action would further deteriorate the situation on the Indian sub-continent. Dismissing the justification offered by the US Administration, Chavan stated "Either you are deceiving yourself or you are trying to deceive us. It is either of the two." He warned that by lifting this embargo, the US may weaken the psychology of normalisation of relations and they will not help in the development of good relations between the two countries.

Chapter 7 contains text of Chavan's Statement regarding Indo-Pakistan talks and the Joint Statement issued in May 1976.

CHAPTER - 5

U.S DECISION TO RESUME ARMS SUPPLY TO PAKISTAN

Reply to calling attention Notice, Rajya Sabha, 18 February 1975

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, Government of India has received reports that the United States is considering the possibility of resuming arms supplies to Pakistan. Press despatches from Washington and Islamabad have also hinted that the 10 year old American arms embargo may be lifted and that the United States may supply sophisticated weapons to Pakistan. According to our information, this question was also discussed during Prime Minister Bhutto's official visit to Washington on 5th and 6th February although no decision has been announced.

The Government of India views the supply of American weapons to Pakistan with grave concern as it will have serious repercussion on the peace and stability of sub-continent. We have taken up this matter with the US. Government at the highest level and have brought to its attention the consequences of the reversal of their present policy on the process of normalisation on the sub-continent. On 28th January, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State on this subject and conveyed to him our deep concern about the harmful effects of arms supplies to Pakistan on the peace of this region as well as on Indo-American relations. I particularly emphasised that Pakistan's fears about a military threat from India are wholly fanciful and unwarranted as both India and Pakistan are committed in the Simla Agreement to work for friendly and

harmonious relationship and the establishment of durable peace in the sub-continent and to settle all their differences through peaceful means.

It has always been India's policy to promote peace, stability, co-operation and good-neighbourly relations among the countries of this area on the basis of equality, sovereignty and respect for independence and territorial integrity of all States. Despite the unfortunate past, we have made special efforts to bring about normalisation and reconciliation with Pakistan. Thanks to these efforts, we have succeeded to some extent in improving relations between the two countries in spite of the slow progress in the implementation of the Simla Agreement. These hopeful trends will be jeopardised and the promise of co-operation replaced by the spectre of confrontation by and American decision to induct sophisticated weapons into the sub-continent. It will not only create new tension between India and Pakistan but also receive old misgivings about the United States role in the region.

In the recent months, both India and the United States have made sincere efforts to improve their relations. The Secretary of State himself stated while in India last year that the United States does not wish to encourage an arms race in the sub-continent. In view of the past history of the Indo-American relations, it is our earnest hope that the United States will carefully consider all implications its decision to supply weapons to Pakistan will have on the relations between our two countries. We also trust that the United States Government will not reverse its present policy of non-induction of weapons into the subcontinent as this could not be in the interests of the United States, India, Pakistan, or peace of this region. ...

Shri Y B. Chavan : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, Prakash Vir Shastri, has raised practically all the aspects of this problem and I will briefly deal with all of them, one by one. It is not only one party or one Member of this House or the other House, but the entire nation is of one voice in saying that the American arms supply to

Pakistan is going to have an adverse effect on the normalisation process that has started in the sub-continent and on the relations between the USA and India. I have no doubt that America will take note of this one particular aspect of the problem. It is not an ordinary thing and I can assure the hon. Member that the letter that I wrote to Mr. Kissinger, US Secretary of State was a letter which gave him a very clear idea of the strong reaction that this country will have as a whole.

So, there was no question of writing any love letters to anybody in the matter.

The other point that he raised was the American policy in the Indian Ocean and, as a matter of fact, in the entire Asian region, what are its effects going to be and what is our assessment about it. I think it is much better if we see, what the factors were, which were responsible for these ups and downs in Indo-American relations. And this was basically the fact that they always tried to play a sort of balance of power politics in the sub-continent. They had this idea of parity of military strength between India and Pakistan. When the Secretary of State was here, knowing this attitude was responsible for this sort of things, we specially raised this particular aspect with him. He was very categorical in this matter when he spoke about it and said that it is not the U.S. Government's policy. I am only repeating what he said. He said that they do not any longer believe in this policy of having a balance of power between the two countries. Then he also said that it is not their intention to start any arms race. And this is the occasion, when we will have to test them on this particular matter, whether they mean what he said or not.

Prakash Virji mentioned about the base that is likely to be established at Makram on the Pakistan coast. Well, we have also read about it, heard about it. But at the present moment, I cannot affirm it or reject it whether it is a fact. But one will have to be careful about it because we see the tendency of having these naval

bases all over the Indian Ocean. It is certainly not in the interest of America. It is definitely against the interest of all the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean and, I think, we have to pursue our policy of creating an opinion for treating the Indian Ocean as a peace zone. That is only effective answer to this particular problem.

Now, coming to the other aspects of the problem, as far as Pakistan is concerned, Prakash Virji raised certain aspects about the effect of this arms supply to Pakistan. I think he is right that Whenever these arms were supplied to Pakistan, they were only used against India. That is our experience in 1971, and this is going to be the effect of the supply of more sophisticated arms in future. Well I agree with him that the distinction between defensive arms and offensive arms has not much a meaning in this particular matter. It is also true that such a supply of arms is not in the interest of Pakistan itself. This is also a thing which Pakistan should realise, and if the Americans want to be friendly in the real interest of Pakistan, they should not tempt them with arms. This is one basic thing which I hope both the U. S. Government also realise. So, far, I see a common approach between me and Prakash Virji. When we come to the other aspects, I must say, we have got different approaches. Because, Simla Agreement was the only right thing to do under the circumstances then. And what does the Simla Agreement say? It is not merely an agreement; it lays down certain new approach as to how to develop relation between these neighbouring countries. If at all we want to avoid the intervention of any third big power, our emphasis will have to be on the bilateral relations and a willingness to sit together and negotiate the problems that may be existing between the two countries. Therefore, this was a right thing. If we say that we do not want to have discussions then that is an invitation for the third powers to come in with their arms and other temptation. So, the policy of the Government in this matter is not what he said.

Therefore, I would request the hon. Members that this demand

for atom bomb, weapons and nuclear weapons would not be the right policy to follow. It is neither in the interest of India's security nor in the interest of peace in this part of country. Naturally, we have declared our intention that we will certainly develop nuclear technology in this country and we will use it for peaceful purpose. That stand is a firm stand and we stand by it.

Shri Prakash Virji made some mention of Shri T. N. Kaul's activities there. Shri Kaul is trying to help improve relations between India and the U. S. A. He is doing that as the Ambassador of India. I think that should be the line on which he should work. He has been very careful to warn all the responsible authorities there of the consequences that will follow not only on the Indo-U.S. relations but also on the good friendly relations of the various countries in this sub-countries in which everybody should be interested.

I think I have practically touched all the questions that he has raised.

CHAPTER - 6

U.S DECISION TO RESUME ARMS SUPPLY TO PAKISTAN

Reply to discussion, Rajya Sabha, 10 March 1975

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan) : Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, I am indeed grateful to hon. Members for giving me this second opportunity to discuss and express my views on this very important debate that is going on in the country about the arms supply to Pakistan by the USA. Many Members have participated in it and different shades of national opinion from anxiety, concern, disappointment and regret to resentment, have been expressed in this debate. And it is very heartening to see shades Right, Centre and Left - are completely united in rejecting this policy, in disapproving of the policy decision taken by the United States in supplying arms, or in lifting the embargo on arms supply to Pakistan. I would not like to repeat the whole thing again but I would like to give some background as to how it is that the whole situation came about. We know the history of the last few years, nearly ten years. At one time, America on its own decided that giving this sort of lethal arms either to India or Pakistan was not going to help peaceful conditions in the sub-continent; it was not that they completely stopped the supply of arms. Some are non-lethal and some lethal weapons. The decision was that they would not give lethal weapons. But there was something in that system of arms supply by the imperial powers. Sometimes there are some compulsions which force them to make some sort of an exception because in 1970, they made

some 'onetime exception' which ultimately resulted, as we know, in further belligerency and militant attitude which resulted in Pakistan's armed aggression against India. Admittedly, there was that tilt. Admittedly, there were certain positive results of what happened on the sub-continent. India emerged as a country which stood for justice, for the liberation of the oppressed people. Justice was on its side and the cause it supported was so just that it got victory, we took a series of initiatives and started a new process, on our own re, of detente on the continent, of understanding that without the interference of any of the big sub powers, it is better that we take our own initiatives, be liberal, be very generous, and try to remove the tensions in this area, because that is the only way of bringing about peace in the world. What exactly is detente process? Detente is a process which would remove areas of tension in this area, because that is the only way of bringing about peace in the world and emphasise the necessity and the compulsions of co-existence - peaceful co-existence - between two powers. This was exactly what was happening, and actually it was our intention. It was, I think, the necessity of the time to see that the forces which interfered with this process of normalisation of relationship should also be neutralised, that they should also be encouraged to support this process, that powers which by interference always created this sort of an imbalance should be encouraged to support. So, the genesis of the discussion with Dr. Kissinger, really speaking arose out of this objective condition and of certain historical necessity to which there was some response from the other side. That does not mean that we were deceived or somebody was trying to work out the theory of deception. All that I am saying is that, at least, we were not deceived.

I can assure not only Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, but also every other Member of this House that none of us was deceived. We know. I am not disclosing the discussions with Dr. Kissinger, because that is not done. But I would like to tell this honourable House and the country that when we decided to sit down and discuss with them, we really wanted to find out what are the perceptions,

intentions, of the Americans in Asia, in the sub-continent, in South East Asia, in the Gulf countries. What are their intentions about certain positive processes that they have started in this part of the world? What exactly is the significance of the understanding of the new type of relationship that was built in Asia with China? Is it an understanding between U. S. and China? If it is, then it is good, because we wanted their relations to be good. But we certainly wanted to know whether it is going to be at the cost of any other nation, particularly this country. So we started those discussions. We wanted to understand as to what exactly is the position. Now I think it is a known fact that what Mr. Kissinger told us, what he made public in his statements. We have also let it known. Anyhow, it seems that they are taking wrong decisions at wrong times or possibly right decisions at wrong times. I do not know what it is. But they decided, and I think it is a good thing that they decided before I went there. Otherwise if immediately after my going to Washington the decision was taken, it would have lead to a greater sense of disappointment or greater sense of being cheated - I am glad to use a wrong word rather that way. Therefore, in that sense we are not deceived.

The point is, what are we to do? We still want mature relationship with all countries. We want mature relationship with the U. S. A. We want mature realistic relationship with all the countries. What we are trying to say is not merely a verbal protest, as my hon'ble friend, Mr. Subramnian Swamy, is afraid to say. What we are trying to show is the fallacies of the policies that have been followed by these big powers. The arguments that they have given in support of what they have done are untenable, invalid

Shri Bhupesh Gupta : Outrageous.

Shri Y B. Chavan : Well, this is the way we use a word, and their incredibility is likely to be accepted in this country. And this is what T. N. Kaul says. Now let us take it argument by argument. They say, "We are in a very curious position. Here is our ally to whom the other countries are giving weapons." And then he said that they

did not give weapons. This is a rather very absurd argument that has been made for the last so many years by American statesmen, from President Eisenhower down to Mr. Kissinger, of the present Administration. Then they say that they wanted us to be their friends. Well, these two things -' look rather contradictory.

They are also having friendship with China and they are also having detente. They want friendship with Russia and they also want friendship with India. Then they want Pakistan as an ally. Ally against whom? They are very intelligent people and I am entitled to ask them this question. You want Pakistan as your ally, but ally against whom?

Shri Bhupesh Gupta : What did you say ?

Shri Y B. Chavan : The other point is that Dr. Kissinger publicly said that they are not interested and they will not encourage arms race. Now they lift the embargo and tell us that they would like to supply arms to Pakistan in the interest of security to keep the strategic balance. Is it not encouraging the arms race? If not, what is it? Either your words have no meaning or those people who talk and those people who listen do not understand. I really do not understand. It is very difficult. They said Pakistan feels insecure. Well, that is the subjective feeling of a country. But you must put some objective test for it. As a matter of fact, after the liberation of Bangladesh, Pakistan may have contracted in its territory, but Pakistan has become more compact from the security point of view. From the point of view of arms strength, from the point of view of man-power, Pakistan is more powerful today than it was in 1971. It is a fact.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta : They themselves admit it. Last year Prime Minister Bhutto said it.

Shri Y B. Chavan : That is right. My point is that there was no question of any sense of insecurity in Pakistan. If we apply objective criteria to this matter, it is not a fact. He has made a statement that we are spending about a billion dollars a year on

arms purchase. Well, certainly as a matter of fundamental policy, we are trying to build our own defence industries and our defence strength in our country. These is nothing wrong about it. This is one thing. Then if we compare the budgets, experts like Mr. Subramanian Swamy will vouchafe what I am saying, the defence expenditure is normally taken either in forms of percentage of the GNP or in terms of percentage of the annual budget. If you see this year's annual budget - I have casually seen it, unfortunately, I have not gone deep into it - I think our defence expenditure is about 20 to 21 percent, may be 21 to 22 per cent. And in terms of GNP, I am sure it is not more than 4 per cent.

Shri Subramanian Swamy : The correct figure is 3 per cent. Why say 3 to 4 percent ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan : All right, 3 per cent. I am prepared in this matter to be a little more liberal in order to be a little more convincing to them. If we compare the figure of Pakistan's expenditure in terms of their annual budget, their defence expenditure is 56 per cent of the budget, and in terms of GNP, it comes to about 9 per cent.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta : Ten per cent.

Shri Y B. Chavan : Here I am prepared to come down. After seeing these things, to say that there is a sense of insecurity in Pakistan is something very irrational; it is an irrational idea that has been planted in the mind of Pakistan which has a tradition of rather inflated belligerence. Nevertheless that is very harmful to Pakistan. As we would like to educate Americans that their policy is wrong, we would certainly like to educate Pakistan leadership, Pakistan statesmen, Pakistan Government and, if we can, the Pakistan people also that this method is the method which takes them to run...

Shri Bhupesh Gupta : I think we better say "We would like Pakistan leadership to be educated" rather than "we would like to educate them."

Shri Y. B. Chavan : So, some of these arguments which have been made on behalf of the American administration are arguments which are not acceptable to us at all. They are not acceptable, not because we do not like them, but because they do not stand any objective scrutiny, any objective criteria. Therefore, their policy is basically wrong. If they want peace in the world, which they claim they want - they say "we want peace in the sub-continent and we want to help it" - then this is not the policy to do that. Either you are deceiving yourselves or the other alternative is, you are trying to deceive us. It is either of the two; I do not want to make any charge. But logically there seems to be no third alternative in this matter. I am saying this frankly because I am not criticising for criticism's sake. I am making this frank assessment in order to build mature relationship because mature relationship means frank assessment of each other. This is how I am trying to put it before the House.

Now, the main point that ultimately we have to consider is : Where do we go from here? This is the main point as to what ultimately we are to do. There is no shortcut in developing or going in the right direction as far as international policies are concerned because it is a difficult world, it is a changing world and it is a complex world in which we have to assess our own strength. We have to have our own objective principles of policy and follow them firmly, with full faith and this is exactly what Government of India is doing for the last 25 years. I think the leaders who have laid down this policy have acted wisely. This is what I would like to tell you again that at the time of every crisis the entire Indian people have stood by this policy and that is because the basic policy is very strong. This is where the strength of the policy comes. It is a policy which is not manipulated by anybody for rich countries on the promise of support or manipulated by any ambitious politicians. It is a policy which has grown out of certain convictions and the life of the people. Therefore it has this sort of strength. Whether Pakistan has done it or USA has done this,

ultimately whatever they do, I entirely agree with all the Members - not any particular Member, but I just remember the last two speeches because they were the last and therefore they are a little fresh in my mind - that ultimately the function of the international policy is the function for internal unity of the people and economic strength of our own people. And for that matter what we will have to do is to pursue the policy of non-alignment, pursue the policy of keeping unity of the third world, strengthen the non-alignment movement and try to build up relations between our neighbours to which we have given the highest priority and which we are pursuing positively, consistently, ceaselessly and successfully.

Somebody mentioned about Asian security or collective security. This idea is floated. But nobody has yet concretised or defined what it means. If it means creating an atmosphere of economic or political co-operation in Asia, yes; well and good; it is all right. But the conditions here will have to be objectively seen and then we have to go ahead. Personally I feel there are certain regional areas which are difficult. There are certain areas in which there are tensions and though some Simla process we have to try to eliminate these things and strengthen relationship. There are certain contradictions in the situation in the Gulf countries. There are certain contradictions in South East Asia. We have to remove these on the basis of a network of bilateral relationship and then there may some sort of multi-lateral idea of co-operation. We do not want to give an idea that collective security is aimed at anybody. This is not what we mean. I am very glad that this process is on not in the sub-continent, but elsewhere, despite this decision of USA to supply arms to Pakistan. And what we said has come true. Within fifteen days of the announcement of the decision on U. S. arms aid to Pakistan, Bhutto's language has changed. He was saying he wants to follow Simla Agreement. But for the first time after a long time he spoke the language of war. Well, sometimes I feel like not taking him seriously. But experience has shown that you cannot take him complacently also. But, really speaking, he knows about it. Ultimately, this wrong language and

wrong step will lead to results which are not going to be healthy results for them also. What I am trying to tell you is that we are trying to make the Americans see that this is the result of their doing. Our main point was that by lifting this embargo they may weaken the psychology of normalisation of the relations and they will not help in the development of good relations between the two countries. But I would like to assure this House, this country and the world that despite all talks of war by others, we are not talking in terms of war. We are a country dedicated to the cause of peace, world peace, and we will make all efforts to remove any misunderstanding between the two countries and try to strengthen the spirit of the Simla Agreement and proceed on that basis.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta : You should strengthen the spirit of the Simla Agreement.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Yes. We are very glad, as somebody just now said, that the President of Afghanistan is amidst us and we certainly want to have good relations with Afghanistan and we also want that Afghanistan - Pakistan relations should be good, and that the relations between Afghanistan and Iran are also very good.

As was just now mentioned, for the last so many months a controversy about the relationship between Iraq and Iran was in the air. But we have good and friendly relations with both Iran and Iraq and I am glad indeed that an agreement has been arrived at the leaders of Iraq and Iran on their major bilateral problems. Our satisfaction over this development is all the greater since we have traditionally close and friendly relations with these two countries. Let me take this opportunity and convey our sincere congratulations to the leaders of both these countries. So, this is our approach in this particular matter. As I have said, ultimately, what we have to do is not merely to see that we do with this Joint Commission or that Joint Commission - these are small matters and small issues and these are not issues on which we should concentrate our energies - but also to see the directions which

ultimately we want to take, to see what the general principles of policy are by which you want us to be guided in this particular situation, and, ultimately, we will have to pursue our own policy of building up our relations with our neighbours and with other countries and, at the same time, not neglecting building up and strengthening our economy, building up the unity of our people and building up self-reliance in the matter of defence production in this country and that alone will give us the strength of national security.

Friends, I do not think I can add more than this and I do not think I can take any more of your time.

Thank you.

CHAPTER - 7

STATEMENT REGARDING INDO-PAKISTAN TALKS

Rajya Sabha, 18 May 1976

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Y B. Chavan) : Sir, as the House is aware ever since the Simla Agreement was signed in July 1972, it has been the Government of India's policy that, in keeping with the Agreement, the severed links between India and Pakistan should be restored and the relationship between the two countries normalised. During this period, many problems have indeed been resolved. The telecommunications and postal services between the two countries re-established and a visa agreement was signed to facilitate travel from Pakistan to India and vice versa. In January 1975, agreements were also reached between the two Governments on shipping and trade. However, some other items from the Simla Agreement remained unresolved; these were air and land communications and the restoration of diplomatic relations. Two meetings between official delegations were held in November 1974 and May 1975 to discuss questions arising out of Pakistan's complaints with the International Civil Aviation Organisation but no agreement could be reached.

On the 27th March, Prime Minister of Pakistan, in a letter to our Prime Minister, indicated that Pakistan would be prepared to withdraw its case from the International Civil Aviation Organisation. As the House is aware, India had previously urged such a course in order that the process of normalisation could maintain its momentum and the Simla Agreement enjoins us to work for the

establishment of durable peace and harmonious bilateral relations, our Prime Minister, in her reply of 11th April, suggested that the Foreign Secretaries of the two countries should meet and discuss pending matters such as air-links, overflights, resumption and rail and road communications and also the restoration of the severed diplomatic relations between India and Pakistan. The Prime Minister of Pakistan accepted these suggestions in his letter of 18th April. As a result, the two Foreign Secretaries arranged for the delegations to meet in Islamabad between the 12th & the 14th may.

After, the meeting, a Joint Statement was issued, which was simultaneously released to the Press in the two capitals. The two governments have also agreed to make public the three letters exchanged between the two Prime Minister. I am placing texts of the Joint Statement and letters on the Table of the House.

The Members will observe that the Joint Statement embodies an agreement to restore all the severed links between the two countries. In respect of some of these items, further technical level contacts may be necessary to work out the detailed arrangements for the resumption of the links. It has subsequently been agreed that this entire package embodied in the Joint Statement would be put into effect more or less simultaneously between the 17th July and the 25th July, 1976.

I am confident that these positive developments will be welcomed by the House, the people of our two countries as also the friends of our two countries in the region and the world at large. Both countries must recognize the logic of their interdependence and the need for co-operative relations between neighbours. If peace and mutual confidence prevail in the sub-continent, our nations could more fully bend their talent and energies to resolve the gigantic problems which confront us and play an even more effective role in the international sphere where we have so many interests in common.

.....

Joint Statement issued at the end of Indo-Pakistan talk held in May, 1976

Pursuant to the letter written by Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto on 27th March and the reply of Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi of 11 April, the delegations of India and Pakistan met in Islamabad from 12 to 14 May 1976 with the objective of resuming normalisation of relations between the two countries as envisaged in the Simla Agreement. The discussions were held in a frank and friendly atmosphere.

His Excellency Shri J. S. Mehta, Foreign Secretary led the Indian delegation. He was assisted by representatives of the Ministers of External Affairs, Tourism and Civil Aviation, Finance, Home Affairs, Railways, Shipping and Transport and Commerce. The Pakistani delegation was led by Mr. Agha Shahi, Foreign Secretary. He was assisted by the representatives of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Railways, Finance, Communications, Commerce Interior, Information and Broadcasting, Law, Aviation Division, the Department of Civil Aviation, Ports and Shipping and Pakistan International Airlines Corporation.

In regard to matters relating to civil aviation, the two delegations discussed the modality of withdrawing the cases and counter claim pending before the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organisation and agreed to send a joint letter to the Council for the purpose. They further agreed to the resumption of overflights and the restoration of airlinks between the two countries. It was decided that expert delegations from the two countries will meet to work out the necessary details.

The two delegations agreed to resume goods and passenger traffic by rail through the Wagah/Attari border. In this connection the Pakistan delegation stated that the rail track on its side was already functional. The Indian delegation undertook to carry out

the necessary repairs on its side as soon as possible.

The two sides recognised the advantage that would accrue to trade between the two countries with the resumption of freighting of goods by rail.

It was decided that the experts of the two countries should meet urgently to work out a detailed agreement regarding interchange, freight rating, compensation claims, custom formalities, the creation of a wagon pool etc. for the goods and passenger traffic between the two countries.

The two sides agreed to grant multiple journey visas valid for one year to the members of the railways staff operating on scheduled services along the specified route.

The two delegations agreed that goods meant for the other country could also be transported by road upto the Wagah/Attari border. For this purpose, they undertook to make necessary arrangements for the transshipment, warehousing, bonding and customs clearance etc.

The two delegations discussed the question of early reestablished of diplomatic relations between their countries. They agreed that each country should be represented by an Ambassador with supporting staff in the capital of the other country. In view of the problems which had been faced in the past in the functioning of their respective diplomatic missions, the two delegations reaffirmed their adherence to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations 1961 to which they were party and agreed on a basis of reciprocity, to grant each other's Missions all facilities and courtesies for their normal functioning.

The two delegations reviewed the working of the Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement of 23 January 1975, and the Shipping Protocol of 15 January 1975. They agreed that in terms of Article 3 of the Trade Agreement, in addition to state trading organisations, the private sector be also enabled, with effect from 15 July 1976, to

participate in the trade between the two countries subject to the laws, rules, regulations and procedures in force in their respective countries from time to time.

The two delegations also agreed that the Joint Committee envisaged under Article 9 of Trade Agreement should be constituted immediately to review the working of that Agreement and that the first meeting of the Joint Committee should be held at the Commerce Secretaries level as soon as possible and, in any case, before the end of 1976. The two sides decided that a further meeting of the respective shipping experts should be held, as early as possible, to review the Protocol on Shipping as provided in Article 22 of that Protocol.

The two delegations reviewed the existing visa agreement for regulating travel between the two countries. They noted that the arrangements envisaged in that agreement were working satisfactorily and required no change.

The two delegations discussed measures for promoting cultural and scientific exchanges as envisaged in the Simla Agreement. They agreed that further discussions on these measure could be undertaken in due course.

The two sides held discussions on the question of the detainees and agreed that this humanitarian issue needed to be resolved expeditiously. They also agreed to make efforts to locate persons still untraced and repatriate them with all possible dispatch in accordance with the existing working arrangements.

The leader of the Indian delagation, His Excellency Shri J. S. Mehta, was received by the President of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

The Indian delegation warmly thanked the delegation of Pakistan for its hospitality.

Jagat S. Mehta
Foreign Secretary
Ministry of External Affairs
Government of India
Islamabad, May 14, 1976

Agha Shahi
Foreign Secretary
Ministry of External Affairs
Government of Pakistan

SECTION - 3

SIKKIM

EDITORIAL NOTE

This Section contains the developments in Sikkim which ultimately led to Sikkim's merger with India. These are of historical significance.

CHAPTER 8

STATEMENT ON THE SITUATION IN SIKKIM

Lok Sabha, 11 April, 1975

Shri Y. B. Chavan : I should like to take the opportunity to keep the Hon. Members informed of certain recent development in Sikkim.

As the House is aware, Government have been making sincere efforts to ensure the speedy economic and social development of the people of Sikkim under democratic conditions, as stipulated in the agreement of 8th May, 1973 and the government of Sikkim Act, 1974.

Both documents had the assent and approval of the Chogyal as well as the political leadership of Sikkim. However, the arrangements that were instituted on the basis of these agreements, with the responsible Government constituted by duly elected leaders on the one hand, and the Chogyal functioning as a Constitutional Head of Government on the other, depended essentially for their success, on the sincerity of the Chogyal and full acceptance by him in practice of the democratic system under which he would cease to have the overriding powers he had exercised for more than two decades.

As Hon. Members are aware, Government of India have been requested, on several occasions over the past 20 years, by political leaders and the people of Sikkim for the abolition of the

institution of the Chogyal. Government of India's endeavour has been to protect the institution, although in the case of Princely states, the Princely order has been abolished in deference to the democratic processes in the country. The deviation in the case of Sikkim was motivated by our desire to show special consideration to the Chogyal in the hope that he would play a responsible role. As regards the present Govern Assembly in Sikkim - the first that is truly representative in character, having d been elected on the basis of one-man one-vote in free and fair elections-the demand for the removal of the Chogyal has been made and repeated for the past several months. As early as in September last year, the Chief Minister had warned that if democracy was to survive in Sikkim, the Chogyal must go. On our part, we have conunselled restraint in the hope and expectation that the Chogyal would ultimately reconcile himself to his constitutional role and adopt a more constructive attitude. However, we have always made it clear to the Chogyal that while we are anxious to protect the institution of Chogyal in Sikkim, as we have been doing over the past several years, we must naturally give the highest priority to the welfare, interests and aspirations of the common people and their elected leaders. I must say that the situation in Sikkim has now reached a critical phase.

Almost from the day on which the new arrangements came into force, it became clear through Chogyal's statements and actions that he was not reconciled to his Constitutional role and that he was determined to obstruct the functioning of the democratically elected Government through all means at his disposal. In the past few months, the Chief ministers of Sikkim and his colleagues in the Council of ministers and the Assembly have constantly been representing to the Government of India against the Chogyal's activities, and drawing our attention to the fact that democracy cannot survive in Sikkim as long as the institution of Chogyal continued to exist. We have been conuselling patience to political leaders in Sikkim because we hoped that, ultimately good sense

and wisdom would prevail on the part of the Chogyal, in the larger interest of the welfare of the people of Sikkim. Unfortunately, these hopes have been belied. The chogyal's actions over the last few months have been deliberately directed towards creating a crisis situation in the State. The elected representatives and the Government leaders in Sikkim have taken strong exception, and with justification, to his statements questioning the validity of the Democratic process and even the Government of Sikkim Act which he himself had promulgated only some months ago. They have been outraged by the propaganda campaign that he has either undertaken personally or encouraged. The Government of Sikkim and the Government of India has been particularly shocked, in recent weeks, to know the efforts, to intimidate, terrorise, threaten and even physically harm political leaders and common people in Sikkim in a bid to disrupt law and order, obstruct the functioning of the Government and subvert the democratic process. There have been assassination attempts on the Chief Minister by use of explosives, there was the stabbing of an unarmed Member of the Sikkim Assembly by a member of the Chogyal's entourage in the Chogyal's presence, and some other distressing information has come to light only a few days ago on elaborate plans to use violence against elected representatives.

In view of the sharp deterioration in relations between the elected representatives and the Chogyal, I had instructed the Foreign Secretary to visit Gangtok last week to study the situation. In particular, the Foreign Secretary did his utmost to impress upon the Chogyal that we had all along been urging patience upon the elected representatives in the hope that the Chogyal would cooperate with the Government instead of seeking confrontation with them, but if these efforts to impede the functioning of the Government, insult the elected representatives and intimidate them in various ways continued, the situation could well reach crisis proportions. It is now unfortunately evident that this effort did not have the desired effect.

It is in the context of the deteriorating law and order situation

and the suspicion of the imminent threat to the lives of some leaders in Sikkim that an urgent request was received from the Chief Minister of Sikkim for the immediate disarming and disbanding of the Sikkim guards. Even earlier, the Government of India has been urged by the Chief Minister that the Government of Sikkim should not be expected to support with public funds the presence of several hundred armed personnel for the exclusive use of the Chogyal. The Hon. Members would agree that there could be no justification for a private army of about 400 people retained by the Chogyal on the palace premises but paid for by the public exchequer. The evidence of possible conspiracy against the Chief Minister and his colleagues including complicity of some Sikkim guards added urgency to this request. In view of the pressing appeal from the Chief Minister and of the Government of India's responsibility to ensure law and order in the State, the Government took necessary steps to disarm the Sikkim guards on the afternoon of 9th April.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention another demand by the political leaders in Sikkim, which has been made earlier on many occasions and has been reiterated in recent weeks, for according to the elected Government full rights and responsibilities on par with a constituent unit of the Indian Union. The request is a reflection and a conscious expression of the traditional sentiment and popular with in Sikkim to fully participate in the mainstream of Indian life. It has again been repeated, along with the demand for the abolition of the institution of the Chogyal, in the resolution passed unanimously by the Sikkim Assembly at its meeting on the 10th April, the implications on which are being studied by the Government of India.

CHAPTER 9

CONSTITUTION (38 AMENDMENT) BILL REGARDING SIKKIM

Lok Sabha , 23 April, 1975

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Bill further to amend the constitution of India be taken into consideration.”

The Bill comprises of the insertion of the entry “Sikkim” in the First Schedule to the Constitution under the heading. “I. THE STATES” and also the insertion of the new article 371F incorporating special provisions with respect to the State of Sikkim. The bill also provides for certain consequential amendments to the Constitution.

I think it will be very appropriate at this stage, even at the risk of repeating whatever I have said before in the form of a statement, to give certain historical background of the political developments to date.

In the days prior to independence, Sikkim was one of the many Indian princely States which constituted British India. The Maharaja of Sikkim was a member of the Chamber of Princes since its very inception in 1921, and enjoyed a gun salute of 15.

The political leaders of Sikkim, witnessing the emergence of democracy in the rest of India in 1947, agitated for accession to India and the establishment of an elected responsible government. Arrangements were arrived at, which were not basically dissimilar

to those applied to the other Indian States, in the sense that the Government of India had exclusive responsibilities for defence, external relations and communications, as also ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of law and order, good government and efficient administration and for the development of self-governing institutions in Sikkim. The institution of the Maharaja was retained in the hope that the peoples aspirations for fully responsible government and closer links with India would be fulfilled with the passage of years.

Our hopes that through these arrangements the people of Sikkim would progressively be able to satisfy their aspirations for democratic and responsible government and that there would be orderly socio-economic growth in Sikkim, were belied by the actual course of events. In retrograde fashion, the distance between the ruler and the Sikkimese people progressively became wider. The frustration and the resentment of the people against an autocratic and corrupt system brought matters to a head in April 1973 when, following charges of widespread malpractices, manipulation and nepotism in the elections which had been held three months earlier, a massive popular agitation erupted. A strong articulate demand for sweeping constitutional changes was put forward. In the face of this widespread popular agitation, law and order broke down completely and both the ruler and the people appealed to the Government of India for assistance and intervention.

The House is aware of the history of developments in Sikkim since 1973 -the elections held in Sikkim in which the ruling Sikkim Congress won 31 of the 32 seats, the Government of Sikkim Act, 1974, providing a constitutional framework of Sikkim and the request of the Sikkim Assembly for further participation in the political and economic institutions of India, which led to the Parliament passing the Constitution Thirty-fifth Amendment Act, which provided for the association of Sikkim with the Union of India and enabled it to have representation in our Parliament.

While it was our hope that the existing constitutional arrangements

would provide a satisfactory working arrangement for progressive responsible government with the Chogyal as constitutional head, the popular government had strong reservations over the Chogyal's willingness to adjust himself to his constitutional role. As early as September 1974, the Chief Minister had publicly indicated that "the Chogyal must go." I fear that India's persistent efforts to reconcile the continuance of the ruler in the constitutional role with the hopes and aspirations of the people proved to be an impossible task.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to burden the House with a long account of recent developments. Apart from the Chogyal's transparent confrontation with the Council of Ministers in a determined effort to see that the Government should not be permitted to function effectively, intimidation and terrorism were also equally applied. An attempt to assassinate the Chief Minister, which fortunately proved to be abortive, the stabbing of the Sikkim Assembly Member by the Chogyal's Palace Guards, discovery of explosives and weapons, as well as startling evidence of involvement of the Chogyal's Palace Guards and ADCs in the plot to assassinate popular Sikkimese leaders contributed to the heightening of tensions. It was against this background that the Sikkim Assembly met on the 10th April. Observing that the Agreement of the 8th May, 1973, and the Government of Sikkim Act, 1974, had broken down on account of the persistent harmful activities of the Chogyal, the Assembly solemnly declared and resolved :

"The institution of the Chogyal is hereby abolished and Sikkim shall henceforth be a constituent unit of India, enjoying a democratic and fully responsible government.

It was decided to submit the Resolution forthwith to the people for their approval.

Conveying this decision to the Prime Minister, the Chief Minister of Sikkim wrote on the 10th April :

"The survival of democracy in Sikkim is indisputably dependent

upon the closest links with India. The Government of India's commitment to the welfare and progress of the Sikkimese people and to the development of constitutional democracy in Sikkim has provided us with great inspiration. It has generated, in response, an even greater urge amongst the Sikkimese people to complete the work which was left unfinished in 1947, despite the known urges of our people, and to merge in the main-stream of India's political, economic and social life."

The Chief Minister also stressed - I quote :

"We can no longer remain patient in the face of the Chogyal's repeated and persistent manoeuvres against us. Our people are determined that Sikkim immediately be given the full rights and responsibilities which are available to other constituent units of India.

Following their decision, the Government of Sikkim organised a special poll throughout Sikkim on the 14th April. The result was announced on the 15th April. Out of a total electorate of approximately 97,000 - 59,637 votes were polled in favour and 1,496 votes against the Resolution. The poll was conducted by the Sikkim Government with their existing electoral rules under conditions of scrupulous fairness and was covered by large numbers of journalists and representatives of other publicity media.

The Chief Minister of Sikkim communicated this result to the Government of India on the 15th evening and stated :

"In approving this decision, the Sikkimese people have overwhelmingly made it clear that they can no longer suffer the burden of the institution of the Chogyal and they desire, with immediate effect, that Sikkim henceforth be a constituent unit of India, enjoying a democratic and fully responsible government. Through this poll, which was conducted with scrupulous impartiality under the supervision of Sikkim's election officials and was fully covered by a large number of Press representatives, the Sikkimese people have unitedly endorsed the Assembly Resolution of the 10th April and have confirmed their mandate to the Assembly.

On behalf of the Council of Ministers, I now strongly request the

Government of India to make an immediate response and accept this decision, taking, as had been requested in the Assembly Resolution of the 10th April, such measures as may be necessary and appropriate to implement this decision as early as possible.”

The entire Council of Ministers of Sikkim accompanied by some senior Sikkimese leaders visited New Delhi on the 16th and 17th April and personally conveyed to the Government of India, Sikkim’s strong desire that immediate action be taken to give effect to Sikkim’s near-unanimous decision.

The choice for us as far as Sikkim is concerned has always been a clear one. Are we to uphold the narrow vested interests of the anachronistic system to the breaking point, or are we to respond to the democratic urges of the people and their freely expressed will in favour of fully joining in the mainstream of our national life? We have made every effort to accommodate the interests of the Ruler with the wishes and aspirations of the ruled in Sikkim. The long course of our relations with the Chogyal and with political leaders of Sikkim representing the trodden masses, bear testimony to our continued efforts to help the different parties in achieving a workable accommodation among themselves.

In the final analysis however, when the constitutional machinery has broken down, when the Constitutional Head is in an irrevocable confrontation with the elected Government, and when events have reached a point of no return, our choice is simple and self-evident. We can do no more than to respond in full measure to the wishes of the people as incorporated in the Sikkim Assembly Resolution of the 10th April, 1975, duly and overwhelmingly approved by the Sikkimese people.

It is these aspirations of the people of Sikkim which are embodied in the Bill which I am submitting to the House for consideration. The people of Sikkim have resolved that :

“the institution of the Chogyal is hereby abolished and Sikkim shall henceforth be a constituent unit of India enjoying a democratic and fully responsible Government.”

These wishes of Sikkim are embodied in the Bill which is now before the House for consideration.

I need not go into the details of the bill because the article which is amended and which is now here in the form of clause 3, whereby we are adding article 371F after article 371 E is rather self-evident which, really speaking, makes provision for re-election of the Member of Lok Sabha and, for the interim period, the application of laws, adaptation of measures, etc. I think, we will discuss them in the course of the debate.

With these words, I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House.

SECTION - 4

MISCELLANEOUS

CHAPTER 10

ENTRY OF U.S. NAVAL FORCE INTO INDIAN OCEAN

Lok Sabha , 15 November, 1974

Shri Y. B. Chavan : On November 10, 1974 a task force of us 7th Fleet consisting according to our information, of an aircraft carrier, the "USS Constellation", three destroyers, and one fast combat supply ship, entered the Indian Ocean. The exact duration of the task force's stay is not known though from some remarks of an official US Government's spokesman it appears that it will be an extensive visit.

The House will recall that the US 7th Fleet last appeared in the Indian Ocean on June 29, 1974 and remained there till the 30th of August and also that the US aircraft carrier, the "Kitty Hawk", was deployed there from March 11 to April 21, 1974. Government reiterates their deep concern and misgivings at these developments which are inconsistent with the UN resolutions declaring the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Recently the UN 15-Member Ad-hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean of which India is a member, has recommended to the General Assembly to call on the Great Powers to refrain from increasing and strengthening their military presence in the Indian Ocean region as an essential first step towards the relaxation of tension and the promotion of peace and security in the area. A further proposal was made unanimously by the Ad-hoc Committee

to convene a UN Sponsored Conference on the Indian Ocean.

At this stage I should like to assure the House that Government will continue their efforts to mobilise international opinion and with other States of the region, take all possible measures to achieve our objective of creating the Indian Ocean as an area of peace and tranquility.

As far as the first part of the question is concerned, it is true that I have only mentioned about the visits of some of the naval crafts only in 1974. I think, the others were mentioned in previous statements. Therefore, I have not made a mention of them. It is not that I am not aware that the American naval ships, this Task Force has visited in 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974, continuously for three or four years. There is no question of our not knowing that.

Instead of isolating any particular aspect of the problem, the main question is : what should we concentrate our efforts on? Instead of isolating importance or non importance of any particular Navy or isolating a particular great power as such, our emphasis will have to be to create an international sanction for it. It is not merely a question between India and one power or one base. It is a question of creating unity amongst the littoral countries and work very effectively at the international forum of the United Nations. This is the only basic way of approaching to this problem.

I think, what I said yesterday and what I say today is that we have to act on this aspect of the problem. It is this particular aspect that I have in mind. Naturally, the Navy of any great power never moves without any purpose behind it. They do not move about just for fun. As to what their intentions are on whether they are militarily intended against any particular country or not, I cannot say. I have not got any information.

At the present moment the question is that the constant or continuous presence of the fleet certainly creates an atmosphere of tension and this atmosphere of tension can be countered only

by certain constructive measures that we will have to take and these are indicated in the reply I have given.

.....

The first question the hon. Member raised was with regard to Diego Garcia figuring in our discussions with Dr. Kissinger. We have made our position entirely clear in our discussion with him that not only the Government but the entire nation as one man is against this idea of having a base there in Diego Garcia. We have made that position absolutely clear. He made it clear that there is no identity of approach on this question. That was the reaction. We agreed to differ. Naturally, we did not want to make it a bilateral in that sense.

Secondly, his question was whether we have taken up this matter with the UK Government. As you know, UK Government is aware of our position in the matter. My information is that they have said that they are going to have a second look in the matter. So, let us wait for their second look.

The third question is about the entry of the naval forces of another country. Naturally, if they enter the territorial waters, they have to inform and possibly, we may object. But, as long as they are on the international seas, normally, they informally inform and I am told that our Navy was informally given information that such a force is entering. We also called in the representatives of the American Embassy here and conveyed our concern about this particular matter when they gave us the detailed information.

Secondly, about the statement of the Shah of Iran, I hope the hon. Member would have seen the joint communique that was issued in the matter between the Governments of India and Iran and there is a special reference made about this particular point on which the Shah of Iran has expressed his satisfaction on the concept of the Indian Ocean being kept as a peace zone. We will say this is an improvement in the situation.

Shri Samar Guha : Did you ascertain about the presence of

Russian fleet or Naval base?

Shri Y. B. Chavan : We did not have any discussion with him about this question. We will have to go on the basis of what UN Secretary General said about presence because the respective countries have made statements. Their statement says the Soviet Union has no base in the Indian ocean. This information was given by the Secretary General on the basis of the information supplied by the governments.

The last question he mentioned was about our taking official initiative for having a conference of littoral countries in this matter. I would say we have to be very cautious in this matter. It is not just a question of taking initiative for having a conference. Such an initiative can be counter-productive also. So, we will have to activate the international forum.

There is, if I may again use the word, an error being made in judging the situation. Let us not isolate the question of this general situation in the Indian Ocean and its treatment by looking at it only from one navy's point of view. It is a fact of life which has been known to the world that the navies of the USA, France, UK and USSR do cruise in the Indian Ocean. Now we have to find out how we can tackle this problem by eliminating the presence of this military and naval strength in the Indian Ocean so that it may not create tension.....

Shri Piloo Mody : Turn it into land.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : This, really speaking is the problem of ours. Now we have to formulate our approach to this problem and we have to think in what manner we can effectively deal with it. It is not a question of merely getting subjectively angry and making very fierce statements; it is not going to help us at all. Therefore, the approach has been to create opinion in the world which we think is gradually building up. The conference which was held here yesterday is ample proof of that.

CHAPTER 11

STATEMENT REGARDING MEETING OF FOREIGN MINISTERS IN HAVANA

Lok Sabha , 7 April, 1975

As the House is aware, I attended the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Bureau of the Non-Aligned countries held in Havana from 17th to 19th March, 1975.

The Havana meeting took place an year after the earlier Bureau Meeting in Algiers in March, 1974. Important developments have taken place on the international scene both in the political and economic spheres during this period and the meeting provided a valuable opportunity for the Ministers of the 17 countries assembled at Havana to review and assess the situation. Apart from the members of the Bureau, delegations from over 24 other non-aligned countries were present as observers.

The meeting reaffirmed and reiterated the basic positions adopted by nonaligned countries in earlier Conference in regard to important issues like Detente, West Asia, Decolonisation, Indo-China and the Indian Ocean. On Cyprus, the Final Declaration issued at the end of the meeting and people of the non-aligned country, India, together with Algeria, Guyana, Yugoslavia and Mali - the group of five non-aligned countries which have been lending their good offices in the negotiations in the UN - evolved the consensus formulation in this matter.

The meeting expressed its solidarity with our Arab friends in

their continued struggle to recover the territories illegally occupied by Israel by aggression and the restoration of the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people. The failure in the following week of the efforts for further withdrawal by Israel has highlighted once again the gravity of the situation in West Asia and the urgent and imperative need to find a just and lasting solution which alone can ensure an enduring peace in the region.

As the meeting was taking place in Havana, special attention was naturally devoted to developments in Latin America and the Caribbean. While the Caribbean countries have only recently emerged into independence and the Latin Americans over a century or more ago, it is not very long since the process of their economic emancipation has begun. In more recent years, with the entry into the Non-aligned Conference of more Latin American countries - Cuba was the first, there are at present six members - the trend towards increasing adherence to the principles of non-alignment has become manifest in Latin America.

This is an important contemporary process which was noted with particular appreciation at the Havana meeting.

Ever since the Non-aligned Summit in Lusaka in 1970, the non-aligned countries have been expressing concern at the escalation of tension in the Indian Ocean area. Thanks to the initiative of the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, the United Nations also adopted in 1971 the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as Zone of Peace. Since, then, the non-aligned countries, both at the United Nations and in their own meetings, have been urging the speedy implementation of the objectives of the U. N. Declaration. The Havana meeting has noted again with deep concern the strengthening of air and naval military presence and of foreign bases in this region. The expansion of the base in Diego Garcia against the expressed wishes of the overwhelming majority of the littoral and hinterland states has been condemned as a negative development.

In view of this worsening of the situation in the Indian Ocean,

the Ministers assembled in Havana have called for strict compliance with the U. N. Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The Conference of Foreign Ministers of all non-aligned countries to be held in Lima later this year, will undoubtedly examine this whole question in greater detail and depth. At the United Nations, the non-aligned countries will continue to work together for achieving our common objectives of keeping the Indian Ocean free from Great Power rivalries and conflicts.

In my statement before the Plenary in Havana I stressed the special efforts and the initiatives we have taken to normalise and strengthen our relations with our neighbours. During my conversation with Ministers of other non-aligned countries, I found that there was much appreciation for these efforts that India has been making. In this context, I did point out in my statement that the induction of arms into the countries belonging to military alliances in our neighbourhood is a grave development, which cannot but retard the process of normalisation and relaxation of tension in our area.

One of the most important issues at the meeting was the acute problem facing the countries most seriously affected by the current economic crisis. Several Ministers dealt with it in their statements in the Plenary. It also figures prominently in my conversations with my colleagues. Prime Minister Dr. Castro's Speech at the closing ceremony of the meeting dwelt on the imperative need for maintaining solidarity among the non-aligned countries for meeting the extraordinary economic crisis facing the majority of them and provided a fitting finale to the meeting. I had also urged the same point in somewhat different language in my statement.

In my statement, among other things, I drew particular attention to the enormous imbalances characterising the present deteriorating global economic situation. Apart from calling for speedy implementation, particularly by developed countries, of various decisions for remedial action already adopted in the United Nations and related forums, I also stressed the urgent need for

mutual cooperation among non-aligned countries to help each other.

The Declaration issued at Havana has an Economic Part which analysis succinctly the present situation. In the field of cooperation among nonaligned countries, I am glad to state that the following important decisions were taken :-

(i) The importance of measures for additional aid proposed in the Algiers OPEC Summit Declaration has been noted and the need for their speedy implementation has been stressed.

(ii) Trilateral cooperation using technology and resources available in different countries for development in a third country has been emphasised.

(iii) Concrete follow-up measures to be recommended in time for the Lima Conference on buffer stocks financing as proposed in the Dakur Conference resolution.

(iv) Recommendation to the Lima Conference to adopt and bring into existence the Non-aligned Solidarity Fund.

It is my assessment that the OPEC countries are not insensitive to the problem facing the most seriously affected countries. Many of them have individually pledged support. The OPEC Summit Declaration of Algiers also represents a manifestation of their collective will. However, the balance of payments problem facing so many of the developing countries is so enormous that much more needs to be done and that too urgently. Therefore, while we are appreciative of all that the OPEC countries are doing we will continue to stress the gravity of the situation and the need for concrete measures being adopted on the priority basis to relieve the heavy burdens placed on several countries, including India.

As a founder member, India continues to render important and useful service to the cause of non-alignment, as in the past conferences. The Chairmanship of one of the main committees was entrusted to India (Foreign Secretary was appointed Chairman of Economic Committee.) We were happy to receive full cooperation and understanding from other members, in the consideration of

several important issues.

In the Economic Committee, in particular, our views received a positive response from others, as was reflected in the Economic Declaration - especially points relating to MSACs*.

The holding of the meeting in Havana was an event of special significance for Cuba which is seeking to reinforce its links not only with Latin America but also with the non-aligned and developing world in general. We were much impressed by the excellent arrangements made for the Conference and deeply grateful for the welcome and hospitality extended to us.

I took the opportunity of my visit to Havana to meet and hold important discussion with Cuban leaders including Prime Minister Dr. Castro. These discussions have contributed to further strengthening of Indo-Cuban relations which are already very close and cordial. We agreed that efforts should be made for greater cooperation in the economic and technical fields.

I also made a visit to Guyana, another important non-aligned country in the Caribbean, with whom we have very close and friendly relations based on a long history of association and cooperative relationship. My talks with Foreign Minister Ramphal and others were extremely valuable. We are confident that my visit would lead to expanding co-operation between India and Guyana in many fields.

It is important to remember that the growth and evolution of the non-aligned movement has been marked by a series of meetings since 1961. In between the Summit Conferences, non-aligned countries have been meetings at the level of foreign Ministers and also held coordinating meetings at other levels. All these meetings have made important contributions to the development of the solidarity and unity of non-aligned countries. The Havana meeting was a significant stage in this continuing process. As members

*Most Seriously Affected Countries

are aware, there will be a meeting of Foreign Ministers of all non-aligned countries at Lima in autumn this year. Next year we will have the 5th Summit Conference at Colombo. The decision reached at the Havana meeting will undoubtedly provide a valuable basis for these forthcoming conference of the non-aligned and contributed to the further consolidation of the sovereignty and independence of all non-aligned countries and the building of a new world order based on peace, equality, justice and progress for all mankind.

Copies of the final declaration adopted at the Havana meeting have been placed in the Library of Parliament for information of Members.

CHAPTER 12

STATEMENT REGARDING RECENT DEVELOPMENT IN OUR RELATIONS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Lok Sabha , 15 April, 1976

Shri. Y. B. Chavan : The House is aware that our tradition and policy is to endeavour to develop amicable relations with all countries, notably with our neighbours. The House will recall that while replying to the debate on the budget estimates for the Ministry of External Affairs last week, I had mentioned that we were making an effort in this direction with the people's Republic of China. In pursuance of this policy, representatives of the two Governments in Delhi and Peking discussed the question of restoring the level of diplomatic representation in both countries to the Ambassadorial status.

It is proposed to appoint Shri. K. R. Narayanan, at present Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs as our Ambassador to the People's Republic of China. He is an able and distinguished member of the Foreign Service. The Chinese Government have conveyed their agreement to this nomination. Shri. Narayanan will be taking up his new assignment in about two months.

On the basis of the discussions which have taken place, it is our understanding that this initiative for raising the level of our diplomatic representation in Peking will be followed by a similar move by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

VOLUME - IV

PART II

LEADER OF OPPOSITION
&
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

PART-II

LEADER OF OPPOSITION IN LOK SABHA

EDITORIAL NOTE

This is the first speech that Y. B. Chavan delivered as Leader of the Opposition. He was then Leader of the Indian National Congress in the Lok Sabha.

Chavan candidly admitted that the result of the General Elections was against the Emergency. His party had accepted a lesson that delegation of powers without adequate checks and controls, either to the political executive or to the bureaucracy, is apt to be abused. The Emergency was an unfortunate situation and Chavan said, "I would like to tell my countrymen and partymen that Emergency was not part of a tradition or ideology of the Congress. Congress has stood for democracy, individual liberty and individual freedom. At the same time Congress had stood for social justice, economic equality and socialism. We have said good bye to it, good bye for ever."

Giving a word of advice to Janata Party members, he cautioned them not to do injustice to India in order to spite the Congress Party. India was a difficult country to handle. Now that they are in power, they have to take India forward.

CHAPTER 13

MOTION OF THANKS

Lok Sabha , 31 March 1977

Shri. Y. B. Chavan : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am rising to participate in this debate to briefly explain our views on the President's address. Which is under discussion. Before I start discussing the documents itself, I would like to give my best wishes and congratulations to the party in power, particularly, the Prime Minister, who happens to be an old Congressmen and also a very elderly statemen of India. We are happy to see him there. When I said, I wish well to the ruling party - because they claim to be a party - I have my own doubts about' this proposition, but I would come to that point a little later. But certainly, I think, I must give them my best wishes. They claim to be a party; I wish they were a party, but as they are claiming it, it is better to wish them well.

Now, coming to the document itself, it is a very brief document and looks a light-weight document, not in the physical sense, but looking to the contents to the document. I do understand the argument that there was a very little time for the Government to prepare a well-reasoned document in three day's time, but even then, there are many experienced people in political life and administrative life sitting on the Treasury Benches and we expected a little better document, a little weighty document with a little more content. This observation, I must make as a representative of my party. They have come to take over the administration with

triumphal beating of drums and I think, it was necessary for the country to know exactly what they want to do while in power in different fields. There are, of course, certain indications of a few things, about which I will certainly say very briefly, what we think about these.

Sir, many members discussed the significance of the election results and the patterns of the elections. Well, we have conceded that we have lost the election and the mandate has gone against the emergency. As the Mandate has gone against the emergency, we have withdrawn the emergency and I think, our country has said good-bye to the emergency for good. But at the same time, I think the significance of the election was that it rejected the emergency, but it did not accept the Janata Party. This is a matter of interpretation. The Janata Party, I am told, has yet to come into existence on the 1st of May, a very revolutionary day to take birth and I am sure, the members of the CPI(M) would take a great pride in that and sing songs about it. I, of course, do not know about the feelings of the Swatantra Party.

This vote, according to me, is rejection of the rigours of emergency and the emergency itself. We, as Congressmen have accepted it. We have also accepted the lesson that delegation of powers without adequate checks and controls, either to the executive or to the bureaucracy is apt to be misused and abused. This is a lesson that one needs to keep in mind and I think, this would guide the political life of India in the days to come.

I was saying that I have my own doubts about accepting Janata Party, as one party. Though there is a wishful thinking going on both inside the House and outside the House that a two-party system is emerging. If it emerges I will be very happy about it. For the last 3-4 days, when the regular business of the House started, I have attended the House for the major part of the day, and I have tried to discern and absorb the speeches made on the other side. I was trying to understand what the Janata Party

has got for the people. I know the Members and I know who is a Socialist, who is a Marxist, who is a Swatantra and who is a Jan Sanghi and who is a Cong. (o) man. We know them all. We know their respected leaders and their views and their presentation and we anticipated what they would try to do. But I was trying to know that this strange animal Janata Party is like.

When I am trying to give you description, please don't get angry about it. Certainly you have exaggerated many things. You have showered abuses on my party and the previous Government. Naturally you should be prepared to listen something from this side as well. As a ruling party, I would advise that you should learn to absorb more of this type of things because you have to stay there. Is it not? If you want to stay there, then accept such things.

I was trying to say that we know their respected leaders. We know them all. Now, what exactly, the Janata Party can give? What exactly is Janata party's special programme? Yesterday, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, who is not present here went as a Jana sangh candidate, he never got more than 1 per cent of the Muslim Votes but this time when he went as janata candidate, he got 91 per cent of the Muslim Votes.'

..... I was saying that this party is nothing more than a vote-catching device. I can say that in politics there is nothing wrong in adopting vote-catching devices. Let me make it very clear. It is a very legitimate thing to do. But then say, that is so.

Hon. Member Shri. Karpoori Thakur this morning gave statistics as to what percentage of votes his Party got and what the Congress got. I would certainly like to tell him that this type of percentage-collection of different types of parties together, without any common approach excepting the opposition to the Congress and exploitation of unfortunate situation of the emergency, will not help them. The emergency, will not help them. The emergency was an unfortunate situation. They have expressed their views and I have expressed my views about emergency and I would like to

tell my countrymen and my party members that emergency is not a part of the tradition or ideology of the Congress. Congress has stood for democracy, for individual liberty and individual freedom. At the same time Congress has stood for social justice, economic equality and socialism.

Shri Madhu Limaye : I take it, it was an aberration of yours.

Shri Y B. Chavan : If you call it aberration, well, I will not take objection.

Shri Madhu Limaye : Thank you.

Shri. Y B. Chavan : But this is not part of our Congress tradition; this is not part of our Congress ideology. It arose because of certain unusual events which prevailed before the introduction of emergency some of the parties have made their contribution to it also. Let me ask you to take note of that also. We drifted into that situation of emergency. It is good that it is over. We have said goodbye to it and good-bye for good, good-bye to it for ever. So I would like to make this point perfectly clear. As I said, we have learnt a lesson, You also have learnt a lesson, don't take people for granted; comforting oneself and throwing election results at our faces in the manner in which it is being done is taking people too much for granted.

...The point which I am making is this, that our party has got its commitment, its ideology, its programmes; it has got its coordinated policies, on the basis of the which they have functioned in this country for the last thirty years. These efforts have made a major contribution in making what modern India is today. These facts cannot be denied simply by accusing Congress. You can always raise arguments about emergency. Yesterday the Finance Minister was refusing to accept certain realities. We don't say that we have done everything good. But we have done certain things to improve the economy of the country. Look at the foreign exchange position. We have proved that we have got the capacity to stop the trend of inflation which the world bodies have accepted.

The Prime Minister (Shri. Morarji Desai) : The World Bank has wrongly accepted the manipulated claim of buoyancy of the economy which was bogus.

Dr subramaniam Swamy (Bombay North East) : Government statistics are what they are; we have expressed our doubts about the Government statistics.

Shri. Y. B. Chavan : You will be representing India in many international conferences. Please don't do injustice to India in order to spite the Congress. Only because you do not like us, don't say the World Bank was bogus.

Shri Morarji Desai : I have not said that the World Bank is bogus. I have never said that.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : The World Bank has produced certain documents which you consider bogus. That means, World Bank is bogus. What else does it mean

May I respectfully submit to you that our Prime Minister who was also a member of the former Government for many years had also made some contributions to what India is today. (Interruptions). He was himself a part of the Congress. At that time he was Finance Minister. Then, he was a Commerce Minister for many years and then Deputy Prime Minister for some years and he had his own contributions to make. So, why disown our own doings or our own child, if I may say so?

I find only a sort of negative attitude in this and thus you would not be taking a realistic view. If you want to handle India, a difficult country, a dear country which we all love - but a very complex country and difficult country - please do not take our people for granted. We were 350 a few weeks ago and the people got angry and so we are now 150. But, take note of one thing with all your efforts you have got 270 seats and in no time you will be seventy only, if only the people take it into their heads. So, please do not take our people for granted. I am only stating the fact. I am sitting on this side in acceptance of certain realities and we are realistic indeed. We shall certainly look forward to the future with confidence and shall certainly get our place in the hearts of the people and be back again. We are for the service of the people

as we had been so far and we can certainly go to them and admit our mistakes. A mother can be angry with her child. But she does not get angry with her child permanently.

These are our relations with the people. You have only the name of the People (Interruptions). The Prime Minister was not here when I said that we expected a little more content in the document. Our party represents certain integrated policies. You cannot say that the economic policy can be separated from the internal policy or the internal policy can be separated from the external policy. Economic policy, educational policy, industrial policy, defence policy, are in integrated coordinated whole and so, you will have to take a view of the whole matter. Therefore, we wanted to see the glimpse of it. We heard something of what you proposed to do about the Constitution etc. We had heard about it. Just now I heard the lecture of Shri Hegde M. P. from Karnataka on the law of property; he was talking about the liberty of the people. Mostly he talked about the law of property and the right to property.

.... Then, Sir, the Finance Minister while speaking the other day, was referring to the document which did not represent the philosophy and policy and the programmes of this Government. I wanted to know what philosophy and programmes and policies he had really in his mind. Because I find a number of philosophies sitting before me. This point, which I am talking about, is very serious. Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you I would like to know what is their philosophy, what is their programme and policy? Can anyone say with hand on heart that the disciples of Ram Manohar Lohia can completely give up identity and join with Jan Sangh? Can I ever imagine that those who have accepted Marxist philosophy as their social, economic and life philosophy can ever go and integrate themselves with Swatantraites like Shri. H. M. Patel.

...Sir; I was trying to say that this Janata Party, if they want to work as one party, certainly they can try. I wish them good luck.

...But they must learn something from those who have wielded power for thirty years. We have made mistakes but we have also made major contributions towards building India. My piece of advice is that all those old habits, which they formed while working in the Opposition parties, during the last thirty years may be forgotten by them now. Do not go on repeating your stories of successes in the election. Do not merely go on abusing Congress for the emergency because it is no longer there. I am trying to tell you that people after taking contrary view about a certain situation namely emergency, have put you in a seat of responsibility on probation. Please take my words. Fortunately you have got a good leader.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu : Earlier he was your leader also.

Shri. Y. B. Chavan : Because I know him that is why I am giving him this certificate, which I am sure, he does not need. I hope you will make good use of him.

Sir, What I am trying to say - the Prime Minister was not present yesterday is that now a series of economic conferences will soon be held and we will be participating in the economic co-operation conferences. We are one of the leading nations among the developing countries which have certain responsibilities to take a lead in certain matters. So, please don't damage India's reputation in the economic field and political field. That will not help us.

I must say that one paragraph on the foreign policy is rather inadequate. It however seems a somewhat responsible statement. I am glad that they have said that they stand by all the commitments made to the other governments. At the same time, they also supported our non-alignment policy because non-alignment policy is not a party policy. Non-alignment policy has been evolved in the course of the last 30 years by exchange of views in this House and debate outside and it is now the policy of the nation. Our foreign policy is not a party policy, it is national policy and I hope we continue with that without any break. A person like Shri. Atal

Bihari Vajpayee is in charge of the policy and because he was a member of this House and has been in politics for a long time, I am sure he will provide that leadership and see that the foreign policy of India succeeds and makes India a stronger India in the comity of nations.

I would like to say one word about the economic aspect. Yesterday I found the Finance Minister and many other Members were trying to say that India has lost economically this way or that way. This is not going to help India as a nation and I would therefore request you to forget the Congress, as now, you have defeated it. Why is that the Congress is constantly on your mind? Forgot about it and think about yourself first. I am giving a word of advice on the basis of experience. See to your responsibility because India's problems are complex problems, difficult problems. Merely abusing the Congress is not going to help you. Therefore, concentrate on what you can do. Merely underestimating Congress or underestimating the policy of the Congress is not good. You have to take India from where it is to the forward positions. If you are to do that, you must be conscious of the strength of India and you must also be aware of the weakness of India. I'm cannot say that all is vague, everything it lost. Then you don't know India. Certainly there are many basic stands in the foreign policy area. Regarding science and technology, for example, we have certainly got many assets to our credit. Are you going to underestimate them? Are you going to create an image of India as if, it is nothing? Please, therefore, forget us for the time being, and think at least about India, if at all you want to rule this country.

I will express some views on one paragraph that the Government have included in the Address. That was about the Constitution-making where they have advocated the theory of balance. This is the very old theory of balance, balance between people and parliament and judiciary and individuals and people all sorts of balance of power theory. I will certainly like to make my party's position very clear on some of the aspects. Though

we have accepted the-results as a rejection of the Forty-second Constitutional Amendment Bill, I would like to make that clear, we basically stand for the paramountcy of Parliament. If you want to underestimate it, you do that. But we stand by that principle of Parliament's paramountcy. At the same time I would like to say that if there are any other aspects and if you come with any specific formulations, we will certainly consider them.

.....

... I was making certain clarifications. I have stated our position. But if at all there are any positions which we think in the light of the new situation are worthy of our consideration, we can always consider them with an open mind. But I would like to repeat that as far as the basic position is concerned, we don't accept the election result as a rejection of the 42nd Constitution Amendment

Bill. That is very much part of our policy, and we are not sorry that we passed it.

Shri. K. S. Hegde : What about denigrating the judiciary?

Shri Y. B. Chavan : judiciary? (Interruptions). We respect the judiciary and we want the judiciary to function effectively in its own role given by the Parliament. Do not forget that it is Parliament which was the supreme power. Within its sphere judiciary is certainly supreme; but it cannot say that it is supreme in all shperes and it can sit on everybody's head (Interruptions.)

These are the only two specific issues to which the President's Address made a reference and that is why I tried to explain our position. As the Address is rather brief, I do not think that I should make a long speech. So, Sir, I have done.

CHAPTER 14

DEBATE ON FINANCE BILL (NO.2) 1977

Lok Sabha , 15 July 1977

EDITORIAL NOTE

The Finance Minister of the Janata Party government had proposed several modifications to his original Budget proposals. Chavan, who had held the office of Finance Minister earlier, put across his views about the proposed changes.

Speaking generally about the performance of the Ministers Chavan remarked that the performance of the Government as a whole was not harmonious. He welcomed the government's intention to give rural areas priority and offered cooperation of his party, if the Government was really serious to reorient and reorder the priorities. In that context, Chavan critically analyzed problems of rural area, his experience of handling those problems and made several suggestions.

Chavan's grasp of problems of rural areas and his forward looking thinking on the development of the rural sector are clearly set out in this speech..

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Mr . Deputy- Speaker, Sir, we had the pleasure just now to listen to the second statement that the Finance Minister presented to this hon. House which contains many modifications in his proposals as they contained in the original

Budget presented to the House. I would like to reserve our right on behalf of my party to examine some of the modifications made and make further amendments or suggestions at proper time. But at the same time, I must congratulate him for dismantling some of his own proposals which were certainly not in the interest of the small industries, particularly in the textile field. I am very glad indeed that as far as the investment allowances are concerned, he has taken the claims of the small industries into consideration and has come forward with the modifications, particularly about the negative list by which certain important employment-oriented industries were excluded and he has now tried to include them in the eligibility list for these allowances.

I think some of these proposals were rather absurd mistakes which were part of the original budget. It is good that the democratic process of Parliamentary debate and further consultation with his colleagues has helped him to come forward with these modifications. To that extent, I must say that these modifications are an improvement on the Budget. But as I said in the beginning, I would like to reserve our right and my right also to make further comments after examining the implications of these modifications.

We have now reached the last phase of the processing of the Budget. When we reach the stage of the consideration of the Finance Bill, It is practically the last phase and we can possibility take the more objective and realistic view of the Budget as was presented. The socio-economic and political policies which it represents can be very properly viewed. At this point of time, we can have more realistic view of the whole budget process. Therefore, it will not be out of place if I may make certain general observations about what the Budget and also the Finance Bill stand for and represent. As a matter of fact, the Finance Bill is not merely a financial document. As it is an instrument of Government to implement the socio-economic policies, it becomes a socio-economic and

political document also. Therefore, general observations become more relevant. I, therefore like to take this opportunity to examine some of the points that have come up during the whole process of passing of the Budget.

Sir, in the last few days we were discussing in this honourable House, individual demands. I had the privilege of listening to the speeches of almost all the hon. Ministers on individual demands here. I was wondering as to how the whole process looked like : Presentation of the budget, the Finance Minister's Budget speech, individual demands and discussion on them. Then again this further discussion on the Finance Bill. The whole process looks like playing an orchestra where the body of individuals with their instruments come together and play the music. What is the test of an orchestra? The test of good orchestra is that it must produce harmonious blending of different musical instruments.

Shri jyotirmoy Basu : You also really did it during your time.

Y. B. Chavan : I hope you enjoyed it. But I find - let me come to the point - no ears for good music. I was trying to make a distinction between the collective impression that I got of the budget speech, discussion on demand and the Finance Bill. The impression that I got from the individual performance of the artistes - by artistes I mean the Ministers in-charge of different demand - is that I find that certain performances were very good indeed. I must also say very frankly that some of the performances were rather crude. I do not mean any feeling for anybody. It is only my general impression. We are ultimately interested to know as to what exactly this budget stands for. We are curious to know what exactly is the economic and social policy of this new Government and we really want to understand it so that we can cooperate with them. This is our main approach.

The presentation of budget was so disappointing that it revealed nothing Really speaking, it confused not only myself but it was all pervading. I do not want to take the time of the House, but I

certainly would like to give you some of the reaction of the Press. This is not the press of the Congress; this is some thing which can be called the Janata Press, at least it is not pro-Congress Press. For example, here is what the Statesman of 23rd June says. I quote : "There notable absence of new thinking on most important issue of fiscal policies. Lac of initiative in the last three months has created a suspicion that the propose economic changes may not be, in fact, as radical as promised." This is a compliment from the Statesman. I can give you another example. The Capital Economic publication from Calcutta on 23rd June says, "Confronted by ti-conflicting pressures on diverse ideologies in the Ruling party, the Finance Minister has sought and obtained refuge in mediocrity." I am not saying this. Please do not misunderstand.

This is something very interesting, this is from the Economic Times, a vet important economic publication of 6th July :

"As we read and analyse closely the budget papers, the politician an bureaucrat, Mr. Patel shines more than the economists and the financial experts."

These are the compliments from the press, not from me. This is what the full budget looks like. One was wondering what it stood for. We wanted to know because they have made certain claims. The budget speech itself says that they want to re-orient certain economic policies, and they want to come forward with certain new policies. Finance Minister has said in his reply to the General Discussion that they believe in mixed economy. Certainly we also believe mixed economy. We say that mixed economy is an important thing. But what exactly does he mean by "mixed economy?" Does it mean merely sprinkling here and there of public sector and giving the commanding heights to the private sector? If this is so that is so that is not what we understand by mixed economy.

The five days' history that took place couple of weeks ago in Janata Party was certainly very interesting and exciting for us. We

all know that one day the news item appeared in the press that the definition of dominating houses or the monopolistic houses was going to be changed; a big news item appeared in section of Press. On the second day there came a very severe statement from the President of Janata Party, and it came as a fresh air, rather a pleasant thing. We all know that it came from a person who was in a way responsible for bringing up all these new ideas - fighting against the monopolists and others. On the third day comes the contradiction from the Government denying the news of the first day. On the fourth day comes the news that the new Minister is taking charge of Industries Ministry. And on the fifth day we see the Minister himself making a statement on industrial policy. It was a very fine performance. I must say, it was remarkable that Mr. George Fernandes, within 24 hours, came and made a very refreshing, a very radical, a very progressive, statement about the industrial policy. This, other controversial remarks apart, was a very good personal performance. But what about the orchestra's collective performance? That is, really speaking, what is Government's performance. Personal performance is a different thing. We certainly made a good statement on industrial policy and we welcome it. If it is Government's statement, Government's policy, we welcome it. But let me tell you frankly that there still remains a nagging doubt in my mind as to what exactly is the industrial policy of the Government? For the matter, I would like the Finance Minister to tell us where we stand, vis-a-vis, the industrial policy that has been followed all these days. There is the Industrial Policy Resolution which was accepted in 1946, which was modified in 1946, which is basically the guiding feature of the industrial policy in this country. This resolution gives the commanding heights to the public sector and lays down the industrial, priorities. Where do we stand vis-a-vis the Industrial Policy Resolution? If you want to change it, you should come to the House with the changes. Merely making a statement at the time of Demands for Grants is not enough. Otherwise the performance

during discussion of Demands was good. As they say in hospitals, in surgical terms, the operation is successful but the patient is in danger. The performance or the exposition or the statement of the minister was very fine, but the policy is in danger. If that is the position, that one will have to face, I do not know where it will lead us to.

In the last ten years, in this Parliament and in the country there has been a national debate as to what exactly happens to concentration of economic power, because in the last 30 years, we certainly created new forces of industrial strength and agricultural progress but we found - it is an admitted thing - that the whole thing went somewhat in a wrong way. The concentration took place in a certain few hands through monopolistic houses and this has to be corrected. This was the dialogue and debate that was going on for years in this country and in this Parliament and it was being corrected. Suddenly we find some new distortions being introduced. We would like to have a categorical statement from Government, Of course we have had a statement from the Industries Minister and I am glad that we have it, but I would like to have some assurance about it from the Finance Minister because individual Ministers make statement but, ultimately, what they can do or should do depends upon the purse and the purse is held by the Finance Minister here. He must tell us exactly where we stand as far as the industrial policy Resolution is concerned, because this is a basic thing for this country.

That is the point I wanted to make. Individual statements are very good and there were certainly some issues and policies which were outside party considerations like those in respect of foreign affairs or defence : I think we had no objections in regard to them. There was certainly a good debate and a fine discussion : very acceptable and very respectable statements were made and I think they were welcomed not only by the Members of this House but by the country as a whole. Fortunately, the Steel Minister is here and he also made very practical statements and gave

us a feeling of assurance that at least there are some people who are prepared to look forward with somewhat progressive ideas : I hope he keeps it up. Nonetheless, there are some basic issues about which we have certain nagging doubts. The Budget proposals and the Finance Bill, have it appears undergone now so many modifications. That only shows that the manufacturing hand behind the budget was that of the officials and not of somebody who know the problems of the people. That is all that it comes to and it is very unfortunate. The Minister has mauled his own budget so much and this is proof of how the process of budget making operates. I think it is necessary to have another look at the process of budget making. I have myself gone through the process and, therefore, I am making this suggestion.

I have made my point about mixed economy, and another thing I would like to mention and which we have all been talking about is the re-ordering of priorities in the economic and social fields. The main impression the Government have tried to give is that rural areas have got a priority. Well, we welcome this in the sense that this has been our own policy for the last several years. Agricultural and rural sectors have always been core sectors in our planning. In fact, they are not only the core but the base of the core. Naturally, in terms of percentages, you have provided more : it is a good thing and I compliment you on it. I am prepared to concede that this must have been done because, naturally, as time goes by, one has to look at the growth and you must have done it. But I would like to say that some serious discussion must take place in this House when the Government comes up with its proposals, if you really want to give priority to the problems of the rural areas, as to what should be done and what needs to be done.

I would suggest a few things. Now that I am free from office. I personally think that this is the time for me to think and speak rather more frankly about it. One thing is that while functioning in the State Governments one feels a little nearer to the rural areas; once we come to the Centre, there is absolutely no rural bias here.

The problems which are considered are very much detached from the people in the rural areas. If at all, you have to completely reorient the thinking of the administration itself, without that you would not be able to do anything. If you want to do that let us sit together, if you want our cooperation, I am prepared and we offer our cooperation if you really mean to reorient and reorder the priorities.

What are the problems? Let us go into these problems ourselves? The rural economy or rural life mainly depends on agriculture or some industries connected with it. Most of the rural industries connected with the agriculture have practically vanished. They are languishing and there is no life left in them because new type of agriculture is coming into force, new impulses have been introduced in the rural life itself. There is modernization in the methods of agriculture, we have introduced electricity, and we have introduced education and that is a good thing. We have introduced chemical inputs, electrification, lift irrigation, minor irrigation and all these new things are being introduced. Therefore, the rural life is becoming of a different type. Let us not forget that. We find some of the leaders of the Janata Party talking about some new types of rural reconstruction in the name of Gandhiji. Sometimes one wonders whether in the name of Gandhiji somebody is trying to sell us the feudalism.

The problems of rural areas require massive investments. Are you prepared to do that? If you want to make massive investments, then possibly we will have to reorder the planning processes and planning methods. Are you prepared to do that? Priorities will have to be changed. When Shri Subramaniam was speaking, he gave certain interesting information.

Dr. Subramaniam Swamy : All wrong.

Shri. Y B. Chavan : Before I give the information, how do you say that these are wrong? Perhaps, this is wrong.

The information that he gave was that a survey was made of the districts of India from the agriculture point of view. He said that nearly 30 per cent of districts have got only the production increase of 5 per cent. 25 per cent districts have got a negative growth rate of production and only 13 districts have got production increase less than 1 per cent. It comes to about 60 per cent of districts which have got the increase in agriculture production less than 5 per cent and 38 per cent of districts which have got less than 1 per cent increase in agricultural production. You wish to do something like a miracle to change this picture of agriculture. How do you do that? We are talking about irrigation. What type of irrigation? Let us not forget harsh realities of some areas. Most of us in this House are people who are coming from the rural areas. Most of us from villages. I come from an area where in some parts it is very difficult to get rain twice a year. How do you do that? Where do you get the irrigation? There are no rivers and unless you try to find out underground water, there is no possibility of irrigation there. You want to give them a new life. How do you do that? Unless you create some new techniques for dry farming, like how to preserve and conserve the moisture of the soil and produce new types of seeds and other things, it is not possible to continue to keep agriculture there. But this will take a long time. I know because I was in touch with this dry farming research work that is being done in India. It will take another decade, or more than two decades, to bring in effective techniques of dry farming.

The real question now is : how do you give productive employment to the people in these districts which account for 60 per cent of the districts in the country? How do you do that? What is your solution for that? Are we prepared to accept to give a commitment to the people in the rural areas that the government undertake to give a guarantee of employment? Are we prepared to accept that?...

.....Because there are lakhs of people in the rural areas who

are not only without employment but also without any hope of employment. Also there are a large number of educated people in the rural areas without employment. The question of educated unemployment is no more only an urban problems. It is getting more a rural problem also, because the colleges and universities have expanded their activities and a large number of people are coming up in the rural areas also with technical degrees, engineering degrees and other degrees and they want jobs. When they come before us asking for jobs one feels guilty and what answer can one give? This is the problems. So, if at all you want to consider and tell us and make us believe that, you want to re-order the priorities, unless you are prepared to make a massive investment on a more well-considered basis nobody is going to believe it. Unless you are prepared to give a new style and I should say, a new reorientation to the rural life nothing is going to move. If you keep the villages as it is, nothing is going to happen. You will have to think about an agro-industrial pattern that must come up there. Are we prepared for that? Are we prepared to make all the efforts and give all the priorities for that? Unless you do that, I am not prepared to believe that you are prepared to give any priority to the rural areas. Merely providing a few crores here and a few crores there and saying that you are going to give some Khadi work and some village industries work, the problem is not going to be solved. Let us not fool ourselves any more with this sort of programmes.

...Mr. Patel, I remember your own speech in 1976 when you were sitting on this side. You made a very important point. Even where there is some sort of a good productivity, there is a problem. You said that this is the economic reality in India and what is the answer-for that? The moment there is growth in agricultural production, there is a fall in prices....

...if there is an increase in cotton production or increase in foodgrains production in one year, then in the next year there is a fall. If it is one good year for the agriculturist, next year he

has one bad year because of fall in prices. Our agriculturist is also a wise man. He also considers his own economy. He may not be an economist, but he understands his economic interests (interruptions). He will not produce that which fetches him uneconomic return and he will go into some other thing. One year you export cotton and then next year you start importing cotton. Same is the case with regard to oil. In sugar also it is the same.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu : Jute also.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : I agree. So, you will have to find an answer for this contradiction. It looks as if all your experts sitting here in the centre - their main job is how to depress the economic price of the agricultural commodities. This is the main hurdle (interruptions) Their philosophy is that unless you do that, the prices will not be under control. The rising price is a major problem. You want more growth rate; more growth means more growth in Agricultural sector. This is the economic reality. Immediately you start having more production in agriculture, the prices go down; the agriculturist is depressed; his life is depressed; he is driven into the lowest ladder; pushed back to the last bench. In the economic life, in the reordering of priorities, agriculture goes to the back bench, so to say. We will have to find out an answer to this. Let us sit together and let us find a solution for it. We will have to guarantee the minimum and remunerative prices to the agriculturist. Unless you do that nothing will happen.

... I really wanted to highlight some of the basic aspects of the rural economy. Mere tinkering with the problem will not do; that will not give you the solution. When giving priority to rural areas, if you say, we want to under-estimate or give low priority to industries, well, we are opposed to it. Industries have got very important role to play. Even for improving economic life of people in rural areas we must have industries. Unless you are able to move them away from land and give them some other employment, you can't do it. How long do you want them to remain there in same old condition in rural area? I think this is what is important.

I am glad I remembered this. You said there is no modern input, input in technology and so on. There is also no input of social equality in the rural areas. You have the problems of landless, you have the problems of the Harijans and so on.

An. Hon. Member : And also the 20 point programme.

Sum. Yashwantrao Chavan : But you don't agree with it. What is important is not the 20 point programme as such but the content of it. Now, I don't want to criticise anybody, but I want to say this. When the Demands for the Home Ministry were being discussed and the question of atrocities on Harijans came up, I was expecting some very good response from the Home Minister. The Belchi incidents were mentioned and we wanted the Home Minister to respond to it because Belchi represents the conscience of India. You may say, there were old quarrels among the savarnas etc. but the fact is that harijans have been killed there. We expected the Home Minister to take it as a national problem and respond to it in a positive way so that the country would be inspired, the country have its confidence restored. I am making this point because if at all you want to bring about a new life in rural areas, there are these important social aspect of life also.

It is not merely an economic problems but it is also a social problem and so, we shall have to look into it from this point of view. (Interruptions). The point I was making was that we are now at a stage in this country when we will have to think about these neglected problems in much more massive manner - not merely tinkering with them. Analysing the realities of the problems of rural India are also very very important. I would like to say that, as a citizen of this country and as a member of this house, the problems of haves and havenots have come into their own; it is a warning to all of us. If you do not try to deal with their problems on a priority basis, then things will be very difficult in our country.

Therefore, I say that let us not simplify the issues and let us not try to divide, in a way, into Party - A or Party - B. What is more

important is this that the history has taken us much ahead and so, we have to learn from history. Now, we have to look ahead and see what exactly we want to do. Unless we do that, the future is not very bright. One will have to be well-determined. As you are a Finance Minister, I am raising this issue. Please educate your officials; may be, you will have to educate us also. You are making it an official problem. But, ultimately, it is we, the Members of Parliament, the politicians and their leaders who take the policy decision in this country. Therefore, it is for you to come forward and take these issues in a much more effective manner.

This was a general problem. Now I want to say something about the taxation proposals. You have made certain changes in your proposals. I would only make certain observations about one or two of them and I shall finish my speech.

One is about your proposal regarding the closely-held companies. This is something which we have not been able to understand. How is it that with your ideas of re-ordering things and bringing in some better life to the poor of our country, you accept this idea of giving these concessions to the closely-held companies. I am merely mentioning this because I think that you better give some thought to this point. By giving such a concession, you are only giving strength to the monopolistic concerns. Again it is a question of giving strength to the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few families. That is exactly what it comes to. We are going to move amendments on this and propose to press for it. I am just giving advance notice for that. For us it is an important issue. Hon. Members were very right in expecting that you would come forward with concessions in case of biris to small men. We think of small men because it is the small men who work hard and need relaxation. What have you done about their smoking. Is smoking this bad? I am asking my friend Shri Biju Patnaik whether smoking is bad or not.

.....

Then, there is another aspect also. I hope you possibly know it or you must be aware of it. I cannot say. You know about the condition of the working-class that work in the biri industry, women, particularly, who work in their home. They get small additional income from that. This is a subsidiary industry. I am telling you that this sort of taxation that you are thinking about is going to put hardship on them. There is going to be a complete unemployment of many such people because the industrialists would somehow try to find a way-out; they know how to get out of this I am sure about it. The biri industry knows how to get rid of this taxation. They will certainly find out many ways. Therefore, I would like to make an appeal to the Finance Minister to have another look at it.

As regards raising of general excise limit from 1 per cent to 2 per cent, I would like to say that it is a very harsh decision. It is an easy mechanism that we have resorted to. I think it is a mistake. In future any Finance Minister whenever he is in difficulty will make an increase of 1 per cent and get a sizeable amount of money. WE should make it a point not to make use of it. You should not have raised it from 1 per cent to 2 per cent. It was perhaps a mistake to have it even 1 per cent. It is not good for industrial production and expansion of economy.

I am glad that you have made certain changes in respect of powerlooms and handlooms. When I made my first comment on the present budget -I had said that under the name of giving certain concessions, most of the concessions under rationalisation were given to composite mills. But now it is somewhat corrected. We should follow one principle, namely, in all the sectors of textile industry handlooms must have first priority. We must bear one thing in mind that the composite mills must not come in the way of competitiveness of the handloom and power loom industry. I am glad you have given thought to it but please make it a more special point to see that if any further efforts are necessary the same will be adopted.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the allowances for rural development to the private companies. We do not want to oppose it. But I would like to point it out to you, to see to it, that it does not become another source of loophole. At the present moment we are not opposing it because you want to do something for rural development. Let us see what is it likely to lead to but, I am afraid, it is likely to be another source of loophole. So is the case with the charitable trusts where you have raised the limit from Rs. 2 lakhs to Rs. 5 lakhs. This time we have decided not to oppose this also but I would like to warn you that this also must not become a source of loophole. It looks simple, beneficial and insignificant source of tax evasion. So, one has take care of all these matters.

Then, Sir, you have given certain concession to the areas which are beyond a certain limit from urban centres. You have re-defined the rural area. Instead of 8 kilometres now it is 15 kilometres. I know it is difficult to define anything, and more so, rural areas. Here I would like to tell you that most of the advantages will be taken by the industrialists in the metropolitan areas to bring about these industries in the periphery of the metropolitan cities. May I tell you from my experience of Bombay that all these definitions can be very easily evaded. Therefore, be careful. No doubt, it is a good idea. May I say that by mere definitions these industries are not likely to come up in the rural areas unless Government undertakes some special steps, that, unless Government wants to make its own investment through Budget, if necessary. There is another point. My friend, Mr. Biju Patnaik, in his speech, has said that in the case of public sector, we do not want to depend upon the budgetary provisions. I understand his point. He wants the public sector to become commercially profitable more efficient. I agree. But do not put any restriction that you will not make any provision for the public sector in budgeting. All concessions through budget to the private sector are given and only the public sector is asked to be on discipline. Please do not discriminate

against the public sector.

Secondly, the public sector must be efficient and must be commercially viable. I entirely agree with him. But if it has to occupy a high position, it has to be modern in its technique and management. I have no doubt about it. But must see that the public sector's importance in the Indian economy which, a long years of efforts, has been established is not disturbed, is not allowed to be eroded. If you do that then possibly, we can make further progress.

Sir, I have done.

CHAPTER 15

FINANCE BILL, 1977 DEBATE ON AMENDMENTS RECOMMENDED BY RAJYA SABHA

Lok Sabha , 2 August 1977

EDITORIAL NOTE

This Debate took place in the background of certain Amendments to the Finance Bill recommended by the Rajya Sabha. It was a rare occasion for Lok Sabha to consider such amendments.

Speaking on the occasion, Chavan who had handled Constitutional issues as the Union Home Minister expressed his views on the importance of Rajya Sabha. According to him there was no doubt that in the matters of Money bills, Lok Sabha was supreme. At the same time, the importance of the Rajya Sabha must not be under-estimated. The Upper House essentially represents all the States and views expressed by the Members are the views of States. He advised the Government not to treat the recommendations as a party issue.

Highlights of this speech are the analysis of the Capital gain tax, of the closely held companies, problems of sick industries. Views expressed by Chavan exhibit his grasp of economic matters and realistic approach, based on experience.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Mr. speaker, sir, I am participating in the discussion on the motion moved by the hon. Finance Minister, and I must say that, person-ally, I am not surprised to see the

motion because I was expecting some such move on the part of the Government. That is why I am getting confirmed in my fears that Government does not really need any cooperation from the opposition. I was hoping against hope that, perhaps, they would be keen to get cooperation from us at least on issues and matters in which the people's interests are involved; at least we expected that on these they would think it is necessary that they should consider all the serious views that we are expressing on this side. If at all they wanted to discuss any issues, possibly this was the occasion when they could have said, "well, here is a view expressed, not by an individual Member but a view expressed by chamber of Parliament, a House of parliament." And this house of Parliament, namely the Rajya Sabha, is a very important House. I am quite aware of the Constitutional position regarding the supremacy of Lok Sabha in the matter of money Bills; I need not be told about that Constitutional position. We certainly know the constitutional position and we can also resort to the Constitutional methods. But that certainly would lead to unnecessary confrontation which we do not want. The Rajya Sabha, as contemplated under the Indian Constitution, cannot be compared to any other upper chamber in any other Constitution in the world. This is a very important and essential feature of the federal structure of our Constitution. The Janata Government, particularly, has declared to the wide world that they would like to go along strictly on Constitutional lines and would like to follow democratic methods; not technically but in its essence, that it is a Government by consultation, it is a Government by continuous dialogue etc. If that is so, then the importance of the Rajya Sabha must not be under-estimated. The Rajya Sabha essentially represents all the States. It may be an indirectly elected house, but it is elected on the basis of States' representation and the views expressed by the Rajya Sabha therefore, are important. If, because you have a large number of Members here you say 'no', we reject it then we can also, since we have a large number of members there, choose right occasion and reject\ your view. I expected that since this is the view of the

Rajya Sabha, we would sit down here and discuss what are the issues involved. This complete disregard for the recommendations of the Rajya Sabha is complete disregard for the view expressed by a very important House of Parliament. This is, really speaking, rejecting the views of the States of the country. We must take into account that this is a most important political aspect. If you want to make everything a party issue, you can do so; I cannot take any objection to it. (Interruption).

Another point I wanted to make was that I have seen this attitude more than once. When we raised the question of compulsory Deposit Scheme in this House, We were told, 'No, we do not want to consider it, we will certainly fight it out.' But what happened ultimately? You made a statement afterwards, coming to this House or that House, that you have reconsidered the matter. What were the factors which made you reconsider? The only factor you had to take into account was your position in the Rajya Sabha. It was hypocritical to come here and say that you reconsidered the issue on its merits and come to contrary decision. It would have been more straightforward, if you had you come and told us, "Well, we accept the position." but that is exactly what is lacking. But yet we are told, 'We want to give cooperation and want to take cooperation.' This is not the way to do that. The manner in which this motion has been brought just shows that you do not care for opposite views and that what you think about the issue is that since you have got a majority in the Lok Sabha you can certainly do whatever you think is right. You are entitled to do that : I cannot object to it. It is your right to do so, but let us not forget that we have also this right.

....Coming to the amendment itself, he tried to give cogent arguments, which have been repeated for centuries together about the capital gains tax. At least you, Prof. Dandavate, as a socialist, know what exactly is capital gains tax. There are many social factors which go into making the capital gains. Capital gain is not necessarily the result of any efficiency. In most of the cases

there is a social factor which creates capital gains. For example, if there is a piece of land and some municipality or Development Corporation makes an investment of crores of rupees and the value of the land goes on increasing, there will be capital gains. In inflationary times when prices are increasing, certainly without making any effort, if you possess, or own a thing, after a few years its value goes up. This is unearned income, Prof. Dandavate. You have certainly every right to talk about socialism, but I can also share something with you. What is capital gain? Capital gain is unearned income and it is the fundamental policy of any socialist country, or any government, which has to consider the well-being of the people and which is against concentration of wealth in a few hands, to see that no concessions are given in the case of capital gains. If you do not accept this basic thing, what is the point in telling me that he has given cogent reasons? Capitalists argue their case in a much more sophisticated manner and cogent manner. Cogent argument is not necessarily a convincing or valid argument. Capital gains is something unsocial in a sense; it is an unearned income and any concession to the unearned income must never be accepted, and, therefore, this was an essential point for us. We have many differences with you on many aspects of the budget, but we have not made every issue an issue to argue with you; we have chosen only three or four issues, selective issues. First is the capital gains tax; I have given our major argument about it. Second is the closely held companies. The hon. Minister was taking advantage of the Wanchoo commission and was arguing cogently about the capital gains tax. On the basis of the Wanchoo Commission, we had taken certain steps; I was instrumental in taking those steps. He uses the same Wanchoo Commission when it suits him and he rejects it where it does not suit him. Is it a cogent reason for this matter?

Let us come to the closely held companies. What are those companies? These are family concerns. I do not want to name these. It would be giving them unnecessary advertisement. In

giving these concession to these companies, we feel that we will be making a mistake. The hon. Minister says that there is no possibility of speculation; he also argued about possibilities of better investment and productive investment. These are the things which are normally branded about to justify anything that one does about the taxation. This is the simplest thing that anybody can say that this is something for proper investment for productive purposes. I would say that any concession given to the closely held companies indicates definitely - let me make the charge, I am not making this charge against any individual, I am making a charge against the party - and brings out the characteristics of your party consists of progressive elements and other types of elements, it is the domination of reactionary elements. (Interruptions)...

...These are the two things which indicate what type of philosophy, what type of political ideology, what type of political programme, and what type of economic policy this party tries to follow. If you think it is a charge, it is a charge and if you do not think so, it is not a charge, but according to me this is the correct appreciation of your party's characteristics.

Now, I come to the sick industrial units. I would personally like to say more about it because I have got a little more experience about it as I was one of the Chief Minister in this country who started treating this sick industry in Bombay as early as 1957, nearly 20 years ago. He says, "This is because of your wrong policy. I would like to ask what those wrong policies were. In the industries, particularly, the textile and jute industries, the machinery was not properly maintained by the industrialists. There was no proper investment made at proper time on them. They have taken advantage of the speculation in the raw material that is used in this industry. Therefore, all the profits that could be taken out of it, were completely taken out of it. It was exhausted completely when it became sick. They said that they wanted to close it down... (Interruptions). The main point is that this was not as a result of our government's policy. It was the result of policies,

tendency and mentality of the private ownership. These are the typical results of private ownership. They want to take as much profits out of it and kill the cow or the buffalo that gives the milk and the result was that hundreds and thousands of workers were thrown on the streets. At that time there was an opportunity....

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya : It started from your time.

Shri Y.B. Chavan : in Not in the centre. I tried to do in Maharashtra in 1957. At that time we had consulted a great economist Dr. D. R. Gadgil about it and in consultation with him we had evolved a method and handed it over to some other private but efficient management who had some experience. It was the Narsinghagiri Mill in Sholapur about which you all know. The man improved the Working but under the compulsions of the law and the Constitution we had to return the mill back to the old owner. After two years it came back to the same position. So it became a sick patient and it became a matter of taking a sick patient improving him and handing him over back to be again exploited and become sick again. Naturally, therefore, it was necessary for the government to make certain departures or take certain new initiatives and take over the mills, because it was necessary to have modernisation and certain new investments had to be made. That was very useful and socially very important investment because in the sick industry there are two aspects of which one is production and the other is the employment. Here what you are doing is that you are allowing one company to amalgamate into another. If you see the actual working of it, it is only allowing accounts of one company to be amalgamated into another so that he can take all the advantage under the taxation laws and completely disregard the manpower that was employed before. If you are very clear about it, and you are saying very cogently that you are particular about the employment aspect of it, then why don't you accept our amendments? They are very simple amendments. Why are you ashamed of accepting it? You are saying more and more, that 'we are committed to the employment of the people.' If you mean

it, then we want a legal commitment on your part. But you do not want to accept our amendments because you do not mean it (Interruptions) I am talking of hon. Member Mr. Sonu Singh Patil. He and I come from the same State. He and I belonged to the same Party then he and I had to fight the same fight of one such textile mill in his own home town. He remembers that. This is essentially a point of employment. If you are very keen about it and if you are really very sincere about it, please accept the amendments.

One of the observation that was made by the Finance Minister was that we are doing it to pose, as if we are the protectors of the people. Well, if we are not posing, then you are posing. If we pose, you should also pose. What is wrong about it? Trying to take a position and serving the people and honestly meaning what one is saying that is the business of a political party. What is wrong about it? It is the business of a political Party. Political parties are meant for that. They should not merely pose it, they should act on it. That is why we are insisting on these amendments. We are testing your sincerity.

I am mentioning the issues. We are not merely trying that in technical sense of pressing. We are not merely pressing the amendments. We are pressing important issues and we want to have your reaction from you on them.

What a hypocritical moral lecture the Government has been giving that they were against smoking etc. We have heard these sermons long before. The other day when the Finance Minister was speaking, last time when the Finance bill was passed, his colleague Shri Biju Patnaik got up and said that he had been smoking for more than fifty years and he is still healthy. I am not quoting Biju Patnaik only. I also smoked for forty years and nothing wrong has happened to me up till now. I have stopped smoking now. This is because of my choice and not because of taxes. Please do not take that moral pose.

I also find another fashion of this Government. When anything

wrong is pointed out, the reply comes - everything wrong had been done by you and now we are trying to improve this way. How long this will sustain you, friends? This may be for one month, two months, until State Legislature elections, Corporation Elections, Metropolitan Elections, for now that you have them. How long more? India's problems are very serious problems. I would request you on this occasion again....

.. I am not abusing you. I am not criticising you. I am giving you very serious advice. Indian economic problems, Indian social problems, Indian political problems are very complex problems and merely giving out a schedule that will do it in four years and another thing in five years is not enough. I am sometimes surprised, I must honestly confess that - it is rather a very innocent sort of position, but somebody coming and telling us that India's unemployment problem can be solved within ten years. I must say that it is very unfortunate thing for the people of India that such empty provisions are made.

Hon. Finance Minister asked me what bidi has to do with the common man. Shri Ravindra Varma can tell him that while working out the cost of living index of the working class, this smoking is one of the important things taken into consideration. It is one of the item in the basket. It is considered to be essential from that point of view.

Another important consideration is nature and character of bidi industry. Those who know about the nature and character of bidi industry will see that large number of people in the rural areas, particularly, the house wives are employed in that industry. This sort of distinction of branded and non-branded bidis, - cogently argued, only shows that this is going to be exploited by the bidi industrywallahs and they have already started exploiting the small man. Lakhs of people are working in this industry. You tell us on one hand, that you want to create employment opportunities. But you act otherwise. Please rectify it?

..So, Sir, when we say bidi, it is not smoking as such that we refer to. It is against the case of the small man who works hard. He does require certain relaxation. It is the case of the small man and his housewife who works hard in a remote village-house that matters most. Therefore we are raising these issues. Closely-held companies, capital gains tax, unemployment in sick mills, small man involved in the employment in the bidi industry. These are all the basic issues, you are supposed to take a view about. Here is the other House which in its wisdom and coolness applied its mind quietly and made certain recommendations back to this honourable house. We should have taken them more seriously instead of merely and lightly moving a motion that you reject them. This is a rejection like that of an emperor. You are very conscious of the power of strength in this house: Well, Sir, we have taken note of what you think and what you are. Whether this is accepted or not accepted, the people will ultimately judge on the basis of merits. I am sure you will regret what you are doing today.

CHAPTER 16

FAST FOR RIGHTS OF NEO-BUDDHISTS (C.A. MOTION)

Lok Sabha , 12 November 1977

EDITORIAL NOTE

Four Leaders belonging to different Parties had undertaken fast to agitate for the rights of Neo-Buddhists. Janata Government had taken a view that the concessions extended to Scheduled Castes should not be extended to those who convert to other religious, including Buddhism.

As early as in 1961, Y B. Chavan as the Chief Minister of Maharashtra had extended concessions to Neo-Buddhists in that State. For him, the question of conversion was essentially a moral and cultural issue. That , must be seen in a larger perspective. According to him an untouchable, only by becoming Buddhist, not undo cumulated oppressions and suppressions, handicaps and disparities which he had suffered for centuries. It was, therefore, necessary to take a human and a little more corrective view of the Constitution.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am rather pained to listen to this statement, particularly the very strange logic that has been used to justify the present attitude that the Government of India has taken. It is only a mechanical argument which runs like this - that everybody is a Scheduled caste because he has decided to remain in Hinduism which is full of caste hierarchy and, therefore,

in order to have these facilities or safeguards, he must continue to remain a

Hindu.

I would like to say that this question of conversion of untouchables from the scheduled Castes into Buddhism must be taken in a larger perspective. Unless you understand this particular phenomenon you will never be able to understand this entire question.

The question of conversion is, essentially, a moral and cultural problem. Late Dr. Ambedkar, one of the eminent Indians, who knew the scheme of Constitution very well because he was one of the eminent Constitution makers of our country - had made an appeal to the millions of people and masses to accept Buddhism to have some sort of culture revolution in their lives, a moral revolution in their lives. It was one of the rarest events in the history of India that, at the behest and the call of one single individual, Dr. Ambedkar, millions of people responded and they accepted Buddhism as their religion. But this has nothing to do with what the State should do regarding the 5,000 economic problems of people who belong to backward classes. Because, an untouchable, only by becoming a Buddhist is not saved from the accumulated oppressions and suppressions, handicaps and disabilities which he suffered for centuries together. It was necessary, therefore, to take some sort of a human view of the matter and if I may say, a little more creative view of the situation. It is not enough if a State authority merely takes a hide-bound position - based on a certain hide-bound logic. State authorities in a country like India where there is poverty, there are masses who are down-trodden, there are differences, there are caste systems, and so on and so forth, must take a little larger view, a more liberal view, a more creative view. And this creative view is that, even though they may have changed their religion, they have to suffer the same poverty, they have the same cultural backwardness, they have the same handicaps. Therefore, it was necessary to take a larger perspective

in this matter. In one of the State Governments - the hon. Home Minister himself has mentioned this in his reply - in Maharashtra, nearly 17 of 18 years ago, in 1960 or 1961, we decided that these neo-Buddhists should be eligible for all these facilities and they are getting all these facilities, educational facilities and share in State services. They themselves said, "We do not want the advantage of having reservation in elections, in the Legislature" .. This shows their political courage. They said, 'We are prepared to take chances with you so far as the question of sharing power is concerned; which they have done. But at the same time, it is a States responsibility, the political leaders' responsibility, to see that in respect of some of these problems and handicaps which they are suffering from, we must go to their help. Therefore, I think what the Maharashtra Government did in 1960 ought to have been done by the Government of India even at that time. I am not making a distinction between the Janata Government and the Congress Government, I am talking about the Central Government. Now, I would like to tell you that in 1971, the Central Government took this position about their scholarships, education policy etc. I am quoting the background of the decision that was taken then :

"The Government has very carefully considered the matter. It is of the view that scheduled castes converts to Buddhism still suffer from social and educational backwardness. Therefore, it has been decided that any person who professes Buddhist religion and who either himself or any of his ancestors were at any time members of scheduled casts will be eligible for the grant of Government of India Post-Matric scholarship.

Therefore, one step forward was taken. I know, there were certain difficulties in the policy of the Central Government, but the attitude was that they accepted that they have got a problem and that needs to be tackled. That is the main question. Is the present Central Government prepared to take this position or not? Whatever remains to be done is in the matter of share in the

Services. The Prime Minister this morning mentioned about the backward classes. While I would have said that, that is a solution. But the fact of life is that there is nothing like backward classes for services in the Central services. In State Governments, certainly this is a thing which has been in practice. Merely by saying that this can be done for the backward classes may not provide a solution for the Central Services. Therefore, I think, some bold decision is called for and I hope, there are people, who are bold and able people and who can take such a decision in this Government.

My question is, whether this Government is going to say that their position is going to be open and they have not closed their mind on this question, the neo-Buddhists have got a problem and they are prepared to look at it a fresh with an open mind, with a progressive outlook so that we can go and persuade the four leaders, Shri Gavai, Shri Arumugham, Shri Kumbhare of the Republican Party and Shri Rajbhoj of the Congress Party. These four leaders are on fast and I think, they are suffering on behalf of millions of people. I have received at least more than a thousand telegrams from different parts of India. It is not a question of one State, neo-Buddhists are spread all over India, North, eastern and South India. Therefore, I would make an appeal and make a request to the hon. Minister that he should make his point very clear categorically that Government's mind is not closed on this question.

My question is, whether Government of India's mind is open on this question, not only open at both ends, but open to receive suggestions, and ponder over them very seriously and come to a conclusion that whatever is denied to these neo-Buddhists, which legitimately belongs to them, will be given to them. This is a question of one's attitude and I would like a specific answer on this question.

CHAPTER 17

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Lok Sabha , 2 March 1977

EDITORIAL NOTE

This speech shows Chavan at his best as the Leader of the Opposition. He has dealt with the question of Emergency, the repeal of MISA, rural development, as well as, the foreign policy issues. He squarely puts the blame on the Government for using the President's address for conveying what he calls 'half-truths.'

Speaking about rural India, according to Chavan, there are three fundamental problems: of poverty, of inequality, both social and economic - and the problem of modernizing manpower and agriculture with the help of science and technology.

Finally, speaking about the Centre-State relations. Chavan advocates for a strong Centre. At the same time, he warns that "strengthening the Centre at the cost of the States would be against the interest of India, because this will certainly strike at the very roots of India's unity."

This speech shows Y. B. Chavan at his best as a Parliamentarian.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Mr. Chairman, ought to have participated in this debate much earlier as the Leader of the Opposition. I was out of Delhi because of the minigeneral elections and therefore, some

other members of our party spoke on our behalf. All the same, I thought that I should not allow this opportunity to participate in the debate to pass by. This is why I am speaking now.

The President's Address is a constitutional requirement and, therefore, it assumes great political administrative and constitutional significance.

The speech of the President is expected to be an analytical review of the past year as well as a very perceptive peep into the future, at least for a year. And naturally, the speech of the president or, any speech of any President, will have to be judged by these two tests.

I would like to make one more point here. Fortunately, and incidentally, the debate on the President's Address has extended so far this year that while participating in the debate, one has the advantage of having had a look at Government's Economic Review and also the Budget of the year, which normally never happens. When I am participating in the debate now, I have got fortunately, as every one else, the documents of the President's Address, the Economic Review, the Finance Minister's Budget speech and his budget proposals. So, one can see whether they satisfy the test of a peep into the future and give some projections about the future.

If we try to judge the president's Address from these criteria, I must say that it is a great disappointment. I do not want to use more flowery language to condemn it, but it is a very deeply disappointing speech. About its language etc. I share what Mr. Mavalanakar has said. It is not only written in uninspiring language but unfortunately it is not written even in a readable language. It is very unfortunate. I know the process by which the President's Address is formulated, having been in the Government for many years. Possibly some draft paragraphs from different Ministries have been put together to make this speech. Therefore, it does not contain any analysis of the past, it does not give any projections

for the future. This unfortunately seems to be the position though somebody might have co-ordinated these paragraphs. This is what the speech looks like.

It is interesting to try to find out what they are trying to say, and whether it can stand the test of scrutiny or analysis on any particular ground. Naturally, the speech contains a review of certain incidents. This reference to Lakshadweep and Andhra Pradesh, the devastating cyclone's effect etc. is all right, and I think it was very necessary that such an important incident should be mentioned, and it starts with that. But then, the following paragraphs look like just a review paragraph from the Ministry of Law and Justice as to what Act they want to introduce. There also, they are not fair. For, example, paragraph 3 contains two parts, and this is about constitutional amendments. The first part mentions what constitutional amendments have been passed, and the other part is about the bill that is under preparation. I think they ought to have been more generous and fair to the Opposition in this matter. This is the tendency I see in this Janata Government and the Janata party itself, that they would like to take for themselves, credit for everything that is happening as something new. As if nobody has done anything so far in India and it is for the first time, after thousand of years of history, that they are writing the a-b-c- of the history of India. This is the impression that they are trying to give.

Here in the first part they say :

One of the first tasks to which the Government addressed itself in terms of its mandate was the removal of the authoritarian provisions that had been introduced into the Constitution. The Constitution (Fourty-fourth Amendment) Bill, which has been passed by both Houses of Parliament "etc. I think it was very necessary and I would like to say that they ought to have mentioned the co-operation extended to them by the Opposition in this particular matter. Mention is made about the discussions with the Opposition for the Bill that is yet to be introduced, but the Act which was passed could be passed only because the Opposition

parties, and particularly my party, even though it might be divided into two now, gave complete and understanding support to it, not only in Parliament. But it does not fit, in the manners of Janata Party to recognise the cooperation, friendly cooperation that we offered. It was, as if, only they wanted it and other parties were against it. So the review which the President's Address is expected to be, should be full of truths, but, unfortunately it contains half-truths. I thought I should mention this thing because we had certain role in the passage of that Act. We had deliberated and in the discussions that took place with the Government in the matter, we had supported the amendments.

The Prime Minister (Shri Morarji Desai) : I have acknowledged it publicly.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : I know that. Thank you very much. But I am discussing the President's Address. If I were to discuss your Address, possibly I would speak differently. I approve one part of it. I just forgot to mention about the President's Address ceremony. The President used to come to this House in a ceremonial manner and so far, we have always seen the President coming in a feudal buggy with all these things. Personally to me, this presidential buggy is a symbol of feudalistic remnant in India. This time - I must give credit either to Government or to the President himself - they have given up that practice and did not resort to this buggy. If they do the same thing on the occasion of the Republic Day, that would be much better. That is my personal view.

What I was trying to say is that most of the paragraphs that followed, mention what law was to be passed, how it had been examined and how it had to be looked into and there the question of MISA comes maintenance of Internal security Act in. I entirely agree with my hon. friend who spoke before me - this is the view of my party also - that 'repeal of MISA,' the words used in the Address may be technically true, but then Government has seen to it very carefully that the minimum necessary legal sanctions in the interest of security and defence of India, maintenance of public order and all services and supplies essential to the life of the community, etc. are retained under the ordinary law. It is

true, we had the preventive detention law and the first preventive detention Bill was moved in this House by our great Sardar Patel and it was accepted by our Parliament then. A series of amending Acts were introduced after that. But Government was always apologetic about it that they were doing it for a certain temporary period two years, three years normally - which used to be extended from time to time. But this time, now a Government which claims that it stands for civil liberties, democracy and what not - I do not want to use flowery language, I cannot use it - are coming out with a proposal to make in a part of the permanent, ordinary law of the land. So, the independence and liberty of the citizen is permanently damaged. Such a provision in the hands of some tiny officers sitting in some district or taluka or tehsil kechehri who give a report which normally is taken as a Bible by those who are supposed to give final sanction. This is how the MISA or any Prevention Detention Act operates. For that you condemned the previous Government and you got all the due or undue credit for it. Now, you yourself try to bring about MISA in a different form. I personally think, this is a breach of faith with the people of India. This is, again, a promise made through their own manifesto. Apart from that, what is the general mood of this House? This House elected in 1977, is a different House. I would like to say that it has gone through the fire of experience and it holds, certainly, some definite views about the liberty of the people. We may have our own different party loyalties. But, certainly we have gone through the fire of experience and we hold certain views today. What about that? This reality is completely ignored. This is one thing that I would like to emphasise.

Making this MISA provision as a part of the ordinary law of the land is something completely contrary to our concept of personal liberty in this country. I know it and I understand it because the governance of the country requires defence of India etc. But sometimes these terms are rather misused. Certainly, when the country's independence is in danger, Parliament will certainly come

to their aid, whatever may be the difficulties. Why then make it a part of the ordinary law of the land?

Then, credit is being taken for having appointed a National Police Commission after so many decades, etc. It betrays a complete ignorance of what was happening in the States. I happened to be the Home Minister of this country and also of my own state when our Prime Minister was the Chief Minister there and, I think, after consulting him, we had appointed a police Commission in our State. I remember, at that time, there were half a dozen Police Commissions functioning in the country. It was thought that "Police" was a matter for the States, and, therefore, many states appointed Police Commissions. Certainly, they can appoint a National Police Commission. There is nothing wrong in that nobody country had thought of this great thing, of appointing a police Commission and that this Government has tried to do that gives a wrong impression. This is the main point that I am making in this regard. This is what the Address tries to show that something has been done which nobody thought of doing before. As if this is being done for the first time in the history of this country which everybody ought to have done before, but nobody did it, and therefore, they are trying to do it.

Certainly, this Government will have the credit for appointing only the Commissions. If after 10 years somebody writes history and gives some name to the Government, this Government will be called as "Commission Government." I have read in some newspaper - I have not myself made any research in that - that so far they have appointed about 49 commissions and committees. It would be very interesting to find out the expenditure involved. Somebody ought to put a question about that and ask the expenditure incurred on the Commissions. A newspaper has made an estimate of the likely expenditure on the Commission because the commissions are such commodities, are such birds - I do not use the word "animals" because that becomes controversial. (Interruptions). Commission itself is an omission sometimes.

So, I am told that they are going to spend something like Rs. 900 crores on these commissions because the work of a particular commission would never be finished within a given time. It is said that this commission is expected to submit their report within six, eight or nine months, which they would never be able to do it. No commission has ever done it, as far as I know. Normally, they take 3-4 times more than what was given by the Government. So, the expenditure, I am told is going to run into crores. I do not know. But I would like the Prime Minister to look into it and find out how many commissions he has appointed in the course of last 11 months, and what is the expenditure that they are likely to incur. I was told that on these commissions - if you go on working in the normal manner - they would like to spend something like Rs. 900 crores. If that is so, then in addition to this year's collection of taxes possibly another year will have to be added to it. I would request Morarjibhai to find out how many commission are appointed.

...Now I come to the important paragraph regarding the economic situation of the country. As I said, we have the advantage while discussing the President's Address to have a look at the budget and the economic review. You see page 4 of the economic review. You see page 4 of the President's Address. It says :

Inflationary pressures have been brought under check. While the price rise in the previous year was about 12 per cent, the current level of prices is no higher than the level at the end of March, 1977."

This is how this is full of, I won't say untruth, but half truth. But half truth is worse than untruth. Instead of offering my criticism, it would be better if I read out something from the Economic Survey. This is on page 18 of the English version. It says :

"However, the price situation does not call for any complacency. Al_ though the index of wholesale prices rose by only 2.3 per cent over the year ending January, 21, 1978 the increase in some groups was much higher. Foodgrains stand higher over the year

by 8.6 per cent, largely on account of pulses whose prices have advanced by as much as 38.4 per cent, eggs, fish and meat by 15.5 per cent and condiments and spices by 28.3 per cent. The prices of milk and milk products, too, are slightly higher than a year ago.”

So, this is the story. This is what you say and you are trying to cover it by one sentence in the Address that it is not higher than last year. So, it gives the impression that everything is all right. Is this an honest review - I mean the President’s speech? If the office of the President is used to tell the half truth then this is something that is a very serious happening to the country and we cannot just sit quiet about it.

This is what is happening in the economic picture : impression is given that every thing is all right, every thing is improving, there is nothing to worry about; the prices are fine. But the Economic Survey, when it tries to deal with the question of price, starts with that this is not a question where you can be complacent about. This is a very grave warning coming from an expert body of persons functioning in the Finance Ministry about the economic situation, about the price situation. And what does this President’s Address say?

It says :

“While the price rise in the previous year was about twelve per cent...

It gives a comparison with the previous year - that was the bad Government’s performance and this is, this good Government’s performance. There is no price rise, every thing is all right. This is misleading. The President’s speech must not be, at least, misleading.

Again this is what they are complaining :

“The Government inherited an economy in which poverty and employment were acute, particularly in the rural areas and in which the development of the past 30 years had not benefited

large numbers.

This is their common theme; this is what the Janata Government has been saying, nothing was done in the last 30 years.' This is a repetition of the same thing. I tell you, whatever you are able to do now, is because of what we achieved in 30 years. Do not forget this. Do not be disloyal to the history. What has been given to you, you yourselves have admitted.

For example, I find in the Budget speech that the Finance Minister himself has admitted one important thing. It is a good thing when such an admission comes. When a person tries to deal with facts, truth has to come out. Here is that truth. On page 29 while explaining the fiscal strategy of his Government, the Finance minister says.

"The fiscal strategy underlying my proposal...."

I have got many differences with the proposals, but I am now talking about his strategy, the strength that he got for that strategy; that is what he was referring to :

The fiscal strategy underlying my proposals seeks to take advantage of the favourable food and foreign exchange situation for generating fresh expansionary impulses in our economy"

This 'favourable food and foreign exchange situation' was a gift from the previous Government. Do not forget this. If at all you are honest to yourselves, you must say that. This was the gift from the previous Government. Do not forget this. You were not given this Government only with this empty chair, it was given with a big stock of food and very big treasury of foreign exchange. Do not forget that. Now you are basing your basic strategy, the strategy of your fiscal policies on these two important factors. You forget about it and here you say that, when you came to power, there was nothing here but acute unemployment and so on.

Talking about unemployment, I was making this point, Morarjibhai, I must tell you very honestly - in this campaign, I was

making this criticism of your Government publicly, and I would like to make it here because sometimes election Speeches outside are forgotten. This was a very severe criticism that I was making. This Government's claim is that they are rural-biased, and that they are very much worried about rural employment, rural investment, and so on and so forth; for the first time in the history of this century, this Government is doing something good for the rural areas so far they were neglected.. This is the pathetic tale that they are trying to tell us. My criticism was this. If at all you want to do something about rural areas, according to me, the fundamental problems of India are three. One is poverty, another is inequality - both social and economic, and third is, possibilities and efforts for modernising our manpower with the help of science and technology. These are the basic, fundamental problems of this country. A Government which has no basic policies about these fundamental issues, regarding these three basic issues including untouchability has no moral right to govern this country. Only that Government has a right to govern this country, which has got something very fundamental to give, as a matter of policy, for administration and for policy making. They alone can have the right to govern.

Now, what you done for the rural areas? Talking about unemployment and poverty and merely telling us that you have provided additional Rs. 400 crores more for agriculture - is that enough? Some pilot scheme has been sanctioned and Rs. 24 crores have been symbolically provided is that enough? I come from a state where they had said that they want to give a guarantee to work to the unemployed in the rural areas. We merely give to the people the right to vote. That is not enough. That way democracy is incomplete. Along with the right to vote, if you give them the right to work, then alone will democracy be complete. There are hundreds of thousands of people in the rural areas who are willing to work. They have two hands to work with, but they have no work. I think they have got a right to ask for work and if you do not give them work, it is your duty to give them two meals a day.

An Hon. Member : Why did you forgot it?

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : We did not forget it. We in Maharashtra passed this Act, but so far, this Government has not even had the courtesy of sanctioning it. They have not asked for money. Shri. Mavalankar was discussing the question about economic responsibilities and facilities for the States. It is a very very important question he was raising. I am coming to that point also. But here is something that was done. The State Government are providing it for their own purpose. But this Government has not even had the courtesy to sanction it. What is the reason? I do not think they have so far given any reason. I hope, I will get some answer to this from the Prime Minister, when he replies to the debate. I do not want him to say, 'You are the only state doing it. Therefore, I cannot do it.' Why cannot you do it? If some good work is done by a few States, at least let there be a good word of appreciation, and let not obstacles be put in the way of their functioning. This is one important point I wanted to make about this. This is about the economic problems. I do not want to go into it further.

Another point is concerning industrial policy. An impression is being given that every thing is all right with industrial production. Everything is not all right with industrial production in the country. The Economic Review gives a very disturbing picture. The 4.5 per cent growth that has been shown is because there has been a good monsoon this year, so far as the agricultural production is concerned. Because of the good agricultural performance, the general growth rate is somewhat statistically arranged. If you go into the individual industrial field, the Economic Review is full of facts. In vital sectors, the industrial economy is stagnant. But here you are trying to give the impression that everything is all right. Everything is not all right, either on the prices front or on the growth front. This is a matter I would like this Government to consider very carefully, if at all these policies are to be taken care of.

I would like to make a very important point here, not as a criticism of the Government. In any developing country, where economic issues dominate the political problems or as a matter of

fact, political problems follow the economic situation - this is the situation even in developed countries, I would say in a developing country where we have to plan our economy properly, unless we evolve a viable wage, income and price policy, that Government has no chance of succeeding in the economic field. Let us take it for granted. Unless we have got a definite answer for this, no Government is likely to succeed, but there is no effort being made on the part of the Government. We want an assurance about it. In the budget speech, the only part which reads well is where they have given the five fundamental principles of taxation, which the Janata Government has accepted as a policy direction. That reads well. One of the principles is that the taxation policy must look to the distributive social justice, and when we come to the distributive social justice, what is the assurance in the budget speech or in the President's Address? Nothing, excepting certain investments here and there and ultimately saying that there is going to be a deficit of more than Rs. 1,000 crores. I think, this is a record deficit that any Finance Minister has shown so far, and we have been told that this is going to be reduced by selling the Government gold holding at the international price. The deficit is of Rs. 1,000 crores and the Reserve Bank Governor tells us today that the entire gold holdings of Government are worth Rs. 500 crores only. What about the remaining Rs. 500 crores? Where are they going to come from? Is it going to be left to the Government to look after as a deficit and ultimately the people to take the burden on them?

I would like to maintain that this is not the right way? This gold is also a Government asset. You are wasting it. That gold is not something which you have earned. This accumulation of gold is of years together, which has to be used in the days of emergency. Apart from the RBI gold, Government holds gold which is to be used for emergency. It includes gold which was collected for use at the time of war etc. Perhaps this was collected at the time of the Pakistan war or the Chinese war. This is what you are using for meeting the deficit in the budget. Is this the way of running the economic administration of this country? And we are told they everything is all right and you are trying to do far better. I would like to say that nothing is better..

...The last few paragraphs in the President's Address deal with the External Affairs and I am very glad that the Minister for External affairs is present here when I am talking about this matter. I am only making a reference to those portions which I have seen in the President's Address. I am not talking on the External Affairs as a whole. I would certainly like to participate in the External Affairs debate and offer my comments later. What is said here certainly shows and rather gives some sort of a glimpse of what is working in their minds. It is said in the Address :

"The Government has based its relations with the Great Powers on the firm belief in a commitment to genuine non-alignment...."

They are more worried about the relations with the great powers. They have also said about mutual relations with the neighbouring countries. In fact this is also one of the very important forums, but this is not something special, which you have done. This is something which every country has to do and this has been a very important feature of our foreign policy all along and for the last 30 years - even before Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee started visiting the neighbouring countries. We have also followed the same policy because ultimately the neighbourhood in which we live and the relations with them are very important for us. Therefore, one cannot say that this something very special for which one need to be complimented. But this is the only thing you thought of worth saying - relations with great powers and the genuine non-alignment. I am afraid, and this is my fear that I am expressing. So far they have kept non-alignment and kept the old foreign policy by and large in a straight line as far as possible, but there are some of the indications which are disturbing. This use of the words, 'genuine non-alignment' - here I am afraid a new type of alignment is concealed behind this 'genuine non-alignment' This my fear. Sometime, something will come out of it.

Some things are worrying me. For example, it is said, 'It is our hope that notwithstanding the differences which we might have had in the past, we can now foster these relations to a new level, I am talking about the relations with the great powers, particularly,

America and the western democracies. They say, "We might have had in the past some differences. Have those differences completely disappeared? I would like to ask this straight question when we discuss the question of the Indian Ocean being a zone of peace. What happens in Diego Garcia is a matter of fundamental differences with the American imperialism and we will have to say very firmly about it. If you give an impression that the past differences are disappearing, how could they disappear? As long as the military base in Diego Garcia stands, our differences with America will be there. Merely telling that those two big countries are likely to discuss the matter and then alone this question will be solved, is a very wrong approach to the problem of the Indian Ocean being a zone of peace. You cannot merely depend on the talk between the Soviet Union and USA. We will have to say categorically. I know your idea of not taking a lead in calling a conference. I can understand it. I appreciate it also. It is all right, but the culprits must be brought to the limelight that they are the culprits, and if they try to bring back the military bases in the old colonial areas, it means that they have not forgotten their past and we cannot forget our past, and we must protest and tell them, 'You are the villains who are doing this. 'We will have to create the public opinion about this. We may not have any big diplomatic manoeuvrability about it. We may not have many other pressures to use against them. But creating a public opinion, creating public opinion and the human element about it is much more important. On the contrary you are giving them an impression that our past difference are disappearing. Are they disappearing? Have they disappeared? Has part of Diego Garcia disappeared?

Well, I would like to say that dealing with and trying hard with the American Press and their leakage of the tape-recorded 'Cold and blunt' attitude' Thanks to that leakage and thanks to the Press, I would say some corrections were introduced into this relationship and the visit went off very well to that extent. I am not against it. I am only mentioning this. You have specially mentioned about your relationship with America and the Western democracies and try to give an impression that differences and disappearing.

Well, differences should disappear. I do not want that differences should be there, but if they disappear, you tell that. But there are many caused of differences which cannot disappear long as Diego Garcia and the military bases in the Indian Ocean are there. Please do not tell us that your differences are disappearing. Please do not tell us that the inherent contradictions between the global interests of any imperialist power and the national interests of India are disappearing. There is contradiction. It is there that we have to be very careful in this particular matter.

I submit Sir, I went through the speech and found out some of the inconsistencies, half-truths and what not completely untrue, but half-truths, yes and I consider half truths more dangerous. They are very highly dangerous. I am very sorry that our great dignitary, the President of India, was made an instrument to disclose these half truths before the Parliament. This is my worry. This is my sadness. So, this is my criticism. This Presidential Address is a great disappointment. This speech is nothing more than that. We expect a little better speech, because Presidential Address, as I said is a statutory requirement. Constitution has made it compulsory. This document must be the one which will give correct, truthful analysis of the past year and future projections of what the Government proposes to do mostly in important industrial economic and social matters.

Prof P. C. Mavalankar : He made a point in his speech that he will mention about the Centre-State relations.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : Yes, I said. I will like to make a mention about it.

I personally consider that we need a very reasonably strong Centre. There is no doubt about it and we cannot ignore the Centre. But at the same time any strength to the Centre at the cost of the States is something which we do not welcome. The States strength is also equally important. Particularly when most of the developmental activities and responsibilities are with the State Governments. There are some States which are poor. Some States are small. Some States have not got any possibility of having

flexibility of resources and, therefore, it is absolutely essential that this matter of financial viability of the States capacity to look after the complete developmental programme be seriously discussed from year to year, not only once. It needs to be discussed at the national level. I would like Parliament to set aside some special time and discuss this matter because merely making autonomy an issue is not enough. We would certainly want the Centre of a reasonable strength. We do not want a weak Centre. We do not want to weaken the Centre. But strengthening the Centre at the cost of the States would be against the interest of India, because this will certainly strike at the very roots of India's unity.

The speech of the Finance Minister, the other day, expressed his disappointment that he could not do anything about taking away the Sales Tax from the States. That is the only tax which is somewhat expansive and flexible which is giving some sort of resources to the States. Abolition of Sales Tax is part of Janata Party's manifesto. This shows the party's character and policy. They cannot do it and they will never be able to do it because Sales Tax is a very important source of tax to the States. They should not take away the Sales Tax. But I know the trading class in the country is very much worried about it. It becomes rather inconvenient to them. It is their interest that ruling party want to protect. They have, therefore, put it in their manifesto. Fiance Minister is sorry that he cannot do away with it now. But he is asking us for patience. Well, I would like to say that we are showing patience, that is good for him. Once we start showing impatience about these wrong approaches to these problems, I do not know where the country will be.

CHAPTER 18

MOTION REGARDING ATROCITIES ON HARIJANS

Lok Sabha , 7 April 1978

EDITORIAL NOTE

This speech was delivered in the background of several incidents atrocities against Dalits in different parts of the country. The incident a Belchi in Bihar was most serious one. There were also several incidents in Gujarat and Maharashtra.

In that context, Y. B. Chavan had written to the Prime Minister ant requested him to have some constructive dialogue with political parties This issue was, not a question of one party or of one Government. The question was of national conscience and it was for the nation to face it in the correct spirit. It was not merely a problem of law and order. For Chavan the problem of Scheduled Castes, the problem of Scheduled Tribes and minorities was a problem which required awakening of social conscience of the nation.

The Government of the day looked upon this question merely as a law and order problem. In that connection as a former Home Minister, Chavan was of the view that the .law and order aspect of the problem had to be dealt with effectively not when incidents took place but the root causes of these incidents must be tackled effectively.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : If such atrocities have place in Maharashtra, I can say I am ashamed of it. There is nothing to be proud about, there is nothing to explain away. I am equally ashamed of it if it is happening in Maharashtra.

But my main point is that when we were trying to invite the attention of the Government and trying to have some sort of constructive dialogue with Government, I must say that out of despair I had to give up this effort. I would remind the Prime Minister about my correspondence with him on this question.

When I wrote to the Prime Minister, sending along with my letter, report of some of the members of my party who visited some of the States, not only Belchi - they had gone to Bihar, and then to Gujarat and some other places - I was told by the Prime Minister that this was politically motivated. Therefore, out of sheer despair I had to give up the correspondence.

With all my respect for him, my main objective at that time was to establish some sort of constructive communication and dialogue, because this is not a question of one party, of the State Government or the Central Government, this is not a question where you can say that it falls in the State List of the Central List or the Concurrent List. This is a question which lies on the national conscience, therefore, the nation has to take it in the correct spirit and face the question. I must say that all these things, all these issues or incidents were happening in different States, all the States I would say if that satisfies somebody, but the question is not where it happened, but that they were happening, and one has to go into the reasons for it.

From the details that some of the members of the party then gave me, it had some special provocation this year, in the last few years if you like. Some new rights were given to the Harijans, some lands were given, bonded labour was sought to be removed. It is this which was, really speaking, giving them some human rights for the first time in practice. It happened because people

who were not pleased with these things were taking a sort of anti-social attitude and making an organised effort to attack the Harijans and the result was atrocities. Therefore, it has social and historical significance. If you merely rule it away as a problem of law and order, it will be a great mistake. We have then not understood the problem at all. The problem of Scheduled Casts, the problem of Scheduled Tribes and minorities is a problem which requires awakening of social conscience of the nation. For that matter, all the parties together have to have some sort of a constructive programme. But the Government will have to take a lead in this matter and take a special responsibility. Every time we come here and some Members raise this question, it is found that it is merely explained away in a routine manner. That hurts more. We are told that Harijans are 15 per cent and the atrocities are only 1 per cent. This sort of an explanation of happenings in the country in a statistical way is adding insult to injury. Therefore, I do not merely take this opportunity and criticise the Government but I am again making an appeal to the Prime Minister because he himself is a well-known leader who has his own idea about it. I know that he has also done something in this matter in a constructive way, not that I need to speak about it. But I certainly say that we need to emphasise this particular aspect because it has assumed special significance now.

They are getting today at least economic rights and social privileges and some people are getting jealous about it and are trying to deny those things. Certain elements in society in an organised fashion try to do it and if these elements get protection from the Government indirectly by connivance, by negligence, by positive support then what happens? This is the main question. As I told you, specific instances were brought to notice that certain lands were given to the people in the last two or three years, and by forcefully attacking these people, they were dispossessed of the lands. The reasons for some of the troubles were that they refused to offer labour in the usual bonded form. This old slavery, they did not want; they wanted to rebel against it. You will have to

go into the causes as to why the trouble took place. These are of special significance. My constructive suggestion is that the political parties must sit together and accept certain responsibilities. It is not enough to tell a police station officer that you go and enquire about it. Well, that is one way of doing. This is a police way of doing it. What I am trying to say is that there are deeper causes and one needs to go into the matter much more thoroughly. We will have to find out ways of dealing with it. It is however not enough to tell a police station officer that you go and enquire about it. Well, that is one way of doing. This is a police way of doing it. What I am trying to say is that there are deeper cause and one needs to go into the matter much more thoroughly. We will have to find out ways of dealing with it. It is however not enough. If there are other forms of bonded labour, we will have to find out and attack it ruthlessly, if we can. As Government wants to attack law and order problems, this is the worst law and order problem. Law and order problem has to be effectively dealt with not when incidents start happening; they will have to be dealt with, at the root, and we must go into the root cause of it. These are positive and constructive suggestions of doing it. It is not enough to investigate the incident when it takes place. It is necessary to see that such incidents do not take place. People in the villages, the higher casts in the villages should themselves feel it their duty and responsibility and morally they should feel ashamed if such incidents do occur. Unless that sort of feeling is created in the country, especially in the rural areas nothing will happen. This is a national programme, this is not a one-party programme. I do not say it is merely a Government programme. Of course unless the Government takes a lead in this matter, nothing is going to happen.

Instead we find that certain technical explanations are being given about it. One feels that somebody is merely trying to justify. That is the worst part of it; that hurts the conscience of the nation; that hurts the pride of the people. That is the main point.

I would recommend you to read some of the correspondence between myself and the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister felt that I was merely trying to make a political capital out of it to raise it in the Parliament. I was totally dismayed. I wrote to him, " I must leave it at that. I do not want to carry on correspondence further." My intention was to establish some sort of contact. I am mentioning this correspondence only today. I am very glad that the members from the Government benches have started raising this question. At least now he will realise that the question was not raised with any political motivation, with any party interest, but because it is a very serious question which is affecting the minds of the people at large and the nation as a whole.

I think, in our country, in the last one century, all the important leaders of our country, from Raja Ram Mohan Roy to the present days, have tried to create a public opinion about it. But even then we have not succeeded enough by merely creating a public opinion. Unless we create certain politic-social sanction behind all our efforts, nothing is going to make any further progress.

I therefore thought it my duty to speak on behalf of my party and say those who have moved this motion have rendered us service today, it is not only one party speaking, it is the entire House Speaking and it is the nation speaking on this issue of Harijans. I would request the Prime Minister, when he replies, that let him not merely speak because he has to justify a Government or a Ministry. He is more than a Prime Minister. I would expect him to look at the question from this point of view and go into the problem much more fundamentally and gives us a programme. As the Prime Minister, he can give us a programme, a programme for the nation, a programme for all the political parties. This is non-party issue. This cuts across all the political frontiers or party affiliations. Let us create a situation in the country that the question of Harijans, the question of Girijans the question of minorities is given the due priority which it deserves.

Sir, I have done.

CHAPTER 19

RECENT COMMUNAL RIOTS

Lok Sabha , 4 December 1978

EDITORIAL NOTE

This debate took place in the background of serious communal trouble in Aligarh. According to Chavan, Aligarh was merely symbolic. Sense of insecurity had gripped the mind of minority communities. The root of communal trouble lay in the communal politics of the country.

Chavan pointed out that before Independence, it was said that Hindu communalism, Muslim communalism and British imperialism were responsible for all conflicts in the Indian society. Now, Communal politics had replaced British imperialism. According to him, if at all a solution had to answer and solution must be found to the problem of communal politics:

There were aspects of the communal problem; the administrative the political and the socio-economic and all the three aspects had dealt with simultaneously. He made several suggestions in the course of his speech to tackle these problems.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am participating in this Debate, which is a very important Debate from the national point of view.

For, the last few weeks or for a few months, I would say, the

country is full of an atmosphere of conflict and confrontation between the different sections of the community, sometimes in the name of caste and sometimes these communal troubles. I think it is a very good that we have decided to discuss this question on the floor of the House.

Prof. Samar Guha in the beginning said that his question needs to be looked into from a national perspective. I don't think anybody would dispute that point. But discussing a question in national perspective does not mean to make it somewhat academic, the results of which ultimately, will lead to no conclusion. We are today provoked to discuss this question because of what happened in Aligarh. Therefore, Aligarh becomes very important and symbolic.

The sense of insecurity in the mind of minority of this country is the greatest disease that a democratic society can face. I would therefore feel that what has happened in Aligarh is something very serious. I know that it has not happened only in Aligarh. It has also happened in Kanpur, Lucknow, Sambhal and many other places, and in Hyderabad also. I don't say that it has happened only in U.P It happened at different times at different places.

We have a long history of communal troubles in this country. At one time we used to say that there is a communal triangle. Hindu communalism, Muslim communalism and British imperialism. This was a triangle responsible for these types of communal troubles in the past. At the present moment there is no British imperialism to be blamed or to be made a scapegoat of. But this problem is continuing. and if at all we want to meet this challenge or this problem seriously, I think, we will have to sit together and seriously think about what is responsible for it.

The root cause for it is the communal politics in this country. It is no use running away from this fact. There is a certain communal politics. That communal politics has taken the place of British imperialism now. The ignorant people on one side, are the Hindu

section, and the ignorant people on the other side are the Muslim people and this communal politics is trying to take advantage of it and is creating a situation, which is ultimately leading to the killings of many people. Mr. Sathe, in his speech, has explained with details to show what a terrible thing it can be. We have always found that this communal trouble starts from a very small paltry incident. In case of Aligarh, it is very strange and rather shameful that the trouble did not take place only once, but it took place twice, in two phases - once in October and then again in November. The administration of a State Government - kindly excuse me, I am not saying it because it is Janata Government - but if there is a State Administration which cannot stop communal trouble, communal conflicts in one phase and which has the capacity of allowing it to happen in the second phase again, deserves to be pushed out and kicked out of power. I should say, it is a shameful incident.

.....

... It is no use running away from the fact. What has happened in Aligarh? It is always said that the trouble starts from a small paltry incident. May be you could not have avoided that paltry incident, but when a paltry incident develops into some sort of an explosive situation, it is not that paltry incident that is responsible for this trouble, but it is the atmosphere which is created before the paltry incident which is ultimately responsible for this and that is what was responsible for Aligarh.

.....

..If at all you want to find a solution to the problem for communal trouble in India, you will have to find an answer and solution to the problem of communal politics. The politics of Hindu Rashtrawad is the root-cause of the whole trouble which must be accepted honestly and bravely. Sir, the administration has to take the major responsibility in this matter.

There are three aspects of the communal problems; the administrative problem, the political problem and the socio-

economic problem. The socio-economic problems also have their own place in these communal troubles. I would first invite your attention to the administrative aspect. The best way and the best time to stop communal trouble, is to stop it, before it starts. It is very difficult to stop communal trouble when it once starts. The only right time when you can stop it is before it starts. You can stop it, only if the administration has a better organisation of intelligence...(interruptions). What happened to Aligarh There was only one incident. A procession took place in which certain provocation slogans were raised. Certainly it has contributed to that, but there was hostility gradually being built between the Hindus and Muslims, in the minds, of Hindu youngmen and in the minds of Muslim youngmen. But in Aligarh what we find is that it is the Muslims who have become the sole target of the trouble. After the incident has taken place, many people rush there and make their own reports. We have by now got history of every State. Normally, Hindu Muslim riots take place in areas of urban conglomerations. These take place very rarely in the rural areas; sometimes, they do take place, I think, taking the history of the last thirty, fifty or eighty years, we have got the history of most the important towns where the communal trouble takes place. Has the State administration at any time considered this aspect when they post somebody as Deputy Commissioner or Collector or Commissioner of a particular area, whether he will be competent to take care of that area?

Prof Samar Guha : I have suggested a special Inspector general of Police. (interruptions).

Shri Y. B. Chavan : I would say that the most important person in the police investigation and intelligence in these matters is not the I.G., but the head constable; he is more important because he sits in the police station and he knows who is what, and knows what anti-social element is there. Sometimes, unfortunately, they are hand in gloves with them...(interruptions).

We are a democratic country and there are bound to be

Governments of different parties in different States and we have to accept this reality, but we must accept one point that when a communal riot is about to start or has started, no political person or persons who hold office must take any partisan attitude. Unfortunately, in the case of Aligarh, we have found that even the Ministers have taken a partisan attitude. This has to be stopped.

There is yet another aspect. It has also a certain socio-economic aspect. It is a question of recruiting the people from minority communities in the law enforcement services...(interruptions). In the law enforcement services, in the cadre of sub-inspectors, in the cadre of I.P.S. and even in the constabulary, which is much more important, you can recruit more people from the minority communities. The question of unemployment will also be solved. And there will be some sort of an assurance to the people of the minority communities. As I told you, there is a political aspect of it and there is a socio-economic aspect. Poverty is being exploited by the veterans on both sides. And the leaders, to further exploit the position for political purposes and exploit the common masses, who unnecessarily fight and kill each other.

I am very glad indeed that the Prime Minister has called a meeting of the leaders of the parties and groups some time next week, on 17th or so. He has invited us; and certainly we will try again to put forth our detailed view in this matter. I do not want to attribute any motives to any particular person or Minister. Really speaking, as far as communal troubles and problems are concerned, no aspect of question has remained undiscussed threadbare. Everything has been discussed, not once or twice, but may be even a hundred times. But there has been no-follow-up.

Sometimes we took follow up action when we were in office. We have certainly taken some firm action. The main point that I am trying to make is that we will have to take the matter very seriously. It is not merely a question of Hindus and Muslims, or of a minority struggle. There are also scheduled caste problems and other caste

struggles. Let us not add to the burning problems - problems from which we are suffering by adding to them another new dimension, for nothing. If we want to discuss the matter thoroughly, forgetting our party affiliations in this matter and deal with the basic issues, it is good. However unless we are prepared to face it boldly and courageously - I mean the question of communal politics and communal organisations the question of this communal trouble, this problem will not be solved by a hundred discussions like this. I would, therefore, like to make an appeal to those in power, that they must make up their minds and if they want to do it, I will say that we will certainly cooperate with them, as far as possible, in this particular matter.

CHAPTER 20

OBITUARY REFERENCES TO JAIPRAKASH NARAYAN

Lok Sabha , 22 March 1979

EDITORIAL NOTE

On 22.3.1979, Shri Morarji Desai, the Prime Minister announced demise of Lok Nayak Jaiprakash Narayan in Bombay.

During the Freedom Struggle, Jaiprakash Narayan had inspired Y.B. Chavan. He offered his tribute to JP, whom he admired as a socialist a sarvodaya leader.

The hews of Jaiprakash Narayan's death was, however, wrongly reported. The nation shared indignation of the Parliament that the Prime Minister had conveyed to the House of JP's passing away without getting adequate confirmation of the same from reliable sources.

Two Statements made by Chavan are reproduced.

FIRST STATEMENT

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the last three days, I think, the nation passed through a terribly anxious time and at last this unfortunate moment has come when we know that JP is not amongst us. JP physically has passed away, but I am sure, JP belongs at that category of men and leaders, whose work, memory and contribution will be remembered permanently, not in this country, but even outside this country. JP's public life was manifold, he worked in different areas. He was one of the tallest freedom fighters of India. He was not merely a leader of the Freedom Movement, but he was one of those who tried to give a new content to the freedom struggle. I had the fortune of working under his leadership during 1942 and what a change, what a qualitative change, he brought about in the conditions in India. Jayprakash Narayan was perhaps equal to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in popularising the concept of socialism in India. This idea and thought of socialism has been generally accepted in India today, but the contribution for that acceptance that JP has made is something which history cannot forget. He also had intellectual loyalties, thinking loyalties to Mahatma Gandhi and therefore, he is perhaps the only man, who can be described as both a socialist and a ° Sarvodaya leader.

In the recent years, he was trying to work out some sort of synthesis between the socialist concept and the sarvodaya concept. This is what he was trying to do and, for that, he was using the term "total revolution." He stood for certain ideas. He was one of the men, possibly next to Mahatma Gandhi, who never took any office under law; he never took any office under statute. He was great, not because he held any particular office, but he was great because he was great. He never contested a single election to any Assembly or Parliament. He belonged to that category of leaders who changed the course of history, who not only met history but changed the course of history. And that is the impact he was left of Indian mind and history.

Today, we are all sorry on his passing away. He did not belong to any particular party though he led certain political parties on occasions. But at the time when he died, he belonged to the Indian people and the Indian people will never forget the contribution that he has made for their uplift, for the liberation, for the freedom struggle and for everything.

Myself and my party join with the feeling of sorrow not only of the Prime Minister, the Janata Party and the Government here but this is the sorrow of the crores of people of India. We are amongst them. The House should, certainly, convey, through you. Sir, our sorrow to his brother or anybody whoever is there in his family. But this is really the people's sorrow, the sorrow of all of us. His family was the whole nation. We have to convey our feelings to them.

SECOND STATEMENT

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : It is a very embarrassing situation for the parliament and I share the indignation that was expressed by Mr. Stephen, the leader of the Opposition, because such a situation puts not only the individual concerned in a difficult position but it is again the Parliament of the country and we have been led to a position where we were expressing feelings of condolence for a living person and a person who is respected and hounoured. So, I must share that indignation. I cannot help it. But at the same time I support the Motion moved by hon. Member Shri. A. C. George. We are very glad that Shri Jayprakash Narayan is living amongst us and we pray that he lives decades more amongst us.

CHAPTER 21

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Lok Sabha , 22 March 1979

EDITORIAL NOTE

As a MP, it was the first occasion for Y B. Chavan to speak on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. The speech brings out Chavan's grasp of the basic issues in the field of foreign policy and contains his own thinking on several aspects.

Commenting on special emphasis on improving relations with neighbours, Chavan stated that it was in tune with the policy of the previous Government. While we should be considerate towards our neighbours, he warned that we must also take into account certain complexes in the minds of these countries about India's large size. Good relation must be judged in longer term perspective and not only on record of two years of the Janata Government.

Speaking about China and Vajpayee's proposed visit, Chavan warned • that the Foreign Minister should not lose sight of what is China's own attitude towards its neighbours and what is its world view. In that context, Chavan went on to explain his own conception about China's attitude and what could be India's attitude towards China.

Y. B. Chavan expressed his deep commitments to non-alignment and the connection between the self-reliance and non-alignment.

He exerted the Foreign Minister to ensure that non-alignment continues to guide India's foreign policy when dealing with super-powers.

Chavan paid a handsome tribute to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Foreign Minister for exhibiting a flexible attitude and elastic mind, especially because Vajpayee was following and justifying the legacy of Nehru's policy.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : Sir, I must thank you in the beginning for giving this ministry a sort of priority for discussion in this House, because I have always found that this Ministry had a lower priority for discussion. I would also make a request to you that this discussion, on the occasion of the examination or consideration of the Demands, is not enough. Once again, some time in the later part of the year, there should be some sort of a debate on the international situation.

We are today living in a dynamic world, where changes are taking place so rapidly; and they are so important.

Mr. Speaker : It is my desire to have a discussion every session.

Shri. Yashwantrao Chavan : It should be not one the motion of the Government. Some times you should allow it on the motion of Members either from this side or from that side. We are now in a strait-jacketed time-table.

I hope you will permit me to speak a little longer today. Before I proceed further, I also must express a word of appreciation of Mr. Vajpayee as the Minister of External Affairs. I have seen him functioning for the last two years, and this is the first occasion that I am speaking. I must express my word of appreciation here, because I had earlier found him expressing his views as the leader of the Jana Sangh. I have now found, during the last 2 years, that he has a flexible attitude and quite an elastic mind to justify some of the legacies of Nehru's policy It certainly goes to Mr. Vajpayee's

credit. And it also certainly goes to the credit of Nehru's policy. (Interruptions).

We are discussing this question of foreign policy of India today, in the year 1979. I hope that the Minister of External Affairs would look to this problem, not only as a matter of policy for one year, but also agree that India should now consider the projections of foreign policy of the 1980s., i.e. for the next decades what is the world going to be like, what are the world movements going to be like and, in regard to the region in which India continues to exist and continues to influence, how it is going to change and what will be our policies. What is the assessment for a decade, for a longer time, and what is the longer perspective?

Foreign policy is one subject which can very well be handled only if there are long-term perspectives. I hope that after listening to the debate, Mr. Vajpayee will not merely answer the points made here and there, and get-away with the usual eloquence that he has, but will try to take us into confidence and give us his assessment of some of the problems of longer perspective.

There are four important criteria on which the foreign policy of any country can be judged. The first criterion is : What is its relations like with its immediate neighbours, and secondly, with the countries in the region in which this country exists. Naturally if we take the first thing as an important criterion to be taken into consideration, I find there is some sort of a sense of complacency in the mind of the government. They are giving two impressions, that the relations with the neighbouring countries are very good, there is nothing to worry about that, and other it has happened only after the Janata government has come to power. Both these aspects are rather misleading. If there are good relations with the neighbouring countries diplomatically and in other respects, they were there even before. But to say everything is all right with the neighbouring countries is absolutely wrong because neighbouring countries do not necessarily mean Pakistan and Nepal and Bangladesh; that also mean China. It has been the continuation

of the foreign policy of Pandit Nehru and we are glad that, we are inheriting a framework of policy and if we are honest and loyal to that framework of policy to the basic principle, no foreign minister, no government can ever go wrong. We will have to be very honest and careful about the basic approaches that have been laid down as the foundation of the policy.

We know that our relations with Pakistan have somewhat improved but the process started during the regime of the last government. At the time of Bangladesh there was war. After that war there was a new phase and then came the Simla Agreement and thereafter a series of agreements were entered into between Pakistan and India; bilaterally the relationship was being improved. The Principle of bilateralism is a very important principle not only in regard to the neighbouring countries but also with regard to other countries in the world. We will have to emphasis the bilateral aspect of the relationship and work more and more for it. I am glad that the new government has carried on that process forward. But do not be under the impression that you have got some little more agreement and therefore everything is all right, because let us see what Pakistan is doing. Only other day we were trying to know from the government what Pakistan were doing in the nuclear field, what new agreement they have reached with China and France and other countries, what were their intention and so on. We will have to be constantly vigilant about their intentions, about their preparations. etc.

With Nepal our relations were always good. They had some misgivings about certain aspects, they were interested in some sort of a separate transit agreement. If you showed weakness and gave them two agreements instead of one agreement in respect of trade, and an agreement for transit, I tell you, please take care; these are dangerous seeds; you are trying to become unrealistic about the relationship with our neighbours. Small, they are. But I know we should take into consideration the complex in their mind about our bigness in size. I am prepared to concede that position,

that we should be rather considerate in these matters. But in this, let us not get swept off our feet and go on accepting unreasonable things. If you ask me, what is the criterion of good relation and friendliness, I will say the real test of friendliness is, what they are going to do about the common river projects for Nepal and India. Every year when we discuss the agricultural demands, we discuss the question of floods in this country. Floods in the north are mostly there because we have not been successful in working our river project with Nepal. We have raised this question many times; there had been some goody goody response to it but nothing further is there, it is making no progress. I remember in 1976 when I visited Nepal we had an opportunity to raise this question with the highest authorities in Nepal and a letter of intent was exchanged between the two foreign secretaries. I remember that when the present foreign minister visited Nepal, on return from Nepal he also made some mention about certain further progress being made about the river projects. I would say, concentrate on that. If you want to have good relations between Nepal and India, merely having goodwill visits is not enough. Certainly we should have goodwill visits. I have nothing against them. It is a good thing because that also helps. Personal contacts with the leadership of any country is a good thing. So far so good, as far as goodwill visits are concerned. But let us see, What are our priorities of relationship. Merely having goodwill visits is not the final test. The real test of good relationship is, what is going to be the attitude on more important aspects. Therefore, I mentioned these river projects. I am sure the Foreign Ministry and the Foreign Minister, while taking up our relations with Nepal, look into it the real priorities.

With Bangladesh, they say our relations are good. Certainly the relations with Bangladesh were certainly good in the previous regime also. As a matter of fact, Bangladesh got its birth because of the previous regime's contribution to the whole process. You cannot forget history. (Interruption). Certainly it will be

remembered in history. There is no doubt about it. Now you say, relations have improved because you have given them more water at the cost of poor Calcutta. I sympathies with my friends from West Bengal. Now they say, the relations are very good. But don't go by these things. This is not the test of goods relationship. The test of good relationship is a little longer perspective, their attitude towards the question of refugees coming this side, the question how minorities are treated, etc. All these are very important question. (Interruption). Forgetting these things, merely declaring from the top of the house that our relations with our neighbours have improved in the last two years, as if they were very wrong before two years-that is not the right thing to give an impression like that.

The most important neighbour is China, Personally, I have no grievance about Shri Vajpayee's visit to China because I think the Minister should go to China. But he very jocularly said in his Television interview that he would not go to God, if God does not invite him, but even if Satan invites him, he will go! It is all right when you say that. Nobody can go to God without invitation and I wish he does not go to God for a long time. But I would also advise him to be careful about Satans. Only because you receive invitations, don't rush to them. About China we will have to take a little more cautious view. I know the process of improving the bilateral relations and diplomatic relations started during the previous government's regime - the Congress regime. But what we had in our mind at that time was the awareness of the realism of the assessment of the situation in China, rountabout China and most of the Asian region. Has China changed? If you want to take a view, an assessment of a country like China, you must not merely take the view of a communique issued in Peking when you visited China. China is one of the important countries in the world. It treats itself as a big country and it is a big country. Population-wise and taking many other considerations, it is certainly a big country. What is its attitude towards its neighbours? What is its

world view? This is much more important. When you think in terms of relationship and friendship with a country like China, you will have to take these aspects into consideration.

What is China's world view? China firmly believes in a Third World war. China does not believe in detente China thinks that unless there is a Third World War, there is no hope of a further revolution. That is one aspect of it.

Has it changed its attitude towards its neighbours? No. In 1962 we had an experience. In 1979 Vietnam had an experience. The mind is the same. Chou En-lai and Mao may no longer be there now there is Deng, Hua and others. But it is the same China as far as its neighbours are concerned.

I remember - that after 1962, I was just telling Subramaniam here, of one of the conversations, that I had with one of the Ministers who attended the conference to consider to Colombo proposals, which were made at that time. I think the story must be known to many Members of Parliament, because that Minister told this to many Members of Parliament. During his visit to China he was told by Liu Shao Chi, the then President of the Chinese Republic. "Tell that country, please tell the Indian friends that if they do not learn lessons, we will do it again, again and again." That is China's mind towards its neighbours, small and big. Why? Because they think they are the Middle Kingdom, they are the country which dictates terms here. This psychology, we must not forget. Knowing this, we must try to make an effort for improving our bilateral relations. I agree, but let us not forget this assessment.

China is considering a long-term programme of modernisation. They are talking of four modernisation-modernisation of industry, modernisation of agriculture, modernisation of technology and modernisation of defence preparedness. What will China be in 2000 A.D.? This is the perspective with which China is working. What is the perspective with which we are working? We China is -only working with the perspective that our visit to China has created a good impression.

Only this morning I was reading the speech of the Prime Minister, and he has declared that our relations with China have improved. Even after the lesson that they have taught Viet Nam, are you going to tell us this? We would certainly like to know from you, Mr. Minister. Do not merely quote the sentence from the joint communique. What is your personal impression? What is your assessment? Do you think that the process that we have started will lead us to any profitable, useful, and helpful results? (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : Let us have a quiet debate.

I was making only a limited point as to how the people are misled by certain atmosphere of euphoria....

....that Mr. Vajpayee has visited China and the friendship has come about. There are so many complex problems between China and India. China's attitude towards India will have to be considered; China's attitude towards other neighbours in this region will have to be considered. China's inside policy will have to be taken into account. Then we will have to think about more. Once you start creating hopes also, then, certainly, we can go into the old Bhai-Bhai era. We do not want to repeat the same mistake....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamat : You are for Hindi-Russi Bhai-Bhai now.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : If you are suffering from a complex of anti-Russianism, I cannot help it. I am not suffering from any complex. I am very glad indeed that after the visit of our Foreign Minister to China, a visit of the Soviet Prime Minister to China, a visit of the Soviet Prime Minister took place and they agreed and signed certainly some good agreements. I am very happy about it. They have done a good balancing thing. For that, the Government certainly deserves compliments. I am prepared to give compliments where they deserve. I have no hesitation in doing that.

I was talking about the criteria. The first criterion was of the

relationship in the neighbourhood and the relations with the countries in the region. I think, I have dealt with this subject, as far as, it was necessary.

They second criterion is what is the work that we do in the international field. India can do its work in two ways. First, as a sponsoring member of the non-alignment movement. The contribution that it makes in the non-alignment movement is a very important area where we have to find out how they are functioning. How they are going further. I must say, in this respect at least, I have no grievance to make about what Government has done in the last two years. They certainly have participated in all the important meetings of the nonaligned movement, the coordination bureau meeting, the Foreign Ministers meetings : the are yet to wait for the Summit meeting. But they have taken the right positions at the right time in the non - aligned movement. It is good. It is the Nehru legacy that we are carrying on. But while they do it, they are doing it with reservations in their mind. I have to go into that. They are constantly telling the world and themselves that they are genuinely non-aligned....

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri. Atal Bihari Vajpayee) :
What is wrong about being genuine?

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : The wrong about it is, telling the world that you are genuine. You must be genuine. Once the lady starts protesting too much....

An Hon. Member : There is no lady here.

Shrimati Mrinal Gore : The lady is on the other side.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I must say that I have made this criticism outside the House and it would be honest for me to make that criticism here also that is they put the word "genuine" behind "non-alignment" and they go on repeating constantly, continuously, as some sort of a mechanism or a cover for their tilt towards the West.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee : May I remind him that this Government has been elected on the mandate of 'genuine non-alignment?'

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : You were elected on so many mandates. Have you forgotten all about them? Why are you telling me about mandate? We know the mandate.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee : Would you like us to forget all the mandates? That cannot be your intention. You would like us to remember all the mandates.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I am glad you are doing it. But when you are repeating it so much and, so many times, then we are afraid. After all, nonalignment does not mean neutrality. Let us try to understand what 'non-alignment' is. Non-alignment does not mean you have Soviet Russia on this side, and America on that side. Be friend here and be friend there and call one 'Your Majesty' and call the other 'Your Highness' That is not non-alignment. Nonalignment is a positive concept. It has the content of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism, and you will have to test every move, every step, every event, every position that you take whether it meets that point of anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism. This sort of non-alignment, with the positive aspect of non-aligned movement, must be kept in mind and we will have to work for that.

I would remind one thing, because when we are talking about non-aligned movement in the world and our contribution to it. We can certainly make further contribution because there is something like economic content in foreign policy. One very important decision was reached at the Colombo Summit when the non-aligned countries met for their summit Conference. They have agreed on collective Self-reliance because we have found in the last decade that the dialogue between the developed countries and the developing countries was continuously being frustrated by the attitude of the developed countries. Wherever there was the question of transfer of real resources, whenever there was the question of proper share of trade, whenever there

was the question of giving some sort of concessions in the matter of debts, whenever there was the question of reforming the monetary system, to suit and benefit the developing countries, the developed countries have always taken an adverse position, a negative position. Therefore, the Colombo Conference came to the conclusion that the developing countries, the non-aligned countries, must work out a programme of self-reliance. Nationally we speak about self-reliance. When we talk about non-aligned movement, we talk about collective self-reliance. We have to follow up this position. India will have to take a lead in this matter because India is in a position to take a lead in this matter, because we have certainly got a good industrial base, we have certainly a good technological base, unless you forgot the principle of self-reliance and dismantle the scientific progress that we have made, of which I am afraid there are possibilities. I must warn them of that. If they do that, then that will be the end of India's future. Naturally, we on this side of the House will not allow them to do that. We should have self-reliance in industrial activities.

Now, what is non-alignment? Non-alignment is self-reliance in foreign policy. Self-reliance in technology is essential for our modernisation. These are very important matters. We would like to know this because we really do not know what is your position, what position you take and when. We were told in this House by the hon. Prime Minister that he had made a unilateral declaration that there would be no peaceful explosion. Vajpayeeji makes statements occasionally which are quite contrary to that. (Interruptions) Not contrary, but you will make your position clear at the end because we would like to know exactly, what your position is. If you have unilaterally taken a position not to resort to nuclear explosions, that means that you have taken a position of not making progress in nuclear technology. You may have done it as the government, but we would like to tell you and the world that the people of India have taken this position. The people of India have taken a position that we have every right to make every effort in the field of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes....

Shri Vasant Sathe : They have a mandate for that also. Vajpayeeji said that.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : This is one thing. The first point was the contribution made by Non-aligned Movement and the other is the role that India has played in the United Nations because that is also one of the important forums where we certainly can make a significant contribution.

I was trying to look through this report of the External Affairs Ministry to see about the work that we are doing for the last 2 years in the United Nations or as a member of the Security Council. There is not much information given about what role and what positions we have taken in the Security Council consistent with our national policy.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee : We are no longer a Member of the Security Council.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I know. It ended on 31st December. Sir, this is the only announcement he has made-that we have ceased to be a Member of the Security Council. In the paragraph about the world and the Security Council this is the announcement they have made as if this is an announcement of joy, 'No, we are no longer a Member of the Security Council.'... (Interruptions) I will tell the hon. Minister there. There is a school of thought in the Foreign Ministry - I am not talking about the Foreign Minister - which believes in isolation, as far as, the Security Council is concerned...

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath : When you were there also, the same was the position.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I was for taking responsibility in the Security Council. We were defeated once. Even then we persisted and got elected and got membership of the Security Council.

.....

Once a Member is elected, it is for two years.

Therefore, we would certainly like you to take note of that; that it is a very important role that India can play. We should certainly take an opportunity again to get into the Security Council because this is the place where you can influence important opinions, decisions and discussions of the world politics, and India has the respect of the world, because India has taken correct decisions on correct occasions and because India is not a military power. Nor is India an economic power in the sense it is understood, though it is not an ignorable proposition. Certainly it has made progress in both the fields. I would like this one point to be taken note of that in the foreign policy areas India's voice is heard with respect.

I was talking about our relations with the big powers. Well, our relations with the USA are good. They are improving. Visits are taking place. Their President came here and our Prime Minister went there, and you meet of the Foreign Ministers when you go to the United Nations. It is a good thing to discuss. But I would like to utter a word of warning here. When you think about good relations with big powers, they are like machines and they have no heart. They only have national interests - not only national interests whether it is Soviet Union. U. S. A. or China - they all go by global interest. How far India has got priority in the U.S.A.'s assement? I am afraid, as far as U.S.A. is concerned, India has got a very low priority because there is no question of making any movement. We started with the mechanism of the Joint Commissions with the big powers in cultural, economic and industrial matters. I have no doubt that this is making some progress. And when it comes to the matters of importance for us, like when it comes to the nuclear technology, they do not think about that warmly but only think of blunt and cold letters. That is what President Carter of the United States of America happened to speak here and he just happened to have leaked that out, thanks to a press man. So one will have to go by what your priority is in this field and not by mere formalities of goodwill.

Now, when we come to the question of Diego Garcia, one of

the worst things is happening there. If U.S.A. is a member, or is a friend of a particular country of the littoral countries, then they must come forward and say we discontinue this from today. In one of the speeches made during the debate I learnt - I think it was Shri Stephen who quoted it somewhere that Russia had made a declaration that they are prepared to discuss it with other countries. We are not against their general movement in the Ocean. Certainly every power can move about in the world. That is because it is an open road in the Indian Ocean! But they have a military base. It is not only a threat to Independent India, but I would like to tell you that the whole area, as somebody called it, is a crescent of crisis. I look at it as some sort of an arc consisting of Africa, the Gulf countries, India, Pakistan and also South Asia. It is an arc. This Diego Garcia is at the centre of that arc. So it is a threat to African countries. It is a threat to countries on both sides of Suez. It is a threat to Gulf countries. It is a threat to India which is a most important country in this part of the world. When we raised this question, the other side smiles and says that they take a formal note of it. If you want to talk about genuine non-alignment, we will have to make it as a test.

My main point is this who has got a base? Soviet. Union, has not got a base here. It is the U.S.A. which has got the base, which you will have to keep in mind and take note of it, and all your calculations about your relationship should be only on this basis. Sir, I have not spoken to criticise the government. I have not spoken to criticise A or B. I have merely spoken with a view to espouse the cause of national interest in the area of India's foreign policy and that is what I have done.

CHAPTER 22

REGARDING ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Lok Sabha , 15th May 1979

EDITORIAL NOTE

For Y B. Chavan, the Aligarh Muslim University was not only an educational institution to cater to the requirement of the minority but it was representative of the secular character of the country which was being vitiated by those advocating 'Hindu Rashtra.'

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I, am rising only for a brief intervention, to speak on the censure motion of Shri Banatwalla, on account of a very sad and beastly attack on the Aligarh Muslim University students while they were travelling in a train at Dadri station.

There are two aspects of it. One is specific aspect of the incident itself; and the other is the general consequences and general aspect of the problem. I will try to deal with both of them very briefly.

From what many Members have said including what Shri Banatwalla said in his initial speech it looks, Prima facie, that the attack was organized. Organized, because the students were coming here for a known purpose, for demonstrating against the Bill that was being passed in Lok Sabha, and for making their demand, for Government accepting Aligarh as a minority institution.

This was a known thing. They were coming for the demonstration. Somebody who did not like it, organized it. It was very obvious. Prima facie, it looks very obvious.

The attackers had already occupied two bogies at the Aligarh station itself; and they chose a place where possibly they expected some supporters which were also, a rather isolated place where they can leisurely attack these people. That seems to be the general pattern of events. If it is so, I would say that this is an extension of what happened in Aligarh. This is not something which was separate from Aligarh. It means the Aligarh communal situation is still continuing further.

The Prime Minister has appointed a Committee of leaders under the chairmanship of our Deputy Prime Minister. Babu Jagjivan Ramji, on communal problems; and we are meeting in the Committee and discussing very well the general aspects of the problem. Viz., the intelligence administration, political aspects, communal politics etc. We are all considering them. Naturally, if some commissions are appointed, we have to wait for their report. By the time the Commission's recommendations come, the situation will be such that those recommendations become practically inapplicable. They are not good for any application. So, this is a very serious matter, which must not be dismissed merely as a thing to be discussed once under adjournment motion and then to forget all about it.

Now, about the attack on the students. The composition of the students was very picturously described by Shri. Banatwalla. It was a group of young Muslim students, amongst whom were students of Ph.D., LL.M., medicine and engineering. As we all know, Aligarh attracts students from all parts of the country. Aligarh students really speaking, are a sort of a national elite of the minorities of India. If such attacks on such elite are made, and they go unpunished and investigated its impact will last long. It is not merely an incident; but it is, again, a trend and a very dangerous trend that must be stopped, and stopped with

determination. This is the purpose behind this motion. It is not just that we are only talking about one particular thing. Let us call a spade a spade; it is time we called a spade a spade. This attitude of 'Hindu rashtra' has poisoned our national life. It has to be fought, and fought at all levels. It is an organized attempt at poisoning the minds of the people of India. Which will certainly endanger the future of India. Secularism is not a gift of anybody to anyone. It is not a gift of Hindus to Muslims. It is a gift that Indians have given to themselves. It is on secularism that the independence, the democracy and the unity of this country depends. It is such an important thing. Unless we take care of this very fundamental principle of equality, I don't think we have any future.

Mr. Samar Guha has made a very interesting speech. He said that we are a sort of an island in the ocean of theocratic States all round. I would like to ask those like him, is it something new that we are facing? These were States which were there when we became independent. Knowing all these facts we have accepted secularism. This is not an island of secularism; I would say that this is a continent of secularism. (Interruptions). He mentioned about repercussion on Bangladesh. I quite agree with him. We must not give any reason for this. But it is not the headline in Bangla news papers that matters; it is a fact that it took place here that matters. What happened in Bangladesh? What news papers publish is certainly a matter for consideration. I do not want to underestimate it. But the fact is that this particular incident which took place in Jamshedpur, Aligarh and other places shows that Muslims have reasons to be anxious about it; they have reasons to complain about it. They have a right cause for grievances. And who is going to divide ourselves in different parties where the question of secularism comes, where the question of secularism comes, where the question of communalism comes. It is all of us who have to stand united and give an answer to the grievances of the Muslims minority. We have to tell them that they are our young brothers and we have to protect them. But if there

are some amongst us who are creating this sort of psychology of 'Hindu Rashtra'. I would like to say that the Government will have take note of this matter. I would like to say a few words on the general aspect of the problem of the question of minority character of the Aligarh Muslims University. This seems to be the cause of this trouble; and unfortunately, possibly maybe a cause of more trouble in future. It may come. Who knows about it? (Interruptions). We have made mistakes. I am coming to that. We have all made mistakes since 1972. We put the demand in our parties manifesto. We did not do anything about it. You put the demand in you manifesto in 1977. You have not done anything about it. We have all made mistakes. I am speaking here as non-party man; I am speaking here as an Indian who is sorry for what has happened in the last few months in India on the communal front. Let us accept this reality that the Aligarh Muslims University is a minority institution. It is not by an Act that it can be called like this; it is a history behind it which gives to it, its real character. It is a Muslim's small organization. A school was started first which ultimately developed into a University. It is a Muslim University. Why don't we accept this reality? Why do we give artificial reasons for grievances for the minority? Let us accept it.

The Rajya Sabha has passed a Bill. Now another Bill has been passed by the Lok Sabha. If the Rajya Sabha's Bill comes to the Lok Sabha, it means it will be defeated. If the Lok Sabha's Bill goes to the Rajya Sabha, possibly it will be defeated there.

The Prime Minister very kindly invites us to discuss all important matters of national character. I would like to ask him and request him about it. Is it not that the Aligarh University issue is more than the national issue? What type of legislation we should undertake or the type of answer we should find to this question? Will it not be necessary, if all the parties and their leaders come together, sit together, find out some answer and give to this question. When it suits Government, they call us for a discussion. When it does not suit them, they do not call us for a discussion; they do as they like. Therefore, I feel that this question of the minority character

should not be treated as a parochial question, a question of one community; it is a question of the psychology of minority, a question historical importance. Let us accept certain realities; and let us grant them their real demand. At the same time what has happened at the Dadri Station with the Aligarh Muslim University students deserves to be condemned, but also it is necessary to see that those who are guilty are punished; those who are guilty are exposed. Let the country know who are these people who have done this dirty job.

CHAPTER 23

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Lok Sabha , 11th July 1979

EDITORIAL NOTE

This was perhaps the most important speech delivered by Y. B. Chavan as Leader of Congress (S) in the Lok Sabha.

Chavan was not happy in moving the Motion against the Government led by Morarji Desai. He therefore stated at the outset, that he was doing so as a national duty. It was not against any particular individual or group of individuals. He described the utterly chaotic socioeconomic condition that prevailed in the country. Minorities were gripped with fear. There was unrest in the peasantry as well as among the industrial workers. Chavan observed that "we have reached such a situation in the country, where God alone can save us."

Summing up, he stated that the country was witnessing tragic destructions of national ethos of secularism, deterioration in the economic life, complete lack of coordination within the Cabinet and disruptions in the political party system.

Following his moving the Motion the Janata Government resigned. A new Chapter of coalition government started in India's political history.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : Sir, I beg to move :

“That this House express its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers.”

Mr., Speaker, Sir, while moving this motion of no-confidence against the Council of Ministers, I must say that I am doing it as a national duty. It is not a pleasant job, but it is a national duty. We are not doing it as some sort of formality or parliamentary tactics. There is no individual dislike or hostility against any particular individual or group of individuals. It is the nation that demands the motion that I have moved in this House.

What is the situation in the country today? If you make a general survey of the situation in the country today, we find that there is a complete lack of confidence, or if can borrow the words of the President of the Janata Party, crisis of confidence, and this crisis of confidence can be seen in all walks of life. Ultimately, the Government must represent some section of people, some class of people.

Whom do they represent today?

Shri Saugata Roy : Jan Sangh, RSS.

(Interruption)

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : Well you have answered it. But I am asking him. Whom do they represent today? If we go to the intellectuals or the elite (Interruptions). If we see the views of the intellectuals and the elite, they are dissatisfied with this government, if we go to the peasantry or industrial workers, they are angry and resenting the many things that this Government is doing. If we go to the small common man in the urban areas, it is the same feeling against them. If we go to the minorities. I must say, there is feeling of fear, the most tragic thing that has happened in this country. One of the most important things that Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru evolved in developing this country was the national ethos of secularism. What one finds today is the tragic destruction of this ethos in this country That is

the most unfortunate thing. Somebody would get up and say that some statement from the Government can be made about it, but it is not the statement of Government on this matter, that decides this ethos of secularism. It is ultimately the feeling of the minorities themselves, the faith of the minorities in the Government, in the country's policies, that, really speaking, will make or unmake the ethos of secularism. -

This is the picture that I find today in the Country. There is general atmosphere of no confidence, there is an atmosphere of crisis in this country. Therefore, I say it is not just as parliamentary tactics, but I thought it my duty that I should move this motion, so that the people will know that their feelings are properly represented. I find the Janata Party has started already responding to my call under the leadership of Mr. Raj Narain.

I think, it is the classic duty of the opposition to represent the people, during the period in between elections. We sit here as a result of elections, but in a democracy, society goes on changing, moods go on changing. What is the mass mood today? Today the mass mood is against the Janata Party. Let us not forget this. It is the reality.

I am reminded of a very interesting conversation that took place between the great leader Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and Vajpayeeji the other day in Bombay which I read in the newspapers.

J. P asked Shri Vajpayee : आज देश का हाल क्या है?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee) : That was not correctly reported. J. P did not ask me that question. The question was asked by the newspaper man, and not by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : It was meant to be a witty remark, but the beauty of wit or humor is that is often brings to light the intrinsic truth, and that remark of yours : देश का हाल मत पूछिये, विदेश का पूछिये । is such remark.

Shri A. Bala Pajanor (Pondichery) : Please put it in English.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : J. P asked him "What is the situation in the country today?" and Vajpayee said "Don't ask me about the situation in the country. Ask about the foreign countries." Is only gives me the impression that Ministers seem to be very happy and relaxed only when they are out of the country. There are talking, about high sounding principles of foreign policy and all that. I would like to make it clear that we are not making the foreign policy the basis of this no confidence motion. I want to make that point very clear, but this psychology of the ministers speaks very eloquently about the real situation in the country. When they come back to the country and when they see the realities, naturally I can understand their feeling and if Vajpayeeji had said what is reported, I very well share my sympathies with him.

Though I said that I was not making the foreign policy the basis of this motion of no confidence, I would like to say one important thing, that no foreign policy will succeed, however good it is, unless it is supported and strengthened by sound internal domestic policies. That is the ultimate test by which a Government will be judged, a country will be judged. When a sitting Prime Minister goes to another country, they just do not look at his face, they look at the face of the country, its economic situation and political situation and how the whole thing looks like. That is the final test. We have to go by what the internal situation in the country is and what the picture looks like. Let us look at the picture of the country today. What is the political picture like? As I have told you, the general situation can be described as a situation of crisis. But when somebody asks the Prime Minister about it, I am sure, he will say that there is no crisis, everything is alright and God will look after us, I think, it is only God, who can save us from the present situation. We have reached such a situation, where God alone can save us.

Shri Dinesh Battacharya : He God or She God?

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : If you want, She God. I would like to touch two points on the political picture. How are the States functioning? Why go to the States on all sides; let us look at the States which are being run by the Janata Party. In the last two or three months, there was a competition in unsettling the state administration of these Governments. When the top leadership is interested is unsettling the administration in the States and creating some sort of a chaotic situation, who is going to save the political situation and what is the political atmosphere is going to be. It is better not to talk about it.

We talk about indiscipline. I am going to come to the Police Strike. It is stated that discipline is important. Yes. But it is not merely a word, but an attitude. You are not running your own party or your own Governments in a proper method, but in a fictional manner, and interested in toppling the State Governments. What is the significance of that toppling is that the Upper classes have combined against the poor people in the country, the rural people in the country. This is the significance of the unsettling of the Governments. (Interruptions) I said the truth and I got the response from there. This is about the unsettling of the State Governments.

The communal troubles-that is the most shameless thing that is happening in this country. Well, the communal troubles have taken place on earlier occasions also but only for two, three or four days even in the worst times. But now, it goes on for months together. If trouble starts, it goes on - Jamshedpur, Aligarh, Nadia (interruptions) I am talking about the national situation. I am mentioning that because it is happening there, what can I do about it? The most important thing is that the Muslims are feeling unsafe in this country. They do not have faith in the Government. The minorities question is also there. I am also a sitting member of the Communal Harmony Committee appointed by the Prime Minister. We have decided that every party will give its own note. But the basic theme of my note would be that ultimately the test

of communal harmony will be, we will have to achieve it. It is not you and .I who can decide this matter. What is it that the minorities want? Only recently, two or three days before, Jamiat Ulema - I, has started a movement of civil disobedience. That is an organisation of patriots, who fought against the British imperialism and who fought against the two-nation theory, who are with India and they are now coming on the streets, offering civil disobedience. Is it nor our duty to respond to their demands? (Interruptions) I am told that threats are being given to them. They are ten times better patriots than anyone else who can claim to be so. So, this question of communal harmony and the problem of minorities is a very important one.

Now, a Bill has been encouraged in the name of Freedom of Religion Bill and a general atmospheres being created that the Government is behind it. When Government is asked to explain its attitude, they give some sort of a vague reply meaning thereby that they are not opposed to what Mr. Tyagi wants. Do you want Christians to feel the same thing, what Muslims are feeling in this country? This is what is happening in two years. Where has the situation come to? This is how the affairs of the country are being managed. This is how the national affairs are being looked after. The basic issues are being completely neglected. Very minor things are being given a priority in this situation.

Take the situation in the north-eastern region. It is a very important part of the country. It consists of areas where there are international borders; it is an area which has possibilities and potentialities of insurgency. How are you going to deal with this? This is the most important thing. I am not sure that this question is being wisely tackled. If you merely tackle it with guns, no question can be tackled with guns. I do not say, gun will not be necessary. I am not taking that position. But ultimately, you will have to go through political efforts, persuade those people, persuade the leadership and continue this dialogue. It is the dialogue that means democracy and it is through dialogue that we will certainly

bring about a change in the situation. This will have to be done.

About the police revolt, only the other day this House discussed it for more than 3 hours. I do not want to go into more detail. But I would like to make one point. On the Government side, they made much of it. They said that they appointed the National Police Commission after 70 years. It is like a school master telling a school boy that he has made a very great thing. Are they aware why the National Police Commission was not appointed in between? During colonial time, there was the necessity of treating the whole police as a national police. After coming into existence of the Constitution, naturally, the responsibility went to the States. In the course of the last three years, practically every State has appointed a police Commission and tried to look after those question.

By appointing the National Police Commission, what did you do? You sit in your room and you consider yourself a nation and you appoint a National Police Commission. Did you make the National Police Commission work? Did you allow it to work as a National Police Commission? A bureaucrat was appointed and put as the Chairman of the National Police Commission....

Shri Saugata Roy : Mr. Dharm Vira, a discredited bureaucrat.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I will not say that. I will not criticise anybody who is not present here.

Unless you take the State Governments in confidence you cannot get the results. The State Governments have got their own problems. They have got their own financial limitations; they have got their own priorities in these matters. Certainly, you have to think about it. The Government of India has also got special police forces like, BSF, CRP, Industrial Security Force and so on. They can think about it also. But you did not allow them to work. I was told by a very responsible person - the Deputy Prime Minister Mr. Jagjivan Ram is not present here - in the Communal Harmony Committee, when we met, one of the Chief Ministers, the Janata Chief Ministers said, "Mr. Home Minister, what did

you do? You got the National Police Commission's Report and you treated a confidential document in the Home Ministry. But the copies of the Report of the National Police Commission and their recommendations were in the hands of the police. The State Governments were completely unaware of it."

This is how the administration is run. This is how you treat the national issues. If you appoint a National Police Commission, there is nothing wrong about it. I do not say that. But you should treat the national issues as national issues and try to deal with them as such. It is this very inefficient, negligent, bureaucratic method of looking to the national problems that has brought us to this situation. This is the political picture. The law and order situation is deteriorating every day; the communal situation is deteriorating every day; the Northern and Eastern India situation is deteriorating every day. Every problem that comes up, instead of being resolved, is being aggravated. This is the political picture, it is a very sad picture.

And what is the position on the economic front? It is equally tragic. (Interruptions). One sentence sums up the whole situation : production is falling and prices are rising. Only one sentence, really speaking gives a full picture of the Country's economy. (Interruptions) And what is the answer for that, that Government had got? The answer is 'Ordinances!' The relationship with industrial workers is very important in the field of production, if at all you want to manage production properly. What is your policy of having relationship with industrial workers?

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu : They are following your path.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : If they had followed our path, it would not have come to this pass. They would have survived for at least thirty years. We survived, despite you, for thirty years, Mr. Jyotrimoy Bosu. (Interruptions).

Agriculture production was showing some good signs for the last three or four years. Nature was very kind to us. I wish it will

be kind to us again this year. But it does not seem to be so because I have just heard reports from my State, that in my State, nearly 15 districts are under the shadow of drought. If this is repeated in two more states, things will grow still worse.

When the Finance Minister presented the Budget, he said that deficit financing will be of the order of Rs. 1300 crores or Rs. 1500 crores, whatever it is. But, after reading the Statement of the Petroleum Minister, it looks as though deficit financing this year is likely to be of the order of nearly Rs. 3,000 crores. I was rather modest, it would be about Rs. 4,000 crores, I believe. If this is the extent of deficit financing, how are you going to tackle the problem and the question of prices and inflation .run-away inflation in this country? The poor man's suffering will become worse and the rich men will certainly get away with it, as they always do and as they have always succeeded.

So, this is the economic picture : it is also very dangerously deteriorating. And this Government is not capable of providing any solution to the problems, that need to be provided : therefore this No-confidence Motion. We think that on the political front and on the economic front there is complete deterioration and there is no justification for this Government to remain as Government.

Now, we come to how the Cabinet is functioning. Normally, in any democratic society, the Cabinet sets the tone of administration; the manner in which they have relationship among themselves, the manner in which they have relationship with the public, the manner in which they deal with the issues as they arise. That creates a different atmosphere. This is how democratic society runs; democratic culture is developed that way. But how is this Cabinet functioning? Is there is coordination in the Cabinet? The Prime Minister has the reputation of being a strong willed Prime Minister and I know that he himself is an experienced Administrator and a strong man at that : I can tell you so from my own experience. But that is not enough. What is needed is some sort

of intelligent coordination and cooperation amongst the Ministers. The most important matters in this country are steel production, coal production, power production, petroleum, transport, cement, the Ministries dealing with these things are important.....

An Hon. Member : Airlines?

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : 'Airlines' is not so important.

But here we find that these Ministers make policy statements on their own which sometimes are found out to be not the policy of the government. The Prime Minister's views are somewhat different. Then what is the policy? There must be coordination among the Finance Ministry, the Planning Commission and the Prime Minister's Secretariat, particularly about the wage policy and certain economic policies. Unless there is coordination, things do not move as fast as they should. But here we find a complete lack of coordination between the Planning Commission and the Finance Ministry. Take the wage policy, for example. Certain individual Ministers go on making certain statements about wages, about bonus. I am not taking any view on merits on this matter. (Interruptions) If it comes to that, certainly we will take a view on that also. We are not in a hurry about it. I can only tell you that my sympathies are with the working class. (Interruptions). Do not suppose that you have the monopoly of leading them and looking after their interests (Interruptions) The wage policy, for example, is a very important policy and wage policy are very closely linked, and in these matters I find that there is a complete lack of coordination in the Cabinet. How are we going to get the result? On the contrary, this lack of coordination has created further difficulties and magnified our problems.

I find that there is a complete drift in the economic policy. If this drift in the economic policy is allowed to be continued, then we are going to see our end, sooner than expected. Who is responsible for this, this terrible situation that we are facing today in the country as I told you, the tragic destruction of the national ethos of secularism in this country, the sad picture on the political

front, a completely deteriorating picture on the economic front, a complete lack of coordination in the Cabinet and disruptions in the political party system.

Now, with these things, how is this Government going to give a lead to the nation when the country needs a lead? This is the time when Government and the leaders must come forward and give a lead to the people and say, 'Here we are with you; these are your difficulties; and these are the solutions that we want to give you.' That is what is expected of a Government. A democratic government does not merely want to rule; it has to lead the people, in every day life, in everyday situations; in every day problems. That is what we understand by democratic way of life.

This is the economic situation we are facing; this is the political situation. This is the feeling of the Harijans. What is happening to the Harijans? They are still the same neglected and exploited class in this country (Interruptions) We made a noise about it, we tried to do whatever we could, but we have not been able to achieve much. These are the issues that need answer, these are the issues which need leadership.

Government must provide the leadership and if the government is unable to provide the leadership, the only alternative before them is to get out. There is no other situation. It is not a question of trying to be goody-goody because as I said am doing my national duty. I am not speaking against anybody in any sense of hostility or dislike of anybody. I have got personally good feelings for everyone of you. But it is not the personal relations that matters most. It is the national issues and solutions for them that are needed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take more time at this stage. I will have the right of reply to the points that will be made on the other side. I think I have taken 30 minutes and I think it is more than enough for me at this stage.

I move my motion and hope that the House will accept it.

CHAPTER 24

BUDGET (MAHARASHTRA) 1980-81

Lok Sabha , 17th March 1980

EDITORIAL NOTE

After, the General Elections held in January 1980, Mrs. Indira Gandhi dissolved all the State Governments, ruled by non-Congress parties. That also included Maharashtra, ruled by the Progressive Democratic Front Government.

Commenting on the Budget Proposals presented to the Lok Sabha, Y. B. Chavan expressed unhappiness over the dissolution of State Governments by the Central Government. The Budget Proposals lacked socio-economic content and was merely an exercise in constructing, what Chavan called a 'bureaucratic budget.' He offered several suggestions based on his experience and intimate knowledge of Maharashtra.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Deputy speaker, Sir, I am indeed glad participate in this debate because the Finance Minister is presenting the Budget of Maharashtra on its new year day. I will, therefore, start by giving him greetings on this auspicious day.

When I am speaking on Maharashtra Budget, I find that there are two aspects of the Budget-one is the political aspect, which is not direct result of the Budget. But these Budgets are the product of that political aspect. Therefore, I Would be speaking symbolically

for all the States, whose Assemblies have been dissolved and whose Budgets are being considered. This political aspects is something, which is not very auspicious for this particular regime, for years to come.

I would like to give some history of this problem. This question of dissolving the State Assemblies after the parliamentary elections was started as a wrong precedent by the Janata Government, Unfortunately, those who claim to be very severe and acute critic of Janata Government are now walking on the footsteps of the Janata Government by dissolving Assemblies of an equal number of States, 9 State Assemblies. I think, this is a very wrong thing. I would like to remind this Government that Mrs. Gandhi as a leader and as a Prime Minister of a previous Government, had taken a decision to de-link the State elections from the parliamentary elections. What was the point in de-linking? The point was that State issues are different; State issues are considered by the people in the different manner. So, the verdict of the people should be taken separately. When those issues are being judged by people and a certain Government is functioning arid as long as there is no constitutional break-down, it is absolutely undemocratic and arbitrary to dissolve such a Government. If Assembly had met and confidence was expressed in the Government by the Assembly that proves that the Government had got a stable majority in the Assembly. Even then it was the sweet will of this Government to dissolve such an Assembly. It was a very unfortunate for India's democratic traditions that such things can take place, where a dozen people sitting in some room of the south Block are undoing what the millions of people have done at the time of elections in 1978. This is, what was done.

Why I am mentioning this political aspects is that it has made this Budget a bureaucratic Budget, a worst Budget. When the political leadership is an authority, when the Planning Commission is in authority, there are certain social and economic priorities which are taken into account while formulating the Budget. Today; we

find that there is neither the Planning Commission nor the political leadership of the state Government. The State bureaucrats come to Delhi under instructions from another group of bureaucrats. They sit with other bureaucrats in Delhi, take some view and what is formulated as a Budget, is placed before us.

I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister : What are your priorities after such an important election result? Are you still only concerned with your domestic intrigues of a political nature? Don't you think what the socio-economic problems have got a higher priority for your consideration? How would you consider socio-economic problems when you have not got the properly constituted Planning Commission functioning. Two months have passed but there is no Planning Commission. We were ridiculing the Janata Party for the rolling plan concept. But now the whole plan text seems to have been rolled up, and there is nobody to guide the 9 States, whose budgets are prepared for one year for all practical purposes. Though it may be a Vote on Account for some months, once the framework is laid down, it is very difficult to make important changes in the budget later on. Therefore, I feel this Government must sit down and seriously consider what are their priorities. The socio-economic problems should get priority.

We just now had a row in the House about harijan houses being burnt or their being beaten mercilessly. We have the problem of prices. For instance, in Maharashtra, there is an agitation going on about onion prices, which have fallen steeply, and the Government agency which was expected to purchase it is non-cooperating by refusing to purchase it. There was police attack on these people and hundreds of people have gone to jail. I am just mentioning one instance. When these problems are exercising the minds of the people, how can you say that these are not your priorities. Therefore, first of all, please make up your mind about priorities. Instead of dissolving the state Assemblies, you should have done something better.

My main point is that when a party gets a mandate of this nature,

that party should not seek a confrontation. I can understand an opposition party trying to seek confrontation. But here I find that the Government itself has started this confrontation in the country. What India needs today is some sort of reconciliation with the people. They have come out of the experience of an Emergency time; they have also come out of an experiences of unstable Government. I think the time has come when some thought should be given as to how to reconcile on the major issues. This cannot be done on political terms; it can be done only on the background of the solution of the socio-economic problems. Therefore, I would request the Finance Minister to advise the Prime Minister to give priority to the constitution of the Planning Commission. Since the House is sitting, we should know who are the members of the Planning Commission. While the Cabinet is important and Parliament is important, in the process of development Planning Commission is also a very important forum, and so we should know about its constitution early.

As I have said, this is not a proper budget. It is rather a bureaucratic budget, which is not conisered by the political leadership at any stage. Yes, certainly, Shri. R. Venkatraman, the Finance Minister, as the political leader is handling it, but at the preparation stage it was not in his hands. In fact, that is how he explained it on the first day when he introduced the Assam budget. So, I would request him to give more thought to this problem.

Coming to the budget proper of Maharashtra, the ex-chief Minister, Shri Sharad Pawar, had issued a statement that no new items have been included in the budget. When a criticism of this type comes from a person who was handling he matter, it needs due consideration. Well, the Finance Minister might point at some minor points and say that these are the new items here and there. Some authority of the Maharashtra Government have circulated a note, which I have with me, and I find that there is nothing new in it.

Here, I would invite attention to one aspect. The elected Government of Maharashtra was giving priority to the problems of what they call, defaulters. A large number of small agriculturists and the co-operative movement dealing with agriculturists is in a terrible mess today.

Sir, one thing should be taken care of in this country more particularly in those areas which are drought prone areas, because in drought prone areas the problems also becomes serious. Even when there is no drought, the small-agriculturist, the agriculturist who has got about a couple of acres of non-irrigated land or three acres of such land, even when there is good rain, he cannot maintain his family on income from agricultural operations on that land.

In the field of industry, we try to deal with the sick industrial units. May I request the Finance Minister, because it is the political leadership which must give lead in this matter, that instead of treating the sick industries you better treat the sick individual industrial units, you also better treat the sick individual agriculturist because he is also in an industry, and try to find out a way for those agriculturist. The Government can certainly find out a way for them, and that way should be only that some of their non-recoverable arrears, must be written off. That is the only way. You give incentives for starting industries in backward areas and you certainly write off or you certainly give exemption in taxes. Here only the legal concept of whatever is due is to be recovered. Sir, this is very inhuman and when you say you want to give priority to the agricultural sector, this particular aspect must be given special attention to. A scheme has been included in a very mutilated form I would ask him to call the officers and find out, in what original form this scheme was contemplated. Maharashtra State certainly can take financial risk in this matter, because this is one of the States whose finances are well managed and who can afford to take socio-economic risks in taking some bold decisions and showing a new way in this particular matter. So, this question

of the scheme for defaulters and treating them as sick units and giving them some facilities for them should be settled because being defaulters they do not get tacavi from the Government, they do not get credit from the bank. Not only that, the Government officers go and auction whatever they have got in their own premises. So, this question needs priority consideration.

I would like to mention another thing which is based on my impression of the Budget. The rate of rise or the rate of growth or increase of expenditure on education was previously considerable in this State. I find this rate of growth of expenditure on education has practically come to a standstill. There may be some technical growth, but there is not high priority consideration for education, particularly technical education, professional education, education to the backward classes and education in the rural areas. These are the matters which require consideration. I hope, Mr. Finance Minister, you will look to this particular aspect of Maharashtra Budget and try to do what you can do. The Plan was expected to be of Rs. 1,000 crores. I find that is being reduced. The State certainly can implement plan of that order if the Finance Minister can help the State, to work out the Budget ambitiously. You should aspire and show courage to have an ambitious plan, because from the information that is provided here, it is clear that they themselves have raised quite sufficient resources. They have had the capacity to raise the resources. Here you are not helping the States which have the capacity to raise the resources. You better do that and let them have a little more opportunity. Naturally, I am glad that some reasonable amounts have been provided for the two important sectors of irrigation and power. These are two very important sectors and they have made a reasonable provisions for this. I would however like to sound a note of caution here and that is, whether the potential that is created for irrigation is actually used or not, is a most important matter and that will have to be seen. We have to see whether the investment in power is made according to schedule and giving the result that is needed. Irrigation is important from the agriculture point of view, and rural

areas point of view. Power is also more important from the rural areas point of view and agriculture point of view.

Sir, I have made a general reference to problems, but the point that I have particularly mentioned about the defaulters and about the potential of irrigation etc. should be carefully considered. About the political aspect, I know we will have to take more time when the issue directly comes before us.

CHAPTER 25

CONTINUANCE OF PRESIDENTS RULE IN ASSAM

Lok Sabha , 10 June 1980

EDITORIAL NOTE

Y B. Chavan delivered his Speech in the context of proposal to extend the Proclamation for the President's Rule in Assam. This Speech is illustrate of his grasp of Assam's intricate problems especially arising from the influx of foreigners. In his speech, Chavan offered several suggestions for finding a negotiated solution to the Assam Problem.

Mr. Chairman : Now, we take up further discussion of the Statutory Resolution regarding continuance of the Proclamation in respect of 'Assam.

Mr. Y. B. Chavan : We are discussing the statutory resolution brought forward by the government to extend the President's rule in Assam for an another term of Six months. I think this is a formality with Which I agree. Standing here, I support that motion.

But, we are not merely discussing the formality. We are discussing in depth the Assam question. What is the Assam problem? What is its face? How it should be dealt with and in what manner? These are the problems before us and I think, before every political party in the country and I would say, before every patriotic citizen in this

country.

When this movement started, at that time I had an occasion to deal with it in the previous government. At that time the demand was that the elections should be given up and as a result the elections could not be held in many parts of Assam. Nobody should even for very good purposes try to block the democratic process of holding elections in the country when the national parliament was going to be constituted. Naturally, I had tried my best in meeting the students delegations, political parties delegations and in one of the trips to Gauhati, even after staying there for a couple of days, these efforts could not produce any results because I knew that the problem is not amenable to a simplistic solution. There are deep fears, suspicions and anger involved in this. This is based on the feeling that there are large numbers of foreigners staying in Assam and as a result of which the people of Assam felt that economically and culturally they are overwhelmed and, therefore they should be deported. (Interruptions). Quite right. As you say, they want that they should be deleted from the voters list. First of all, they did not want elections and now they want the voters lists should be purified according to their concept of purification. I personally feel that there is a deep contradiction in Assam's life because this problem is a very complex problem - the problem of the so - called - foreigners. It is a complex problem and in a way it is an accumulated problem because in the course of 10 to 20 years this question has been raised many times. I remember having dealt with it as the Home Minister and I then agreed to appoint tribunals to look into the cases of suspected foreigners. I do not know how those tribunals came to be discontinued. Personally, I am not aware of it. I persuaded them to have the tribunals so that there may be some machinery which can help to remove the suspicious in their minds.

Now the point is that very extreme positions have been taken. The people who are the sponsors of the movement feel that there

are more than fifty to sixty lakhs of people who are foreigners. Of course, some of us and I think all the parties - I am sure about it - agreed to one thing, that this question will have to be solved through negotiations and when we say that this problem should be negotiated, it presumes that there are some foreigners. There are some foreigners and that section of foreigners should be dealt with. The question is : how it should be dealt with on what principles and criteria etc. Really speaking, these are the questions, the Prime Minister has given a call for the withdrawal of this movement and I, on behalf of my Party, support that call for withdrawal because unless there is withdrawal of this movement, there would not be any proper negotiations or proper discussions as to on what principles this should be discussed. In Assam, this is not an academic problem, it is a very serious political reality. What is at stake there is the entire north-east India. Therefore, I think any patriotic person must take care to safeguard the integrity and unity of this country. That is the first priority today. There is no doubt about that. Negotiations will have to be started for that. When Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi took over, she started well. She called the people; she called some of us, asked the party leaders, and discussed the matter with us. I think while some of us said that we may take 1971 as the cut-off-year, some others said that we may take 1961 as the cut-off-year. A majority of them said that we may take 1971 as cut-off-year. But later on, it was found out during the course of negotiations that the theory of taking any year as cut-off-year was not workable, because it would not create conditions to start negotiations. It was only for that reasons that it was said that this was not workable. Therefore, nobody is emphasizing now on that, at least, on the government side. As much as I could understand the Governments policy, I would say that they are not interested in any particular year as the cut-off-year. We will have to start negotiations. But, when you start negotiations, you will have to do that on certain principles. On what basis can we start that? First of all, we must make an appeal

to them to come there, sit with us and with leaders of country. It is not a question between government and Assam leaders in that movement. It is a question between India and one of its parts. It is an internal matter, wherein certainly be negotiations, we can find a solution.

Therefore, it was suggested that negotiations must be started. I must make one position clear. I endorse what Mr. Indrajit Gupta said yesterday. When the Ordinance was promulgated declaring that area as a disturbed one, I myself was very much distressed to hear that news. I wrote to Prime Minister saying that I am one of those who are interested in national solution. I am not for this type of dealing with the problem. This sort of repressive law is only counterproductive where feelings of million of people are involved and where masses are involved. I do not want to deny, or support, that there is not a foreign hand. So far as the Government is concerned, there is nothing new about that. I am quite sure from my general experience that whenever such a trouble tarts in India, foreign hands are always there. It has to be presumed. There is no necessity of having any specific evidence on that.

My main point is that this sort of repressive measure is not the way to deal with the problem. Of course, there is one exception to that and that I must make clear here. When it is a question of protection of minorities, whether it be linguistic or religious minorities, certainly, Government will have to firm about that. There may be Bengali Muslim or Bengali Hindus or there may be Biharis. They may be very much disturbed that they may get killed. Some figures were mentioned yesterday. I do not want to go into those figures. Even if one person is killed in an organized manner, it is the responsibility of the Central Government to use all possible force, to suppress it. There is no other way; there is no other solution for this particular matter:

So, my main point is that we should not think in terms of army and police to solve this problem. Here our people, rightly or

wrongly, led to believe that there is such a situation. There is an apprehension, that the social life of the people in Assam is being disturbed. There is a feeling that they are being overwhelmed. Psychologically they feel that way and they are convinced of that. Every official or non-official is involved in that movement. At the same time, there are some minorities who are living in fear there. This is the basic contradiction in Assam's life today. This is not something very complimentary to the Assam situation. I would say that, at least in the Indian context, that Government will be democratic government which guarantees the protection to the minorities. This is the first condition for any democratic government that is functioning. Therefore, I would say that while dealing with these things, Government will keep in its mind that this question cannot be solved with repressive measures, army's use or by bullets. Emphasis will have to be only on negotiations. Of course, in order to persuade those people to come to the negotiating table, we will have to wait for some time. We will have to think of another method, namely, to make use of political parties in this matter. I would suggest that it is not only that the Government should try they should also make use of the other political parties and, I think, political parties are prepared to give co-operation. In this matter I would request the Prime Minister not to criticise the Opposition by saying that they are not giving co-operation, because every one knows that when she called the very first meeting of the leaders of the Opposition, they endorsed her suggestion that this question is a major question and we will give all possible co-operation to find a solution. Therefore, this sort of criticism of Opposition parties unnecessarily, is proving to be provocative and then it leads to unnecessary criticism, unnecessary non-cooperation and unnecessary indifference.

Now, Sir, the other aspect I would like to touch upon is this. I do not say that before starting negotiations one should lay down the principles. As Mr. Frank Anthony said, certain basic constitutional provisions will have to be taken into consideration.

Certain international understandings will also have to be taken into consideration. It cannot be forgotten that there were, between our leaders and the leaders of the neighbouring countries, certain understandings. I do not want to restrict the scope of negotiations. My intention is not to do that. But this fact will have to be kept in mind and for that matter Assamese leaders of agitation will have to give thought about it. If they take a negative position, it will not be useful for them or for Assam or for India.

Sir, I again repeat my preposition that this is a mass-government based on certain pre-conceptions or may be certain misconceptions. One cannot deny there are foreigners. I think there are foreigners and they will have to be identified and this process of identification is more difficult. The negotiations are becoming difficult because identifying the foreigners in Assam is the most difficult task, because there are people who came there over the last thirty years, and they have had their children born here.

An Hon'ble Member : Should they be treated as foreigners?

Shri Y. B. Chavan : How can they be treated as foreigners? They are as good Indians as you and we are. So the basic position is that it will take some time. Sir, I would like to think aloud because I have dealt with this problem in some manner. There is not going to be some fixed solution or there is not going to be some simplistic solution. It will take time. One will have to show patient Government will have to show patience and never give up their efforts negotiate because these questions can be solved only through reconciliation with the people and in no other way. So, this one proposition should be kept mind and I would like to say that this is our general approach to the problem. I am representing my party here and putting its approach to the problem. We want to give co-operation to the people of Assam and also the Government India to find a solution in this matter and, I hope, in the interest of India ultimately we will succeed, in solving the problem through negotiations.

CHAPTER 26

DEMANDS FOR GRANT MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, 1980-81

Lok Sabha , 8th July 1980

EDITORIAL NOTE

The Speech is illustrative of the grasp the Y. B. Chavan had acquired over foreign affairs. It also exhibits his world view of India's International relations.

In this speech Chavan has extensively dealt with his perspectives about improvement of relations with China.

Shri B. Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, while participating in the debate on Demand, I must make one point clear. Though it is called a debate on Demands, foreign policy is normally based, by and large, on a national consensus and, therefore, I have always stated that this debate is a sort of loud thinking in this House. So, whatever I say, will be taken in that spirit. This is my first point.

When we take a review of the international situation today, I think we find one basic difference between the 1970s and 1980. This is the first year of a new decade when we find that the world of 1970s was a better than what it is today in 1980s. While 1970s was a decade of detente, 1980s seems to be a decade of crisis, a decade of confrontation, of another war. This is the situation that we see today in 1980. The situation has worsened, not only in our part of the world. Because of the situation in the neighbourhood,

naturally in our region there is tension, there is an extremely grave situation and, as somebody had said the cold war has reached our doorstep. I think that description is quite correct. But if you see the world as a whole, what is happening in this part of the world a reflection of the new situation that is developing in the world today. I see one the basic difference that, in the 1970s the scene of activities and the focus of operation was Europe. I don't think the problems of Europe have been solved as yet or have been minimised, but the focus has shifted from Europe to Asia, particularly South Asia and West Asia. This is the basic difference that we see.

Why has this happened? Naturally there are many causes, but this change has come about - from a decade of detente to a decade of confrontation and of crisis - because the perceptions of the super powers, of each other, are completely changed. And this is the basic reason for this change, as I see it.

Detente was considered possible because, possibly, the U. S. A. looked at the USSR in a different light. Possibly they looked themselves in a different light. At the present moment they are looking at it in a different light.

One of the well known American statesman has called the situation in the Middle East and in Africa in the terminology of geography; he said that this is the 'crescent of crisis.' From north-east Africa, taking the Middle East and the South Asia, including Turkey and Iran, he considers this to be a sort of 'crescent of crisis'. And if we see the things, it appears to be true.

If at all India is to consider the problems of its foreign policy, naturally it will have to be done on the backdrop of this world situation. That is why I made a reference to the world situation, and whatever is happening in our part of the world, also will have in other parts of the world.

If we come to the crescent of the crisis, we see that the

problems of the Middle East are still unsolved. On the contrary I would say that, despite the Camp David Agreement and many talks between Israel and Egypt the Middle East still continues to be an explosive problem; not only an explosive problem, but an explosive area. The question of Palestine is still alive; not only alive but unsolved; and there are not even remote chances of its being solved in the near future. Turkey is in difficulty. If we see Iran, the whole history of Iran that should open the eyes of all developing countries. The U. S. A. adopted it as a friend and tried to give it strength and base-some sort of strength-in Asia. But what did they do? They tried to build up a structure of modern power on the basis of a feudal system and, therefore, the entire modern power structure collapsed under its own weight when the future of the feudal system became dark. The Shah-en-Shah - I am sorry for him - he had to leave. He is not well today. I am not criticising anybody. But that is the difference between the policy of an imperialist power and the policy of any developing country trying to get itself involved in the net of a bigger power, imperialist power. This is the fate that they will ultimately meet with. When we are considering the neighbourhood of India, we will have to consider these problems more carefully. What has happened in Pakistan is causing us concern. I am glad that we have taken many initiatives and tried to improve our relations in the last four or five years, not only, by one administration, then during the Janata regime; then, Mr. Foreign Minister, you have carried the same message forward and tried to improve the relations with Pakistan. This is what we have to do. We do not want Pakistan to be in trouble. I pray that Pakistan remains stable and powerful. But looking to the basic conflict between the people of Pakistan and its military rulers. One shivers to think what is in store for Pakistan in future. And this is something very serious. It is not a matter of satisfaction to India at all. It is a matter of great concern to us. In a neighbouring country, if some sort of instability being built up, what happens to India is the next question; therefore, we have to worry ourselves. So, this is the picture of the Middle East. Iran

going this way and Pakistan that way. So, in this background we have to consider some of the questions that 1980 has confronted us with.

The first problem is the problem of Afghanistan and I can say with satisfaction that the position we have taken, this government has taken and this country has taken is basically a balanced position. Of course, we have taken a position that we cannot justify sending of an army by one sovereign country into another sovereign country. We have said that we cannot justify. This is the position we have taken and I think this was appreciated by many countries in the world. At the same time, there is another aspect about which we have taken a position that the conditions in Afghanistan - Afghanistan is a friendly country and nonaligned country- a sovereign country are such that somebody from outside, reactionary forces from outside tried to interfere with its internal affairs. That also is a matter which cannot be supported. Here again, I must say that we will have to see the perception by the USSR of the other forces. I think, what our Prime Minister was saying, is very correct that Soviet Russia gets a feeling of being encircled. If President Carter feels that his national interest gets threatened if something happen to the Gulf, should not USSR feel threatened if something happens to its nextdoor neighbour, Afghanistan? This is exactly what happened there, They feel that they are being encircled. Therefore, there is no necessity to go far, to seek the reasons and the compulsions, which ultimately led Soviet Russia to send its forces in Afghanistan.

But I am glad that they have taken a position - we have also made our contribution by putting up these problems in a very correct way to Soviet Russia - that the Army will have to be withdrawn and they have conceded this point. And the Army will be withdrawn when the causes for which they were sent, ceased to exist. Sometimes we had ourselves also sent our army across the borders. But, fortunately the causes for which we sent our Army were removed within a few weeks and, therefore, our Army

could come back very soon.

I agree that Soviet Russia on the one side and the USA on the other side are super powers. They are global powers but like Mr. Chandrajit Yadav, I would not like to put them in one bracket. It is a fact of political reality that they are super powers and global powers. They have a global strategy and global interests. But one thing which is more important is: What is our experience of the super power called, the United States of America? And what is our experience of the super power called, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the USSR?

In the last 25-30 years, since, I think, Khrushchev visited in 1955, nearly 25 years or more than that have passed we have found that in every difficult time and in every crisis and in every process of development, Soviet Russia has stood by India, and that is what is more important. Whether, one is a super power or not a super power, is not the problem. That is the difficulty of USA.

They are a super power and we are not grudging it. But how they are using their capacity of influencing the world situation that is more important. And it is very interesting to see how they do that. They have not got in their policy frame-work anything which will look into the problems of political and social changes in the world.

Therefore, if you see from Vietnam onwards, all along, whether it may be in South America, whether it may be in South Africa or whether it may be in South East Asia or in the Middle East, the U. S. A. its forces, its power and its wealth and its prestige have always gone to the help of the reactionaries and the keep the status quo. This is the difference. Normally, they are called superpowers looking to their structure, their military capabilities, their wealth and their capacity etc. to influence the world. They are super-powers in that sense. But, I won't put them in one bracket. I would only weigh it in the light of our own experience

of the national interests. As to how one country behaves with the other countries and how the other countries behave with us is the test; we cannot afford to forget the tilt of the U. S. A. against India in 1971 when India was passing through a most difficult period.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would give my compliments to our country. It is not a question of giving a compliment to Shri Rao or to the Prime Minister individually. It is really a matter of pride for our country that our country has taken the correct position. Why we have been able to do that is the most important point to which I am coming to. That is because basically our approach has been in the interests of world peace. Our interest is not on the side of one superpower or the other because we are wedded to non-alignment. This is one key policy that India has accepted and, as long as we stick to the key policy of nonalignment, our answer will be absolutely correct whatever may be the issue or problem that comes up.

So, in this difficult situation, what do we do? In the recent months, we have got another problem that is, the problem of China, because China has made a move for solving the problem of the boundary question. We rather talk too much of the boundary problem between India and China. Well, certainly, this is the most important problem that will have to be solved. But, how and in what manner is the most important question. According to me, the most important question between China and India is to restore the position of friendship and trust that we enjoyed before 1962. The worst thing that happened between China and

SELECTED SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT 181

India is not only the coming of the faith in the friendship that is what has happened, and that has done an irreparable harm to India-China relationship. That will have to be restored first. Unless

that is done, how can you solve the border problem?

Shri Rao has made a very balanced, tactful, statement about the offer of China for solving the issue. It is quite all right as far as it goes. But, we have to look at China's relations from a fundamental point of view. I have my own doubts about the bonafides of the Chinese. But I don't make that an issue. Even this offer, it is very interesting to see, has come through a journalist, and that too when? When one of the Secretaries of the External Affairs Ministry was going to be in Peking to start consultations and discussions with them, the very next day, they gave this proposal to a journalist. That is what they call diplomacy through people. This is their technique not to directly recognise the Government but to talk over the head of the Government to the people and to say, "Look, how friendly we are. We are prepared to solve the problem. Now the ball is in your court. See what you can do. If you can do, it is good. Otherwise..."

Here I would like to say one thing. The problem will have to be tackled in a more basic manner, in a more fundamental manner. If at all we have to see China, we will have to see what China's world perception is. Naturally, as far as bilateral relationship between India and China is concerned - I was in the External Affairs Ministry when the Government of India decided to improve relations with China - I am entirely for improving the relations between India and China. Bilateral relations, by all means, let us try to improve them. But the real test of improvement of relations ultimately lies on how they look at the world. My fear is : their basic concept of the world is that a third world war is inevitable. They do not believe in detente. May be, there is a conflict of policy and ideology between the USSR and China. May be, because there are conflicts of national interest between the two countries. I do not know. It is possible true. But, looking to the basic problems, in recent times, we have seen good words used by the Chinese for the non-aligned movement. But at one time they were very critical of the non-aligned movement.

They wanted a third bloc, but changed their attitude when they found it is not possible for them to do that. After Dr. Henry Kissinger made a secret visit to Peking, Chinese and Americans started coming together and I would say that is a moment, since when, the world situation started worsening. If I may put it that way, both of them are clever partners because Americans think of using the Chinese card and Chinese think of using the American card in their own interest. I do not know ultimately who uses whom. That is a different matter. Naturally, there is an atmosphere in the country and I do not want to say anything inconsistent with that, that is, improvement of relations between India and China is necessary because she is one of our next door neighbours, she is a big country and our relations with her are ancient.

Sir, we have taken a very correct position from the very beginning. Even when they were non-friendly with us, we had not changed our position. Pandit Nehru made the assessment of the relationship of China and, I think basically he was right, but he got the shock of his life, when they sent their armies across the border. That was the worst disappointment Pandit Nehru faced in his life. We do want to improve the relations, but we do not want to take, any wrong step or any hasty step. Any type of euphoria must not be allowed to envelope us while assessing the issues involved. Assess the issues in the correct perspective and deal with the same objectively and correctly. As far as China is concerned, I think, I have made my point.

Sir, what is the policy that we have to follow ultimately. It comes back again to the same thing - non-aligned movements. It is a good thing that we have made very valuable contributions in the course of the last 25 to 30 years in the development of that movement. But I would like to warn the government that in days to come there are going to be very heavy pressures on the non-aligned movement and there would be efforts to disunite this movement. There would be efforts to wean away people on some theoretical grounds here and there and say that this is what is to

be done, this is what will have to be rejected and accepted. Some theoretical points may be raised and that danger will have to be kept in mind. They have always done that. It is not for the first time that they will do it now. But in years to come, particularly in this decade - take the question of Afghanistan, for example they will try to divide the countries on the basis of Islamic and non-Islamic countries. They will try to divide the countries on the basis of small countries and big countries. India has got one problem. Unfortunately, India has been misunderstood because it is a country of a very big size and it is not our fault that we are a big country. But we never tried to behave like a big brother. We tried to understand the difficulties and problems of the neighbouring countries though they may be small, viz. Sri Lanka, Burma, Nepal, Bangladesh, Bhutan and Pakistan. These are all countries we never considered them small countries. They are equally big countries for us, though geographically in terms of population and economy we may be a little stronger, and we will continue to be stronger. There is nothing wrong about it. It is a question not of strength but of the attitudes and philosophies that ultimately moves one to act. That is more important. And it is the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi that guides us. This non-alignment approach, really speaking was inherent in a form, before, and during the days of freedom struggle. It is a gift coming from the independence movement. Has it grown out of nothing? No. It has grown out of a very long history of freedom struggle. When the Cold War was in its intense form this present formula was worked out. So, we have to ultimately come to this and try to work creatively. It is not enough to talk in terms of catchy phrases about non-alignment and things like that. It is now not a question of formulating the theory of non-alignment, but, applying it to a given situation. And that is what is more important. Application of theory of non-alignment in the coming days, in the coming decade, is going to be more important. And therefore, I would like to say, it is going to be a challenge to the policy makers and diplomats of India. India should be aware of this situation, that there will be pressures on

the non-alignment movement, to divide us and so on, and we will have to work creatively to see that we do not get ourselves divided, but at the same time, we should not lose our initiative in this particular field. According to me, the main strength behind non-alignment is self-reliance.

Yesterday, I think Shri Chandrajit Yadav made that point, that this mantram of non-alignment by itself is not going to help unless you build your nonalignment on a strong self-reliant economy. Non-alignment part of the foreign policy is also a policy of self reliance. For that matter ultimately you cannot divorce foreign policy from internal policies. We will have to build India on a more equitable basis, on a more strong basis. Now a days we heard less from the Government about socialism. I hope they have not forgotten about it. We have made amendment of the Constitution and we have accepted it as one of our objectives.

Shri Indrajit Gupta : (Basirhat) : The less we hear the better, that also has become a mantram.

Shri Y B. Chavan : Even as a mantram, that way at least, we should hear from responsible people, it will be much better if we hear more and more of it. I am not so pessimistic as Mr. Indrajit Gupta is. I have had some experience of this party's Government functioning.

Now, I come to the question of Indian ocean as a zone of peace. This has become another mantram. I quite agree that we do want Indian ocean to be peaceful zone. I am not going to compromise on this or trying to withdraw from it. The demand will have to be much more organised and its content will have to be a little more aggressive. Unless it is more aggressive nothing is going to happen. But I can tell you, that when we talk about Indian ocean as a peace zone with some of the Western diplomats, they feel this is from my experience I have learnt - we are uttering it as a mantram. It is not being taken very seriously. That is the main difficulty about it. They feel that Indian's Foreign Minister, when he talks about India as a peace zone, has to put up this point of view

as a routine thing. Big powers don't go by advises. Having a base in Diego Garcia is one of the worst sins that USA has committed as far as our part of the world is concerned. This will have to be challenged. I think Mr. Chandrajit Yadav said about the need to give an ultimatum. I don't know how you can give ultimatum. I don't know how you can do it. You will have to work through International diplomacy, through the instrumentality of UN, You should work out dynamic unity among the littoral countries of the Indian ocean will help.

In this matter, I would like to say, though it is not strictly an External Affairs problem that the problem requires some projection in the Defence policy also. We still continue to allow our Navy to play a junior partner's role in our Defence forces. It is a long term thing because from my experience of the Defence Ministry, I can say that we can build our army within 3 or 4 years, we can build our air-force within half a decade, but we cannot build our Navy within this period unless you concentrate on it for a decade or so. It takes longer time to do that. That is why in the last 15 or 16 years, we have done a lot. My argument is that we are not going to meet the challenge of Diego Garcia with our Navy. But where a danger is growing in the sea, at least we should be able to guard our coast and defend our coast, particularly in the context of the changed situation. Therefore, Pam just making a mention. I think if you can pass it on to the persons concerned or the authority concerned, they can act accordingly.

Now, the main line of argument that I was making is that the world situation is not easy today but it is a changed situation, extremely grave and in this grave situation, if you have to carry on the foreign policy of India, you will have to be very alert. You will have to be very conscious of your fundamental policies, you will have to be more creative in your approaches. If you do that, it will be a good thing. I want to make 3 or 4 specific suggestions and after having done that, I will conclude.

The network of the bilateral relations both in the political an

economic field is more important for India. But this network will have to be built up more properly. Yesterday, Mr. Yadav made suggestion about the Helesinki type conference. I am not ambitious to think in terms of Helesinki conference, I would say, if I am permitted, that it is unrealistic because the Helesinki type conference is quite different proposition. But I certainly would like the Government to take initiative in calling a conference to develop some sort of collective self reliance among the non-aligned countries. This is a new form of non-aligned movement. It is not enough to have some sort of understanding of non-aligned principles in the political field, but there will have to be a growing economic co-operation for strengthening this self-reliance of all the non-aligned countries. This is the first priority in the non-aligned world today and in order to achieve that, I would suggest, if at all, you are considering or talking of any conference or taking any initiative, you had better start, to start with, an Asian non-aligned conference excepting a few countries like China, Japan, South Korea and one or two other countries. Most of the other Asian countries are non-aligned countries. This is one of the advantages as far as we 'are concerned. Therefore, we can certainly show some creative statesmanship in doing this thing. I would like to make one more suggestion.

I said already that there will be a pressure on the unity of the non-aligned world. So you will have to be more careful. How you do that, you will have to plan and for that matter I will have to make additional suggestion. Better look to the Policy Planning Cell in the Ministry. That is more important. Whether it is diplomatic side or area-wise side, it is quite all right. It is working normally quite good. But I think what we have neglected so far is the policy planning the intellectual input in framing out the options for the Foreign Minister. The Foreign Minister should have half a dozen options and he should be able to choose one of them; he should be able to anticipate things.

Sir, the policy planning cell of the Ministry of External Affairs is

very much neglected. Government should carefully consider how it could be made more effective. I know it is not very easily done, merely recruiting so-called intellectuals and asking them to sit in the Ministry of External Affairs, that does not mean anything. Foreign Policy planning will have to be carefully considered. I would suggest that you go deeply into this matter and then carry on.

CHAPTER 27

MOTION REGARDING RISE IN PRICES OF ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES

Lok Sabha , 25 November 1980

Y. B. Chavan was familiar with phenomena of rising prices. He dealt effectively with the problem during his tenure as the Finance Minister.

In 1980, the prices were showing continuing increase. In this speech Chavan while sharing his own experience, advocated greater titter to the agricultural sector which in recent years had greatly contributed to the country's self-sufficiency in foodgrains, sugar etc. He also advocated subsidy for certain essential items particularly for the poor below, the poverty line.

Shri Y. B. Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think I am speaking practically at the fag end of the debate and I will not take much of your time. I will briefly mention some of the points that I have in my mind. I do not consider this discussion on the prices as a technical discussion on the prices in isolation. It is, as a matter of fact, a discussion on the functioning of the economy as a whole. The price rise or the price fall is an index of the functioning of economy as a whole and what is the health of the economy? Normally, we hear the health of the economy when the economic survey is submitted at the time of the Budget debate or Budget discussion. I think this is the time, when, I can say from my own experience, the economic adviser or economic specialist

in the Ministry of Finance is about the start writing his review. Really speaking, I take pity on the man. What can he write on the paper about it except to say that there was good monsoon and nothing more? Possibly he will, have to stop there!

I am reminded of a very fine and the wittiest congress leader Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramaiah. More than three decades ago, we were in my district. He came on a tour. Naturally, at that time, we were not in a position to provide a posh car to him. We got only a secondhand car and provided that car to him. He toured the district. When he came back, we asked him, "Were you comfortable?" He said, "Yes, yes, we were comfortable except the horn, we heard every other part of the car was making a noise." If we look at our economy and if I have to speak about our economy, I can say on the same line that except prices, everything else is falling. This is the position. I hope the Finance Minister would not take it amiss, because he is trying to do his best of the difficult situation. We know about it. This is not a personal criticism. This is the situation in which we have driven ourselves, whether it is due to this government or another government. But, what is the present situation that we must present here? We demanded a discussion on this because we wanted to reflect the feelings of the people of India today by saying that they are suffering under the pressure of prices. That is why we wanted to censure the government. You did not allow us to do that. Now, we are discussing price situation. But even discussion can censure the government, as a matter of fact, and that is what is being done. What is the situation of the economy? What are we going to do about the present situation? I do not want to go into details and give statistics which everybody has practically provided here. There is no doubt that there is a price rise; whether it started in 1977 or 1978, I can say about it from my own experience, because I happened to be the Finance Minister during those horrible periods of price rise of 1972-74.

I can tell Prof. Madhu Dandavate for his information that the price rise started falling some time in October 1974. After that

period, the process of falling prices continued further and the proof of it can be found in the Finance Minister's Budget speech of Mr. C. Subramaniam in 1975. Some people try to take credit of it for the Emergency. I would like to tell them that the emergency may have its advantages and disadvantages in other ways. I may like it or may not like it; I may have other criticism to offer, but the price fall has nothing to do with the emergency. It started with a package of a very difficult, very unpopular decisions in September 1974. Those decisions we took and a matter of fact, then the fall started; it continued in 1975; it also continued in 1976; it also continued in 1977. Janata Party inherited that fall and you maintained it, for some time.

I would like to say that was done by taking certain unpopular measures. Somebody has made an observation about the economic situation. I agree with it that the economic situation cannot be solved by political manoeuvres. The economic solution can be found out for solving the economic situation and, therefore, it is necessary to go to the heart of the problem.

If you do not mind, if you want criticism of a friend, see a sort of a sense of complacency, a sort of lack of direction, as far as the economic matters are concerned. There is refusal to use the talent in their own party. We do not offer it from our side. I do not want to mention names. There is unnecessary concentration of power somewhere; there is unwillingness to take decision. There is unwillingness to act independently and there is unwillingness to differ, where to differ is so very essential. That makes the working of the government and the working of the economy very difficult. What I do not like is the lack of direction, the sense of complacency that everything is all right. Of course I must admit that the Prime Minister in her interview had agreed that prices had risen. She has very wisely not promised a price fall; she very carefully said : we will try to make an effort and see how we can go about it. That is all right. But it is not enough. You will have to go forward and do something concrete. The basic area is the

public sector functioning. How do you improve the working of the public sector?

The hon. Finance Minister while presenting his budget made a statement on tackling the question of inflation. There are two ways. He said then that either you expand the supply or control the demand. He has taken to expanding the supply; that is what I understood him; if I am wrong he can correct me. At the present moment I have found that neither the supply has expanded nor is the demand controlled. What Mr. Kamal Nath was saying was right; I agree with him. In a developing country one cannot say that the country can go without any inflation at all. But how much? Even developed countries cannot bear an inflation rate of more than 4 per cent. The utmost that a developing country can have is about 4 to 5 per cent; that is one per cent more. One can understand it. How much deficit financing you could have ? Mr. Dandavate made a prophecy that the Finance Minister will come up with a deficit financing of Rs. 3,000 crores; I saw the Finance Minister moving his head horizontally and saying 'no'.

Prof Madhu Dandavate : He meant to say it was more than that.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : I do not know. I hope the Finance Minister is right and wish that he is not going to that length. Under the present pressure of inflation you will have only two alternatives; you increase the deficit financing, or you deprive your priority sectors, from further investment. In a developing country deficit financing has to be taken recourse to. But how much one could take recourse to that? If you go in for thousands you will ruin the country. What Charan Singh did and what you did this year has brought us to this position. The maximum deficit financing that a country like India can bear, according to my opinion, is Rs. 500 crores; that is the maximum, not more.

Shri Rajesh Pilot (Bharatpur) You are late in that discovery.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Better late than never. I must say that is my view. This is the position today. Agriculture, for example, it is the most important area of production. Nearly 70 per cent people of our country are engaged in agriculture. And only in that sector there is complete lack of incentive for production. What help India got in the last decade and a half is from the agriculture sector. As Indiraji in one of her interviews said that there were miracles to save India. I should say agriculture is one of the miracles. In the last decade and a half, Punjab, Andhra, Haryana and other areas have come to the help of India and they have produced more sugar and some other areas produced something more. What are we doing for the agriculture sector today? You are doing something here and there. You are doing something for irrigation I know. But the agriculturists as an individual, has to consider his economy. Does it profit him to continue to do production in the farming. Does it really speaking help him to continue farming? It is the question that any Government must ask itself. Unfortunately, the answer is 'No'. Whatever area you take, whether in agriculture - I do not know his name, one hon. Member said, we are Kulaks because we are supporting farmers. If supporting farmers is being Kulaks, we don't mind being Kulaks. We must support farmers. Farmers are the main supporters of India's economy. If the farmers had not done what they had done in the last decade and a half, we would have been nowhere. The movement that has started is really a stupendous movement. Take a warning from it. They wanted more price for sugarcane, in fact, all sorts of farm productions, onions, sugarcane, rice; wheat and whatever other production the farmers undertakes. Now, he has to use other inputs, industrial inputs for the production with a view to increase the farm production. There, you must go to his help and see that either you reduce the price of the inputs, or give them more prices, if necessary; you can increase the prices for the producers and increase the prices for the consumers also possibly. You will have to think of some idea of subsidy, and give subsidy to the

producers and also give subsidy to the consumer; that does not matter. (Interruptions). Anyway, you are having deficit financing. At least by doing some justice to some people, you have deficit financing. This all I can say. It is a very difficult problem. I know it is a very difficult problem. We are facing many contradictions in our socio-economic conditions. What is our basic purpose today? What is our basic direction? When I say direction, I mean our priorities. Our direction must be the transformation of the socio-economic conditions in our country. Whatever you do ultimately you will have to see whether you are doing it rightly or wrongly. The major areas of production are fertilizer, power generation, railways, coal, agriculture etc. These are some of the major areas of production. I know you have appointed a sub-committee. That is all right. But we do not know what the sub-committee is doing. What we want is not committees and sub-committees. What we want, and what the nation wants, are results. We do not see the results. We want to know whether there are results; you had said or you had promised the country that by expanding supplies you would control the inflation. You could have certainly done that. But there is no increase in the supplies. This is the tragedy of this country, and I would like to request because our criticism should be taken in a constructive spirit, we do not want to criticise you, for the sake of criticising. Mr. Sukhadia said that the opposition wants chaos. I can assure him, - we are old friends - we don't think in terms of chaos. We don't want chaos. We are not organising chaos. What we want is orderly progress of this country. What we want is consolidation and unity of this country. For that matter we have always offered our cooperation and we are always willing to offer our co-operation for that. But you have got your own fads and attitudes about the country and you say that the opposition is not co-operating. Unfortunately you are not co-operating with yourself. What can we do about it? That is the basic difficulty. Therefore, I would suggest, locate the basic and priority areas of production. Please find out more important sections of society which are necessary for production and what

incentive you want to give to them. If necessary, think about a subsidy. Ultimately you have to find out the prices of the essential items, particularly for the poor man who is below the poverty line, what he needs, at least identify 10-12 items for them. Don't tell them excuses about cost of production and, therefore, you will have to pay more. Think about some sort of political remedy for it. Think of some subsidy for it. At least to the people below the poverty line, you supply 10, 12 or 15 essential items. You have got the machinery for distribution. For more than two decades, we have got a distribution system. Improve upon it. Increase it. Make it effective and try to ease the burden on the shoulders of the poor people. This is the plea I want to make.

CHAPTER 28

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Lok Sabha , 31 March 1987

EDITORIAL NOTE

This is the last speech on Foreign Affairs that Y. B. Chavan delivered in the Lok Sabha. He strongly advocated strengthening of non-aligned movement, and economic co-operation among the third world countries to achieve greater self-reliance.

Shri Y B. Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am speaking at the end of the day. But there is one advantage that I am speaking after many people placed their points of view before this hon. House and I will have my share of putting my point of view.

Prof. Madhu Dandavate : All is well that ends well.

Shri Y B. Chavan : As far as the day is concerned, what Mr. Dandavate says is correct, all is well that ends well. That apart, I think that when we discussed this demand last year and when we are discussing this demand today, my mind goes back to the last one year, to what happened in the world in the neighbouring countries and in India's itself. And there we see a considerable change of situation, in the world situation, in the original situation and in the Indian neighbourhood. Things are getting troublesome.

I would like to use some stronger terms for it, but I am using rather very soft term. It is a dangerous situation that we are facing today. Therefore, Mr. Foreign Minister, you have got a very tough job, and I must say at the beginning that it is the duty of this House and every one of us, to support you and sustain you, in this troublesome and difficult job. I am sorry, my friend, Mr. Ram Jethmalani, is not here. When I was hearing his speech, I felt that I was hearing a speech of the Republican

Senator of the .USA. We have always considered the foreign policy of India to be a sort of policy of national consensus, and it has been so. I think, the House, last year, by and large supported this point of view - when I also spoke on this and the House welcomed this. Now, what has happened in one year that the situation has so changed? Let us go into the whole matter.

Let us take the question of Afghanistan. I am not going to pay any compliments to an individual; I am trying to pay compliments to the country as a whole, as a national policy. Have we departed from our basic approach on nonalignment in this particular matter. No, we have not justified the Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan. My Party has asked for its early withdrawal. I was seeing the Annual Report of this ministry; as far as Afghanistan is concerned, it has said the same thing there. We do not want the intervention of any country in any other country. We want a sovereign Afghanistan. Mark the word 'friendly' also. When we want a friendly Afghanistan, naturally the Soviet Russia also would expect that they should have a friendly Afghanistan. That is a different matter. We have not justified the Russian intervention. We have not also created a row, a meaningless row, about it. That is where the skill of running the foreign policy of a country comes in. Had we just merely joined the chorus of 'withdraw the Army' of some of the Western countries who, fir the sake of formality, go on saying but who in private agree with what we are doing. This is my impression; the Foreign Minister may, perhaps, confirm it. Some of the Western canaries except the U. S. A. and perhaps

the U. K. also - I really do not know - understand this position. Our position is that, as there should not be the intervention of the Soviet Army, there should not be the intervention of other political powers also in Afghanistan, so that it can give a reason for provocation to Soviet Russia. I think, the credit goes India that they initiated this proposition, that the Afghanistan problem can be only solved by political methods and by no other method. The initiative was taken by India - 'India' as a country, I am saying; I do not want to say 'Government'; I am talking in the name of India; they have taken the initiative in this matter, and this has been generally accepted by all; even in the Non-aligned Conference, they have accepted that. There is no military solution to this, there will be a regional war, if not World War. This is the reality of the situation that we are facing today. It is no use using very brave words and taking very brave positions. You have to live through a very dangerous period, and every second has to be lived through very carefully, very cautiously, at the same time keeping our principles in tact. I do not say, 'Compromise with your principles'. Never compromise with your principles. The Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference was held after many years, perhaps for the first time, in India; and I can say this from my personal experience. I was rather a little worried about the position India had taken; I had a fear that there would be some sort of a pressure on India in this Conference. Well, I am glad that this Non-Aligned Conference was held in India; it was held in India and that is the only reason why we could keep the unity of the non-aligned countries. This is the great achievement. Because I feel personally that non-alignment has been for quite some time - I have got experience during my time - under some sort of a pressure for the dilution of the principles of non-alignment, if not division in the movement of non-alignment. Therefore, there was a great danger of disunity at this non-aligned Conference but I must say that somehow India's efforts succeeded.

Some Members mentioned about the draft. The Foreign Minister

was good enough to send his original draft to some of the Members who were the Members of the Consultative Committee. I had seen that draft. Nobody had felt that this draft was going to be accepted as a whole. Not only in this Conference, but in all conferences, the host country always prepares the draft. The only thing is that it prepares a draft according to its own inclinations and it tries to persuade the other countries to accept it. But it does not mean that they are always accepted. More than a couple of dozens of amendments are always made. I remember the previous Foreign Ministers Conference held in South America ...

An Hon. Member : In Havana.

Shri Y B. Chavan : It was held in one of the South American countries. I forget the name of the country at the present moment. There also we saw that amendments had to be accepted. We did move certain amendments and they had to be accepted by the other people. So it always happens this way. Only because some amendments are passed, therefore, we cannot say that India has lost any ground or India was isolated. I do not consider that sort of thing. Even if we are isolated on certain principles, we prefer isolation also, if it comes to that. But there was no isolation. You did not allow ourselves to be isolated. That was a good thing.

One point that troubles me which, I must mention. We had mentioned Diego Garcia in the original draft and ultimately in the negotiations you had to drop that. I know the reasons for it. Possibly Shri Lanka pleaded. 'If you mentioned Diego Garcia, the Conference which was going to be held, America may not attend. I think this is diplomatic wisdom. Sometimes you agree to that. But for those who had the two drafts compared, India dropping the reference to Diego Garcia was rather disturbing. It was disturbing to me. I must confess this thing and this was one point which we noted in the final draft.

Ultimately, what are the principles on which the foreign policy of a country is to depend? According to me, there are two criteria.

One is the enlightened national interests. Second is the geo-political realities. If any country is not consistent with these two principles, if they do not keep the national interests in mind and if they forget the geo-political realities, it cannot survive in the present world. This is a very cruel and complicated world. It is not a easy and simple world to be explained away in simple moral terms.

We inherited Gandhiji's principles, we respect Gandhiji and we still call ourselves the children of Gandhiji. But Gandhiji was a wise man and a very practical man. He was against the use of arms. He was the most peaceful man But when the army had to be sent for the protection of Kashmir, he said, 'Go and send army.' He was a practical man who knew how the nation was to be led.

If there are any moral issues in the world today, there are two issues. One is the peace and war issue and the second is the issue of poverty in the world. These two issues are moral issues. Ultimately, what we do for our internal policies, on these two moral issues, I think Gandhiji would come and certain bless us if we try for these two moral issues. And I think, through our non-alignment movement, we are doing that, through our non-alignment movement, we are serving the cause of peace and, through our new economic order, we are trying to meet the other ones.

As far as the factual situation is concerned, one must say that it is no use merely talking that had Gandhiji been here, what he would have done? It is very difficult for anyone to tell. So, if Gandhiji had been here, perhaps, the world would not be in that bad condition, as it is today. Possibly, that would have happened. We cannot say about it. Gandhiji was a very practical man. He never said that India should not have army. He was against violence. But he never said that we should not have army for India. He said that independent India should have the army to protect its borders.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan was telling some of us when we met privately that if there was any trouble or any persecution against

the Pakhtoon people, he would advise the Government of India to send army across Pakistan. Not that he lived to do that. Nor are we going to do that. We would never have done it. His complaint was that we did not do what Gandhiji wanted us do. This was the complaint of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan which he publicly made in this country. That is not the issue. If at all you have to judge the foreign policy, it has to be judged on the basic two moral issues. These are the two issues on which you can judge our foreign policy. If our foreign policy serves the interests on these two moral issues very perfectly and very legitimately and within the limitation of the country in one's power, it is well and good. This can work wonders. That is very true.

Last year I said that the decade of detente had disappeared and an era of coldwar was round the corner. Now, I find things are still bad - rather worse today. Not only the detente has disappeared completely but confrontation has also started. The important thing that has happened in between the last debate and this debate was the election of President Reagan. I have nothing against anybody or against America or the American people as such. We want friendly relations with United States also we want friendly relations with U. S. S. R. The position is that the manner in which they are talking is not in the interest of World peace. One must accept this because what they are doing in our region is what frightens me. In the last two days, more disturbing news has appeared in the newspapers. First of all, we were told that Pakistan was not willing to accept the arms from the United States of America as a conduit to Afghanistan. We have seen the news; since yesterday we are reading news the Pakistan is saying that we not do that until we are given enough.' So it is a bargaining point. It was not a moral stand that they had taken that they would not accept arms to be sent through Pakistan to Afghanistan to fight the resistance there. They say that 'we will not do that until we are given enough.' This is a sort of bargaining. Mr. Foreign Minister, you should take note of one thing - there is an arms base in Diego Garcia. Unfortunately,

there is going to be an arms base in Pakistan. This is a dangerous position that we are facing today. I am not panicky about it. We want friendship with Pakistan, I think we should take all possible initiatives to develop friendship with Pakistan but the reality also should not be forgotten. Our own experience about the last ten or twenty years must not be forgotten. In the garb of these friendly talks, preparations go and when preparations go on and when there is enough arms, these have a bad tendency of tempting the persons to act aggressively.

I remember in 1965 when we met in Tashkant, we were talking socially with some of the Pakistani friends there. Naturally, the people were rather free after taking two or three pegs. I am a tea-totaller. One man rather made a very interesting joke. I could not forget it, I asked him : 'How, then you miscalculated and started this war?' He said : 'The difficulty with the Army Commanders is that sometimes they act first and think afterwards.' Well, you please keep this in mind that such miscalculations will not take place again. These miscalculations must not take place in an international situation, in military matters, in starting of wars - may be phoney short wars, small wars, local wars. There is not going to be a big war, nuclear war, because both the Super Powers are wise enough. They know that it is not possible for anyone of them to win the war. If anybody goes for the nuclear war the whole humanity is going to perish. So, they are wise and will never so that. They may talk about it. They are conscious of the nuclear power but at the same time afraid of the nuclear power. They want to make use of the other smaller countries in the world and use them as tools to have their own strength and power safe in their own sphere of interest. This is what they are trying to do.

Sir, there is one psychological weakness in America's position. America has fought wars. They have fought war in Vietnam and lost it. They have fought war in Korea and learned their bad lesson there. During the Second World War they fought wars on the Continent of Europe and, of course, got the credit.

It is good that they tried to save Democracy at that time and defeated Fascism. We are grateful to them. But it was not only Americans. It is the British, the French and the Russians who had their major share. Sir, there is a weak point about the American position : they have not fought war on their own land for the last 200 years. The only war they fought was a civil war and that too 200 years ago when there were conventional weapons. What war means is understood by the nations on the Continent. We know what war means. Let us go to Punjab and ask people what war means. Do they want war or peace? Soviet Russia has seen. Therefore one is inclined to believe, if they say, that they believe in world peace. I have got all the respect for Mr. Brezhnev when he responded to the hawkish language of the United States by the offer of further talk of detente. That was a Statesmanlike, wise, thing. Certainly we also want some solution of Afghanistan should be found out but what about El Salvador. What Americans are doing there? What is the theory of Carter doctrine? For the sake of their security of America, they must be there, in the Indian ocean. Vested interests must be protected in the Indian Ocean and Gulf countries. This is ten thousand miles away. If they are justifiable in doing this, what about any other country being careful to see that their neighborhood is safe for them? We want to be careful about our safety and peaceful situation in all the neighborhood, not only in Pakistan.

Sir, some discussion took place about the relationship with our neighboring countries. Some people tried to take credit for what was done by the previous Government. I am willing to give it. I am not against it. I have always said that with one or two exceptions Janata Party tried to carry on by and large the foreign policy of friendship with Soviet Russia. But I must say their approach to neighboring countries was wrong. I have said it before on the Floor of the House as the Leader of the Opposition that there was some sort of feeling that neighboring countries had to be over pleased that India had taken a position of a sychophant to them.

Try to be careful about the mutuality of interests. Respect them, which we have been doing all along, but don't get yourself in a position where you have to be all the while attending on them as to what they wish, like and do not like, and fear about. This is not consistent with the standing of India. How can you justify the agreement on Farrakka in view of the dangers to Calcutta? We were a party to negotiations and discussions. I know the position that Bangladesh takes. We have got all the goodwill for Bangladesh. And in future also we will have it. Mr. Minister, but I would like you also to be very careful about our mutual national interests. It has been mentioned that there is going to be some sort of a Regional Conference of the Secretaries of the neighboring countries in Sri Lanka or some other place. Well and good. Such efforts are always welcome. We shall always welcome those efforts. Go and meet them; talk to them; find out if they have got any legitimate grievances; and accommodate them. It is not that I am against these. But I must tell you that there is one danger in this thing. They have tried to internationalize bilateral issue. This is the game behind these small neighbours; they have this psychology that India is big country, a big nation. Now we cannot help it. Can we? In order to please some of the neighboring countries can we become another small country? We cannot do it. (Interruptions) We are a big country. We are a fertile country both intellectually and in terms of manpower, in terms of population, as well. This is all right. But there has always been an effort by some of these neighbours I don't want to mention nations who have always wanted to internationalize some issues. Whenever they found that they could not succeed in internationalizing them, they wanted to regionalize them. This is another way of doing the same thing! So, be careful about these things. Go and give them help. If you want to have the next conference in Delhi, you have it by all means. But about this one thing you have to be careful because some of these countries play this games against India. The long-term interests of India sometimes are in danger as far as these issues are concerned. Therefore, I would like you to be

careful about these things.

The other issue that we will have to think more particularly is the North-South dialogue. This is a very important issue. If you do not find any answer to problem of poverty I do not think the internal policies that we are declaring also are likely to succeed. We are talking that we are fighting against this problems of poverty in India; we are committed as a nation for this; but how can we do it, unless, those who had the advantage of having empires in the world, and who had the advantage of having a technological revolution 200 years ahead of us, try to share and transfer the resources to us?

Now, we read news about the World Bank's troubles. The Retiring President of the World Bank was in India just a couple of days ago and he has very liberally said something about aid. I am not inclined to believe completely in that. It is a polite way of saying it. There is a polite way of listening to it! I have one fear and somebody mentioned that in his speech, I think it was Prof. Tewary who mentioned it, that now the American policy is to try to bilateralise financial cooperation and not do these things through multilateral organisations like the IMF and World Bank. These are the new trends there. Therefore we will have to remain very alert. Naturally we have got our own limitations. We are one of those who want to 'receive'. We are not in a position to 'give'. Therefore, naturally, people are likely to misunderstand. But at the same time we must create a favourable atmosphere in the countries particularly some western countries, who seem to be in some sort of a reasonable mood now days. But please move them from their political position to the economic field. I have found this because I have attended some conferences wherein these talks had their early beginning about the New Economic Order and I found that two countries were rather difficult for us to manage. One was West Germany and the other was U. S. A. Regarding West Germany, I find, there can be some hope because Mr. Brandt himself, as Chairman of a Commission, has produced a useful report. Even

if it is accepted as a minimum, it will mean some progress for the future. But I am very much doubtful whether the present US administration will be willing to accept any part of it.

Prof Madhu Dandavate : Also England.

Shri Y B. Chavan : Well, England is not a first rank country from that point of view; it has its own economic limitations. So, we have to think about these things.

Shri B. R. Bhagat (Sitamarhi) : It is good if the US President attends the Mexico

Conference.

Shri Y. B. Chavan : Quite right; but merely attending the Mexico Conference is riot quite enough. Possibly by mere attending, they may create more troubles.

Shri B. R. Bhagat : Are they not willing to attend the Conference?

Shri B. Chavan : They are not willing to attend it, naturally. Because they do not want to commit themselves directly or indirectly about this to the third world. This is the basic trouble so far as this matter is concerned. Therefore, Mr. Foreign Minister, there is another way of doing it. The Non-aligned Conference had accepted this position long time ago. And if the North does not want to come forward and share their advantages with us, shall we not at least, the Third World countries, collectively try to work for co-operation and set ourselves for self-reliance. And certainly, we can, if we begin that. I think the Northern industrialised countries, rich countries, will have to think twice about it, if we show our strength. But unfortunately, I am afraid that we are at the beginning of a period, wherein there is going to be a ruthless pressure on the Third World countries and the non-aligned countries. I am afraid that there will be further attempts at dilution of the non-aligned movement. I do not say that they are likely to happen tomorrow. But these dangers are there. I think, if we have to retain our leadership of the non-aligned movement, whatever happens we

must take a strong position; even if we are isolated, it does not matter. We should stand by the principles of non-alignment and this is the basic position that we have to take care of.

Well, Mr. Foreign Minister, I wish you well. I do not want to flatter you because I have nothing to get from you. You have done well, the Government of India has done well in the field of foreign policy and our basic position should be maintained in these difficult times. I think what the Prime Minister said in one sentence, sums up the Indian foreign policy. We are not pro-Soviet Russia, we are not pro - United States but we are pro-India. That is a compact sort of a little thing that she has said and really speaking, sums up both our internal policy and the international policy. Let us stand by it.

CHAPTER 29

GENERAL BUDGET DISCUSSION

Lok Sabha , 6 March 1982

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, sir, I rise for a brief participation in the discussion on the Budget on behalf of my party. I would like to start with complimenting the Finance Minister for presenting a Budget at a very difficult time, taking into consideration all the difficulty economic factors in the country. Making a proper assessment of the situation in different sectors of the economy, he has presented a Budget which, I must say will definitely strengthen the process of making our economy, a viable economy and further consolidate it.

Many Members and many newspapers were saying that they were expecting many things from the youngest Finance Minister. And that is very true. I must say this youngest Finance Minister bears a very wise head on his young shoulders.

An. Hon. Member : He has changed (Interruptions)

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : There is no change in my opinion because whenever I found that the Budget was good, even from those benches I have said that it was good. So, there, is no question of my changing myself.

Prof Madhu Dandavate : He is right, Sir, he has made up his mind. (interruption)

Mr. Deputy Speaker : Professor, you should not join them.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : At least I have made up my mind; but they have no mind at all. (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy Speaker : It is only a good joke; you should not mind it.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : Because I am now discussing the Budget from different plane, I am rather more relaxed than the Finance Minister himself. Hi colleague sitting to his left is also more relaxed.

The Budget proposals are meant for a certain specific purpose in the administrative system of our country. My friend who spoke before me, criticized the Budget as some sort of Budget by installments. Naturally, the economic issues arise from time to time and have to be handled as such. But at the end of a financial year, every administration whether in this country or outside, in a socialist or non-socialist country has to make an assessment about the coming year, take stock of resources and then try to apportion them in a proper manner. Suppose tomorrow there is some unexpected eventuality. Can they say that, any other system than our system, will not change the price system, price structure, for example? I find that the entire criticism is based on mentally refusing to accept certain realities in the world today. I particularly heard the criticism about the IMF and the World Bank; and their office bearers visit to India and meetings with our people. If at all they wanted to influence us, it was not necessary to undertake all the journey from Washington to Delhi and have dinners and interviews with the Ministers here. You can influence from anywhere. But the question is what is the system working in the world? You may not accept it or you may not like it, but the point is that even U. N. has created certain institutional arrangements in the world today and India is participating in them in the last 35 years; we participated in that; the other Government which was here also participated in that system. There was nothing

wrong in it. But some of the people for the ideological reasons do not mentally accept those institutional arrangements that are functioning today; may be those institution arrangements have their own weaknesses they have got certain weak points. There is some situation in which they work against the third world. We had said those things openly when the opportunities had occurred to us, on the forums of the World Bank and the IMF that there are some drawbacks of the system and they should be remedied.

But shall we not take an advantage of certain useful facilities that are created there? In the last decade, in 1972 when the oil crisis exploded on the world, everybody was taken a back. On behalf of the then Government, not this Government I would say, the previous government of Mrs. Gandhi, I had attended those conferences and saw even the representatives of socialist countries because there are some socialist countries sitting in those forums; even they were rather worried about what the future of this world going to be.

Suppose we do not borrow from it. I am not very particular about borrowing from this Institution. Let us take, for example, that we have decided not to borrow; if the Parliament decides on the advice of this Memorandum that we should not borrow from it, then where shall we go? Shall we not make any arrangement for our foreign exchange gap? Shall we merely say, sorry we can not get anything so stop your business, stop agriculture because of no more fertilizer, no more petroleum product, stop all activities because we have decided on principle not to borrow money from any institution. Is there any option? What is the alternative? What is the use of merely, telling what is happening is West Bengal? When the Prime Minister said about the lack of alternative she talked about a national alternative, not pointing out about any one particular State. (Interruptions) Even what you said about your achievements, I do not grudge about your achievements. Whatever your achievements are, certainly if they are good they are good, but do not suppose that the others have not done that, West

Bengal has done something about the land ceiling etc. Many other States have also done something for the last 20 years. You do not know about these things. (Interruptions.) You do not know what it they started this question of law on ceiling, etc. (Interruptions) Therefore, the point that I was making was if at all you want to assess the budget, you must certainly take into consideration certain realities, internal realities and international realities. If you do that, then possibly you will be able to understand What the Finance Minister has done to our economy. I said and I repeat it that the Finance Minister has certainly done many things in this budget to strengthen the process of making our economy viable in terms of internal and international factors. This is an achievement that must be accpeted. But unfortunately, these realities are not taken into consideration when criticisms are made. I would... (Interruptions)

Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty : Reality depends from which point of view you see.

Shri. Yashwantrao Chavan : Naturally, I will see from my point of view. I give you the right to see from your point of view.

Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty : Class point of view :

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : Well, that is your bias. I cannot help it.

The one important reality today in the world and in India is that we are suffering from inflation, a sort of 'super inflation' may have some technical or other meaning. I do not want to go into it. But at the same time, our basic problem is to make India's economy a viable economy in terms of agriculture, in terms of industry, in terms of social services, in terms of foreign exchange reserves etc. in terms of foreign trade, in terms of export and import, etc. all these things have to be taken into consideration. This is the basic task of the Government, and I would like to claim this, not only for this year or for the last two years, but for the last thirty or thirty-five years, that the Congress had performed the historical

role of providing a strategy for industrial development, agricultural development and building up a national viable economy for the country. For the first time we know that we can become a great nation and we shall be one day a great nation. We are today a great nation in a way. I am not talking in terms of military strength. I am not talking in terms of the great powers.

(Interruptions)

Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty: We do not agree.

Shree Yashwantrao Chavan : Therefore, when I said that this year's Budget has to be judged I will come later, on what points one should judge a Budget - naturally our mind goes back to the last year. The Economic Review and the part of the speech of this Finance Minister in paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 particularly he has given the information about the new peak of production the agricultural field, new peak of production in the industrial field, new achievements in many other fields which are very essential and vital for the economic growth. In this background we have to see that we have to keep the same progress go further. We cannot slip back. If we slip back, we lose the opportunity in the history. I think India today has made progress gradually in such a way that 1982's India is much different from what India was in 1952, 1962, or 1972. It has always made further progress, and still further progress. And that is by taking into consideration certain realities when we talk about it. Otherwise, how do you solve the problem of our Western front? Whatever we have to do about many other problems that arise in the country. But the difficulty is Mr. Chakraborty, do not get angry with us when you always remind us what you are doing West Bengal, you always forget India. Truth is that you do not know India?

Shri. M. M. Lawrence : We always remember India.
(Interruptions).

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : We are not objecting to your achievements in Bengal. Many congratulations for that; I am not

grudging it. But it was as if a drama was made that you have got a national alternative and you are presenting it before Parliament as a national alternative. These, for whatever worth, are your achievements in your own small State compared to India.

Mr. Deputy- Speaker : They do not forget that West Bengal is in India. (Interruptions)

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I was talking about the performance of last year. The Finance Minister has given it in detail. He says:

“A large number of industries such as petroleum and petroleum products, fertilizers, steel, cement; vanaspati, sugar, newspring, caustic soda; Wagons and commercial vehicles are expected to achieve new peak levels of production.”

When I re-read his speech, I was a little proud of the achievements that our country has made/because these are not small things. It is not just merely a question of passing a law. It is a question of converting all forces if no more production in a very complicated and a in a very sophisticated system. The present world judges any country's strength and progressiveness on the basis of the progress and production in these particular fields which I have just read out from the Finance Minister's speech. I was also just like you when I was young. I was reading about the superior performance that was claimed by Soviet Russia. It was a performance particularly in terms of petroleum and petroleum products, steel and all those things. They were trying to impress the world that in a sophisticated system also they are making progress. The Finance Minister has to keep the same momentum looking to his instruments and tools and resources around his, whatever that he can make use of. When I said that he has done a good job, I said it not merely in a parliamentary sense; he has really done a good job. Inflation he has to flight. He has to raise resources. He did not hesitate to raise taxes. He did raise more than Rs. 500 crores. He has done that. For what purpose? Because he has to make arrangements for making further provisions for

certain new economic programmes. Naturally, if at all you have to assess or judge a budget, you can do it on the basis of what provisions are made for the vital areas of economic growth. That is one important criteria on. Then the second criterion, according to me, is what are the tax efforts without making it more inflationary. If it is inflationary, certainly one should be rather doubtful about its utility. I find that whatever tax effort he has made, he has made it so that there is no inflationary effect. Normally after every budget, there used to be speeches that prices have risen. I must say that at least in this budget session. I have not heard that complaint from any member. It is creditable to the Finance Minister that he has made his tax efforts without making any adverse impact on the prices and without causing difficulties to the proper people.

Shri Krishna Chandra Haider (Durgapur) : After three or four months you will know.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : These are prophecies of doom. It is their firm conviction that prices must rise. Who can convince them?

Shri Chitta Basu : Taxation without tears! But he said, tears are also there.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : Tears are sometimes of good type and sometimes not of a desirable type. If at all there are tears, they are tears of joy.

I was trying to say, what are the criteria on the basis of which we can judge a budget. I have mentioned a few. There can be further additions to that list. If we try to judge him on this line, I must say that he has done certainly very commendable work. Take the provisions for vital sectors of the economy. I do not want to quote further statistics, because that makes any speech more complicated. Take the important area of energy, for example. Today the world over, when the question of the economy of any nation is discussed, the question of energy is considered to be more important. What has be done for energy. He has increased

the investment by 90 percent of what was done last year. It is an unprecedented provision, particularly for the energy area. Energy is a very very important thing for India. In the third world, every country is suffering from this problem of energy and the burden of petro-dollars, Euro-dollars and rising prices of oil either from the Gulf countries for what ever other countries may be in the market in this particular matter. Therefore, any genuine nationalist, anybody who is patriotic, will always come forward and say that in the coming decade I am again using a long term word; in the coming two or three years, we must make such a progress that we will not be required to go before the IMF for any loan for any other purpose.

Shri Sunil Maitra : What about the thirty years?

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : You do not know about it. Thirty years such a provision was not with the IMF also, about taking such a loan. You do not know that. I will tell you about the fight that we have to put up for this. Normally we used to get loans from the World Bank. But IMF is very conservation institution. Any moneylender is always conservative. Whether he is from the western side or the eastern side. There is not much difference. We have to plead for the things. I happened to be the representative of our country to speak on the floor of the Committee of Twenty. Prof. Dandavate then always wanted to discuss that issue here as to what monetary reforms we were discussing there. I always wanted an opportunity to discuss it here. Unfortunately, Sir, no help came from your side. We could not discuss it. The country would have known exactly what positions that we were taking on those issues at that time. This was one of the issues. Normally IMF was inclined to give loans under its own regulations. They call it by different names in terms of the percentage of our contribution to the IMF. That was the basic formula of the IMF we were telling them that "The third world needs a little more understanding from you, rich countries, there." We were telling them that we needed a proper transfer of resources from them. The manner in which

the whole thing was going on this had to be done. Therefore, we were pleading for this extra facility.

.....

Every money-lender puts conditions. Whether to observe or not it is our job and our responsibility. There is no burden on anybody. The Prime Minister herself has declared on behalf of the Government and the country that if we find that the terms are not acceptable to us in terms of the country's honour and interest, we will refuse it. There is nothing wrong about this matter. This position has been made absolutely clear.

This year will have to be judged by the investments and provisions that they have made in important vital sectors like agriculture industry. Fertilizer is a part of the industrial scheme. The main thing that we have to remember is that we are not merely supporting one particular vital sector of our economy but we are trying to implement the Sixth Plan in totality, as we have promised to the nation. This is also not merely a yearly budget but as a part of the sixth five yearly implementation of certain commitments that we have made to our people. If take this criteria. I think, Mr. Finance Minister you have done excellently well. I must congratulate you.

SELECTED SPEECHES IN PARLIAMENT 205

The other criteria I have referred to is social injustice. Because the theory of growth alone dose not help. We have learnt the lesson in the course of 30 years of our history. We have learnt from our own experience that we believe more in growth. Therefore, at one time, we found that the rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer. Therefore, we have to adjust our tactics, strategies and policies. This is what precisely the Prime Minister has said in her last speech on industrial policy. She is looking to the development of our industries and our economy. We cannot act in the same way as we were acting in 1952. You can act in a

particular way at the age of 5. At 25, you cannot act in the same way. You have to change your manners, behaviour and methods of work.

I do not know want to take more time and, therefore, I not want to go into details. They have done many things. One can enumerate a large number of cases. Take the case of lower income group people. There is no income-tax at present on an income upto Rs. 15,00. In addition to that, the salaries employee get a standard deduction of 20 per cent subject to a ceiling of Rs. 5,000.

In 1982-83 the rate of standard deduction has been raised to 25 per cent, subject to the existing limit of Rs. 5,000. Another innovation that he has introduced in this budget is the social security scheme. It is one more new idea. One can add to these ideas and think about more and more projects. He has done it.

When any Finance Minister is thinking of presenting his budget, he has to consider what incentives for savings and investments he has to give. That is one pet phrase which he constantly hears every minute of his life during the pre-budget days - incentive for saving and investment. It is in this context that we have to consider the capital investment bond scheme.

I have referred to social justice and the tax effort. He has made his tax effort after very careful consideration and examination and it has been done very wisely. It is not just putting some sort of list in the budget papers and then saying that it has been done. He has made more direct effort in the indirect taxation areas of customs and excises. He has collected all the funds from these two areas.

At the same time, he has tried to see that the burden does not fall on the poor man, or on those commodities which are consumed by the poor. He has exempted 38 commodities after very careful consideration. I am glad that in this matter he has made use of the Jha Commission Report on excise revenues. He has very

carefully worked out schemes and collected more than Rs. 500 crores through indirect taxes. At the same time, he has taken care to see that the burden does not fall on the lower income groups. This criteria of looking to the interests of the poor people and weaker sections of the society and considering what is to be done for them is another salient feature of this budget.

An Hon. Member : At least this remark, provokes laughter.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : It provokes laughter without laugh. Secondly, the type of criticisms that we expect at the time of the budget are repeated every year. This year, the IMF loan is an additional one Prof Madhu Dandavate : Thank God.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I do not say that debate is illegitimate. It is a legitimate debate. The country should be careful that we do not borrow money on conditions which ultimately compromise our sovereignty. I do not think anybody will dispute this proposition. I had very carefully listened to Shri. Venkataraman, When he initiated the debate on the IMF loan. He had made the position amply clear. There can be no two views on this question. Merely using it as some sort of stick to beat the Government on one pretext or another is no good. But the argument against the IMF loan is exactly like that. It is highly exaggerated. One of the members of the Janata Party has publicly stated that there is no influence of the IMF loan on this budget.

.....

But I must mention Dr. Subramaniam Swamy's name for another point. He has made another very interesting observation that the present budget reflects the national consensus. And his is one thing that I would remind my Marxist Communist friends - please keep this national consensus in mind.

Shri Sunil Maitra : The Congress party plus Mr. Subramaniam Swamy - that is national consensus!

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : This is what has been said by somebody on the Opposition side. I am merely quoting it, I am

not doing anything more than that.

So, on the ground of special provisions of the vital sectors, on the ground of social justice, on the ground of tax efforts, it does not impose more burden on the lower class of people, weaker people or poor people. If you take these three criteria. I would say that this Budget has passed the test of the time and here is no doubt in my mind about it. The Finance Minister certainly has given a good budget.

I said there are some special features of the Budget. The Finance Minister has given concessions in the direct taxes, but certainly added some more burden on those who can bear it through indirect taxes. He has done that and I do not want to repeat it again. I mentioned the special features also. These are two innovations - the social security bonds and the capital investment bonds. These are the new ways of meeting the needs of the nation, at the same time giving opportunity to the people who can afford to invest in a particular way. So, these are the two new types of bonds this year. Last year there was another type of bond. This year...

Shri. Kamal Nath : James Bond!

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : These are the new types of bonds.

Sir my main position is that this Budget has made a realistic assessment of the Indian economy, the world situation the growing inflation and the Finance Minister certainly kept some deficit financing. About this deficit financing I found that even in the developed countries they talk about 'balanced budget'. The present President of America won the election on the slogan of 'balanced budget'. But the way it is unbalanced today, they ridiculed calling it as "Reganomics."

Another person who was talking about the 'balance budget' is the former Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, and the deficit financing that he had shown in his budget of two years when the

Janata Government was there, never before there was that type of deficit financing.

An Hon. Member : They have lost their balance.

(Interruptions)

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I quite agree with you that they have paid a price for it that is what you mean. But this balanced budget is mainly given for the capitalist countries. Particularly in developing countries where the problems of lower section of the society, the weaker sections of society, have to be taken care of it necessary we have to go in for deficit financing, we could not have a dogma of not having deficit financing. Of course you will have to take wise decisions, you have to use discretion. (Interruptions). A limit should be there, a manageable and bearable limit. It is not only manageable and bearable limit and I sure the limit that the Finance Minister has accepted is certainly manageable and bearable.

Therefore, this decision of his is basic. If you see that broad features of the Budget - taxation system, deficit financing, investment programmes, new innovation steps that he has taken, I think everybody who has the interest of the cause - of the nation nearer to his heart will say that the Finance Minister has done well.

CHAPTER 30

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Lok Sabha , 16 August 1982

EDITORIAL NOTE

No Confidence motion was moved by Chaudhari Charan Singh, Leader of the Janata Party. Y. B. Chavan questioned the purpose of bringing about no confidence motion. He saw no propriety in doing so and attributed the motion to sheer political frustration. According to him such a motion was a serious matter and he referred in that connection to the Motion that he himself moved on 11 July 1979, which brought down Shri Morarji Desai's Janata Government..

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan (Satara) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to participate in the debate not to discuss any personalities, but policies. I was very glad' that Choudhary Sahib has discussed certain matters about planning and planning priorities and about the question of poverty as such. I do not know from where he got this information about the Prime Minister saying that there is not poverty. Perhaps he was the first person in India in recent times to start the struggle against poverty. Nobody has said that there is no poverty. Choudhary Saheb gave very sentimental and very, dark picture of picture of poverty. May be in some sections poverty exists today. We do not deny that. It is not possible to claim that there is a heavy burden of manpower on the agricultural front. I

am not denying that. There are difficulties also. The only way to remove that is to have industry, where prosperity can be ensured; that is one thing which can be accepted. Nobody had denied that improvement of small scale or village industries is a must. From the very beginning there has been emphasis on the village industries and the small scale industries. But naturally, when the basic industries were developed, at the present moment, today India can be counted as one country which came stand in difficult times of crisis. This is so only because we succeeded in building heavy industries in our country. It cannot be forgotten that this is the greatest contribution

About concentration of wealth in few hands, it is not something new that Choudhary Charan Singh is saying. The Congress itself, when they formed their Ten-point programme in the 'Sixties' has said that there are number of resolutions of the Congress on record to say that the rich are becoming richer, and the poor are becoming poorer, because this was the basis on which the Congress people based their programme. The process is still on. I do not deny that. But the solution is not what you say. You have tried to describe the situation of poverty somewhat correctly. I am in agreement on that. But the solutions that you are suggesting are solutions meant for taking the country 200 years back. Therefore, those solutions are not acceptable to us. I tell you Choudhary Saheb that this fact is known to the Indian peasant more than you do. You try to take a position of being the spokesman of the agriculturists. We, in our own small way, can also claim that we have also representative character of the agriculturists. If you see that evidence of the eye in some of the villages at least, where irrigation water has reached, small industries have reached and fertilizer has reached, that there is a better situation. We do not mean to say that the poverty has gone. We also admit that the poverty is there and our main struggle will have to be against poverty. This is what the aim and objectives of this party is. Shri Charan Singh is an elderly person. I have great regards for him. Please do not take a miss. We differ from you on certain basic

issues....(Interruptions)

Coming back to this No-Confidence. Motion, I must express one view that the no confidence motion is a very serious business. It is a very important power in the hands of Parliament. It should not be so light heartedly used the way it has been used. Really speaking, the present debate becomes, in a way, last day entertainment of the session. What was the point in bringing forward this No-Confidence Motion? Is there any seriousness about it ? It is out of sheer political frustration that they have brought this Motion because they could not convince the House in the last five or six weeks on every issue that was brought and discussed here. The House decided the other way; the country decided the other way. Now, you have the satisfaction to come here and say 'get out.' Can you do that? Are you really serious about it? This is one of the biggest jokes. I know how to move a no confidence motion. It was done during the Janata Party rule. This is a very serious business. Please think about this. What is the purpose of moving a no-confidence motion? Are you in a position to challenge the basic policies of the Government. The economic policies, the foreign policy, internal policies, the external situation, have you anything to challenge in them?

Some Hon. Members : Yes (Interruptions)

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I am not yielding. About the internal problems I have told you that the plan process certainly has transformed the situation in India. We will have to take more and more radical positions as we process further. Think about the socialist way of doing things. We can certainly solve the problems. We have yet to go a long way. The journey is long and difficult one. But the most important question that has to be asked today is : whether we are in the right direction or not. We are moving in the right direction. This is the basic thing that we have to take into account.

Taking about the economic or other internal policies, the whole

world is besieged with inflationary problems, which has become a global problem. We are living in a world which is certainly convulsing with problems of inflation. The richest countries and the poorest countries are all involved in it. The richest countries can possibly get out of it. We have our own difficulties.

When this Government tried to find a way out of it, then there was a hullabaloo about the IMF Fund. Well, the IMF the World Bank and similar institution are meant for the prosperity of the world. This is one of the new types of contribution, of post-war period. This is something new and important. But I quite agree that we have to be very careful and cautious whenever we approach these bodies. I quite agree that many times we have to be careful about them. But when there is a necessity for it, merely, talking about self-reliance and also trying to give up whatever help is needed for the development of the country, if we deny ourselves of it, will not be self-reliance but self starvation, which we cannot afford to do. We have to take care of our own sovereignty. This need not be told to us by A, B, or C. This is being done by the party which lead the movement for the freedom and independence of this country. It is quite aware of what is good and what is not good.

Turning to foreign policy, please tell us what is wrong with our foreign policy. You have not been able to find fault with it effectively. Certainly, you have repeated many points, but effectively you have not succeeded in finding fault with our foreign policy. If you look at the present atmosphere of war and peace. It is from this situation that this country has to be saved.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Basshirhat) : War, not peace.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I am talking of the world situation. Since the war situation is there, peace must be taken care of. It is in that sense that I am talking. If we look at the world, apart from the two super-powers, the Big powers, if you look at the policy of any country in the world today, in the third world, it is India's policy, which is completely correct, which is the best way to get out of

the present dangerous situation. Today even the non-alignment movement is suffering from certain contradictions; there are certain pressures building in the non-alignment movement which need to be taken care of, and the country which can play some constructive role in the present situation, fortunately, is India, which has been accepted even by the non-aligned world.

When this is the position that India is occupying in the world today, you people come and say "Resign; we have no confidence in you." Who cares for your confidence" It is absolutely....(Interruptions)

Shri Somnath Chatterjee : In this is the policy of the ruling party....(Interruptions)

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : The most important thing that has to be taken note of today in Asian and African countries is.... (Interruptions). The only country which has a stable Government and which has remained stable is India. There is no denying it. This is not what we say; this is what others tell us. So, India has a big role to play, and that is because India has built up the necessary resources in the industrial and agricultural sector. It has built up a position politically also in the world. So, we are in a situation to make a contribution to the peace not only in India but in the world. This is a fact which must not be denied.

Therefore, I say that the Motion of No-Confidence is not based on any major policy issue. Merely because you do not like a person, because you do not like Mrs. Gandhi, that does not mean that you have the right to bring a No-Confidence Motion. This is some sort of obsession against a personality....(Interruptions) I do not like that. I take a general balanced view of the matter and I feel that she is giving the right leadership to the country. That is why I am supporting her....(Interruptions) I do not want to reply to all interruptions...(Interruptions) I do not want to make any long speech. The points that Shri Choudhary made certainly prove our case that the planning progress that has functioned for the last 30

years has saved India and put her in the right direction and that the No-Confidence Motion is an absolutely superficial thing, which should be thrown out.

CHAPTER 31

DISCUSSION ON WHITE PAPER ON PUNJAB AGITATION

Lok Sabha , 25 July 1984

EDITORIAL NOTE

This is the last speech that Y. B. Chavan delivered in the Lok Sabha on a major policy issue. The Debate took place in the background of the Blue Star Operation, after which the Government presented a white paper on Punjab agitation to the Parliament.

Y. B. Chavan recalled the law and order situation prevailing in Punjab and a sense of alienation that prevailed. He supported strong action by the Central Government to deal with the situation which, according to him, had been allowed to deteriorate. The decision was hard but it had to be taken. According to Chavan "the decision, has made a great contribution to India's post Independence history." A holy place of worship should not be allowed to be used as an armed fortress. He warned that, "If allowed in Punjab, the same thing could have happened in other States."

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : The administration was paralysed and demoralised because of the organised violence from the holy place of Akali Takht which has created some sort of demoralisation among the common people. The people do not know why all this violence was taking place. Harmless innocent people were assassinated in large numbers. Anybody can go anywhere and can

kill anybody without any consequences. Good people, scholarly people, independent people, businessmen, common people, all these were killed and there was a feeling of helplessness among them. You may ask me as to why they felt helpless. I must say that this is how the disintegration starts. When a country disintegrates, this is the manner how the process begins. Fascist movement starts where the terrorist movement begins. All Fascist movements have been preceded by this sort of terrorist activities.

Earlier to this armed action, I had a talk with responsible people in the administration of Punjab and they very frankly told me that there is no way of dealing with the situation in the normal manner, This is the honest statement of facts. I had met the highest man in Punjab administration and he said "This is the situation. But I see no way." I came back, and on my return I gave my impression to the Prime Minister. Naturally I found her going through some sort of a mental agony when I reported this matter, but she was very calm, very quiet, she was not disturbed about it. She only uttered one sentence : " We will have to go through a difficult period before something emerges." This sentences gives an indication of the mental agony through which she was going, and that is very true. What happened was, the administration was demoralised, the people where demoralised, the political parties were completely demoralised. The organization of a few hundred people sitting armed in Akali Takht had created a feeling amongst all the people around that it was they who were ruling the Punjab. Psychologically, this is how things take place. Ultimately, the result was that not only the administration was demoralised, but the political parties outside were demoralised, the Akali Dal itself paralysed, and so important leaders Mr. Longowal, Mr. Badal and others were practically, for all practical purposes, prisoners of Bhindranwale's group. This was the situation that was created in Punjab. What do we do? How do we deal with these things? Prof. Dandawate mentioned a very beautiful phrase and I liked that phrase-alienation, "after the army action, alienation has

taken place." It is a very fashionable and fine phrase, particularly fashionable with professors. But something more than 'alienation' had taken place before this incident, and that is what is more important to take note of while dealing with this matter. When such a thing had gone on there. .

Prof. Madhu Dandavate : I am not very happy to use that phrase; I feel deeply disturbed while saying that there is alienation. But there is alienation and that is fact.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I am telling you that there was something more than alienation before the army action. I said, I like that phrase; that is fashionable.

Shri Indrajit Gupta : Although you are not a professor.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I am not a professor. I am glad I am not a professor.

This was a situation that a group had created practically in the whole of Punjab, and if these things had been allowed to be continued, the whole nation would have been in chaos. This is an important thing that has to be taken note of. In a big and complex country like India, it is not a very soft, poetic way of going all along; it is a big and complex country. It required taking very hard decisions. Occasions do arise when hard decisions have to be taken. I believe that rulers should have a poetic mind because those who have got a poetic mind can get angry with themselves. I think, it is a good quality for being democratic rules that they must get angry with themselves also. Here I found things were deteriorating so fast. I gave my impression to the Prime Minister on my return : There is a sort of pre-civil war situation in Punjab; if things are allowed to go the way they are going, things ultimately will go completely out of hand; something will have to be done; something has to be done.", I knew that 'something' was a very hard decision, and hard decisions take some what is longer time to take. There may have been. I do not know; there may have been some hesitation in the mind of the Prime Minister. Naturally

those who take a decision about the use of army have to go through mental agonies, and it has to be a very hesitant, a very reluctant, decision. Ultimately it had to be taken; that decision was taken finally. The decision, according to my own assessment, has made a great contribution to India's post-independence history. Some people may say that this has created a problem. Naturally it has also created some problem. When this action took place, I was away in my home town a small town in Maharashtra. The morning newspapers flashed the news and I was surprised that people from all sections of the society in that small town came to greet me saying that something good has happened, you have saved the country, the Government have saved the country. I have nothing to do with the decision. But I am telling you the feeling of the people, the feeling of all, not only in Punjab but all over the country. You have to feel about it what happens in the rest of the country. If we allow one holy place or one place of worship to be used as a sort of an armed fortress in Punjab, the same thing can happen in all other States:

This country is full of problems. As I said it is full of complex problems and when such problems have to be dealt with, they have to be dealt with very clearly. Some members said that negotiations were delayed. I quite agree that ultimately this question can be solved only through negotiations. I do not deny it...

An Hon. Member : There is no other solution.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : In a democratic society there is no other solution. Dialogue will have to be undertaken. But I must tell you also my experience about dialogue with the Akalis. You have your own dialogue, the Opposition Members have their own dialogue. I have also dealt with some of these problems because the problems of Chandigarh is with us for the last two decades. It is not there now for the first time. The villain of the piece in the matter is the Shah Commission. They first of all recommended handing over Chandigarh to Haryana. The Government could

not-even look at this decision. I was a member of the Cabinet at that time. Within a couple of minutes a decision was taken that the Shah Commission's recommendations should be rejected. But some solution will have to be found out. I know since 1970 when the Prime Minister gave this award, after many hours of long-discussions, it was decided that Chandigarh should go to Punjab. But Haryana People also must get something in return and, therefore, some of the Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab were supposed to be transferred to Haryana. It fell to my lot as Home Minister that I should convey this report to the two Chief Ministers sitting at my residence. One was the Akali Chief Minister and the other was a Congress Chief Minister. When I told them this, they said, 'Yes.' We understand your difficulties. We cannot say that it is a very good decision, but we have to accept it because it gives in substance whatever we wanted.'

So, in a way why in a way, for all practical purposes, the decisions of giving Chandigarh to Punjab and handing over Abohar and Fazilka to Haryana was accepted by the Akali Dal. Now it is after 14 years that we find that it is not solved. This happened in 1970. So it is very difficult.

We have said that negotiations is the only way to solve the problem, But negotiations with the Akali's is very difficult because they are a very difficult commodity (Interruptions.) I think the Opposition also will have the same sort of experience.

One very basic thing will have to be made clear. Negotiations have been made difficult by two things. Negotiations certainly will have to be done. But they have been made difficult and in a way, impossible by (1) the existence of terrorists group, and (2) this Anandpur Sahib resolution which ultimately indicates towards secession.

Unless these two conditions are controlled and controlled very completely and unless it has given up the idea of Anandpur Sahib and the decision is given up and unless these terrorists groups are

completely controlled and eliminated from the Punjab public life, negotiations would not succeed. And unless there is a possibility of the negotiations succeeding, the suggestion that Mr. Dandavate just now made to withdraw the army from here and withdraw the army from there-it will be very difficult for the Government to accept it. Even today people from Punjab who come and talk about it say that some of the people saying 'Let the army go; we shall deal with you'. (Interruption). This is the position that has come now. So one would have to be very careful about when the army should be withdrawn. Should the army be withdrawn only because some of the Akali people say withdraw the army? The army has not gone for fun's sake; it has gone to deal with the problems; and deal with it effectively. We have a democratic rule. And army has only a limited role. Its role is to help the civil authority. That is the basic role. And this has to be done not only in Punjab but this had to be done in Bhiwandi, Maharashtra also. In Hyderabad, it had to be done. Some one said - I think Prof. Dandavate had said it - that often calling the army's help is very dangerous thing. I do not think so because army is a patriotic instrument of India. It is also a democratic instrument of India. You cannot compare India with any other military dictatorship anywhere in the world. Army has a democratic tradition and by profession they will be very much loyal to our Constitution. I have no doubt about that in my mind. But when it is necessary to call it, we should do that without any hesitation or without any fear. I heard responsible persons in Maharashtra saying that if we had delayed calling the army by one day, things would have been impossible to control for weeks together. I am here talking about the riots.

Shri Indrajit Gupta : Anything wrong with the police.

Shri Yashwantrao Chavan : I agree with you that there is something wrong with the police organisation all over the country - not only in Maharashtra. All over the country, there is something wrong with police organisation. Constantly they are in touch with the local people. The local people include intruders, smugglers,

anti-social elements and antisocial people. So, they also have to deal with them. I was speaking about these two conditions which are more important. Politically, we should be very careful. At least I am very clear about this in my mind. So, let us not talk vaguely about it. We are totally very clear that there are terrorists getting arms and killing the people at will. This must be controlled completely. I am very sorry to say this that no responsible Akali leader has come forward to condemn the terrorist. Tell me which Akali leader has come forward to condemn this thing? If they are not prepared to condemn this, how will you control them? They themselves became the prisoners of Bhindranwale. I think they were physically the prisoners of Bhindranwale. And they could not decide anything. They used to have a look at Bhindranwale's people while expressing a view as to whether they will like it or not. How are you going to control this situation? This will take a long time. This is a process and this process has to be followed very carefully. This country has to be united. I am making an appeal to the Opposition not to support wrong position. It is not only the responsibility of the Government party but it is the responsibility of Indian people. If we are unable to control these two things what also can we do. Ultimately about the decision on Anandpur Sahib Resolution we talk about in different parts of the country. We have to deal with it somehow or other. We have to deal with that democratically. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are dealing with that in Assam in Nagaland, in Manipur, in Mizoram etc. We had to do that in your state. I am complimenting your people Mr. Dhandapani.

So, the most important part is how to deal with the secessionist tendencies. These secessionist tendencies will have to be fought by the people and not merely by the Army. It has to be fought at all levels. This Anandpur Resolution is a great danger single and this India must take note of. I must say however difficult the things were this action which Army took has broken the back terrorism in Punjab. That stands as a fact. But we cannot be complacent about it. It will have its own reactions also. Therefore, we will

have to go very far fully in this matter. Only because you are in Opposition and say that Government does not like that is not the way. This is a national responsibility Controlling terrorism and controlling secessionists is not any party monopoly here. This is the responsibility of every independent Indian in this country whatever they are sitting on this side of the House or on that side of the House.

How are we going to do that? If there are any suggestions, I hope there would be suggestions for this sort of purpose when we are discussing the White Paper The White Paper brings out these two things. There is terrorism not only words but in action also and in a very extensive manner in all parts of Punjab

Ultimately why were negotiations failing? Oppositions has said it many time - I do not see why they said that nothing has happened. But have they not realised this background of Anandpur Resolution was the real obstruction in the successful negotiations? They said one thing at one time, another thing at another time and a third thing at a third time. I am of the view that unless there is a unreserved statement what they are no longer sticking to the Anandpur Resolution, the negotiations are not likely to bear fruit.

So, these two things are the real challenge and these two things will have to be fought very heroically at peoples level, at Government's level, at every level. This will have to be done. Unless we do it nothing could be achieved about it. This is all that I have to say.

VOLUME - IV

PART III

OBITUARY REFERENCES TO
LATE Y.B. CHAVAN

THE LOK SABHA

In the untimely death of Shri. Y B. Chavan, the country has lost one of its seasoned and experienced national leaders an administrator. A distinguished son of India, Shri Chavan was a man of great integrity and ability with an abiding faith in socialism, secularism and democracy. Shri Chavan was born in March, 1913 at village Deorashtre in District Sangli in Maharashtra and was educated at Kolhapur and Pune. He was imprisoned twice for a total period of seven years during the freedom struggle. His parliamentary career spanned nearly forty years from 1946 to 1984. Starting as Parliamentary Secretary in 1946 in the Government of erstwhile Bombay State, Shri Chavan rose to be the Chief Minister of that State in 1956. After the reorganisation of the States, Shri Chavan was Chief Minister of Maharashtra state from 1960 to 1962. After the Chinese aggression, Shri Chavan was drafted by Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, to look after the Defence Portfolio in the Central Government and to modernise the Defence Services. He held to Defence portfolio from 1962 to 1966 with great distinction. During the period from 1966 to 1977 he held important portfolios of home, Finance and Foreign Affairs in the Union Cabinet. For a brief period from August 1977 to January 1980, he served as Deputy Prime Minister. Only recently, his vast experience was availed of and his services utilised a Chairman of the Eight Finance Commission.

The nation is certainly poorer by his passing away.

THE RAJYA SABHA

Shri Y. B. Chavan, a Member of Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Lok Sabha during 1964-84, passed away on 25 November, 1984, at New Delhi at the age of 71 years. Prior to his election to Lok Sabha, he was a Member of Rajya Sabha in 1963 and a member of the Bombay and later Maharashtra State Legislative Assemblies during 1946-62. He joined the Government of Bombay as a Parliamentary Secretary in 1946 and became the Chief Minister of Maharashtra during 1960-62. He was Minister of Defence in the Union Council of Minister during 1962-66 and later held other important portfolios including Home Affairs, Finance and External Affairs during 1966-67. He functioned as the Deputy Prime Minister during July 1979 - January, 1980.

A noted parliamentarian, Shri Chavan was Leader of the Opposition in Lok Sabha during November 1977, April 1978 and again in July 1979. The debates of Lok Sabha bear witness to the valuable contributions made by Shri Chavan both during his tenure as a Minister and as a Member of the Opposition in upholding democratic values of the Parliamentary system of Government. All sections of the House respected and heard him in silence.

A veteran freedom fighter, he actively participated in the freedom struggle and suffered imprisonment for several years.

An eminent political and social worker, Shri Chavan was the President of the Institutes of Defence Studies and Analysis besides being associated with a number of voluntary social, educational and other organisations. He was the Chairman of the Eighth Finance Commission and also the Chancellor of Tilak Maharashtra

Vidyapeeth.

A distinguished administrator, Shri Chavan represented the country abroad on several occasions. He led the Indian delegation to the United Nations and attended several other national and international conferences. He was author of many publications and a number of articles in English and Marathi.

