

[Shrimati Mukul Banerjee]

mately, the wrong people could have benefited. That was why many of us thought that those facts should not be revealed. That was why those facts were not revealed by the Home Ministry. But, we know, you know and all of us know how much of money is coming or was coming. This Bill will stop that—foreign Exchange Regulations Act was not enough—to a great extent the propaganda and other things for popularising this Act among the people, political parties or other organisations who were carrying on such work should take up this job. There are other institutions also that will do the propaganda. We shall certainly try to explain to the people about the great benefits of this Act after this Bill is passed, with these words, I support this Bill.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN
(Tellicherry): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this is a Bill with a good objective. It says that it seeks.

“To regulate the acceptance and utilisation of foreign contribution or foreign hospitality by certain persons or associations, with a view to ensuring that parliamentary institutions, political associations and economic and other voluntary organisations as well as individuals working in the important areas of national life may function in a manner consistent with the values of a sovereign democratic republic, and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.”

There is no difficulty to support this object of the Bill. But the question is: whether by this Bill—a legislation like this—we are going to achieve the goal which is set before ourselves. Sir, if you remember in the Select Committee itself important witnesses expressed their doubt in regard to this point as to what extent this is going to be successful and as to what extent Government will succeed in implementing this legislation.

Sir, one very important point I would like to make is that nobody financially helping a movement or giving contribution or whatever it is with the purpose of subverting the democratic system in our country will not do so through the Reserve Bank or with Mr. Mohsin's permission. This is a fact of life that they will pump money into a country where they want to do de-stabilisation. They will not come and seek your permission. They will send it through various means. This is a thing which is so much played down by the authors of this Bill as if they do not understand.

Let us not shut ourselves from the realities which are taking place in the world where we are living. I do not know whether the Government is that non-political that they think that the operation of de-stabilising democracy of other countries is an action which is completely detached from the political policies being pursued by the Government. I don't think so. I think that there is a very good connection between the two. After the last world war when countries after countries become independent, the colonial system had broken up and when new independent countries emerged in Asia and Africa and in Latin America and tried to pursue a path of their own for making their own future then started the politics of de-stabilisation. It is not merely by contributing a little money that they achieve the end. I am sure the Minister might be knowing about the Marshall Plan. In Europe after the second world war the U.S. Government told Italy and France that they would throw out the communists from the Ministry and then only the money will flow. It is not that the communists were less democratic. The communists in Italy and France took part in the Partisan movement against Fascism and their sacrifices are accepted by the entire world but the money-power of the U.S. imperialists forced

the communists to go out of the Ministry.

Then, Sir, Mr. Samar Mukherjee was mentioning about multi-nationals. Well, there is mention of the multi-nationals in this but are we to believe that ITT will come and ask the Home Ministry to fill up applications and forms and let us contribute this much. Let us not be under that impression. It is ITT which organised a military coup in Chile and brought down the Government there. This is now an accepted fact.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Bill provides for an Indian citizen or a group of Indian citizens to make an application.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: They have done it through Pinochet.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: They have to apply to the Indian Home Ministry.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I do not think you have understood what I mean. Pinochet is a Chilean citizen, a man who played into the hands of ITT. In India, let us hope there will be no Pinochets. But there will be; they can find them.

So my point is that so long as multi-national corporations are allowed to invest money and when Government is going more and more for collaboration even for making tomato sauce, then this possibility of getting our democracy de-stabilised is increasing. This possibility is under-estimated by the framers of this Bill.

When I speak of ITT, I should be very careful to see that I am not saying anything to which a sudden twist could be given. Let me ask one question. Can you consider every country an enemy of India? No. The fact of life is not that. The fact is that the CIA is an instrument of destabilisation of imperialism, which is no more kept a secret. They say 'we will destabilise countries

which we do not like, systems we do not like'. They say, 'if our security is threatened, we 'will destabilise'—this is what Kissinger and Ford have said. They say overt and covert methods will be utilised. What is that covert method? What is that overt method? We have seen these in many countries, even in Bangladesh. We have seen what it does mean.

How is this Bill going to help us find these? I do not think there is any hope. Even after adopting this Bill, who will stop them? The only thing is vigilance, not by the Home Ministry; you have to make the people of this country aware of these dangers. It is a big task; it is not a task the Minister and a few bureaucrats can do. The patriotic feelings of the people should be roused. They should be able to stand up against any threat posed by imperialism. Then this country will have a future

But here the assumption and the background note supplied is very interesting. When they speak of foreign intervention, they always try to bracket the CIA and KGB together. I can understand that politics. That is the politics of the enemies of India who are saying that 'there are two super-powers and be careful with them'. From whom are you facing danger? I do not say you support the KGB. I am not saying that. The KGB and CIA are instruments of two political systems. One political system, imperialism, is standing to subvert the countries which they do not like, the systems which they do not like. You never see the Soviet Union doing that. There are international movements friendly to India and unfriendly to India. You have to demarcate them.

For example, when this country faced such a threat from the JP movement which resulted in the declaration of emergency, who came out in support of India? Did everybody support, did everybody oppose? No. In India, the World Peace

[Shri C. K. Chandrappan]

Council sponsored a meeting which was supported by both the Congress and the Communist Parties and other people. We also offered hospitality and invited the representatives of anti-fascist forces to come to India. They came. They said what happened in India was a dangerous thing. What they meant was the JP movement. They said that the emergency was correct. What is your stand about that? At the time of the Bangladesh crisis, when this country was being isolated by the imperialist world and when there were even voices here saying that 'you stand so isolated in the world', at that time the socialist countries stood firmly by you.

The World Peace Council and many other democratic organisations mobilised public opinion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your point? Where necessary Government should have the authority to grant permission? Is that so? What are you driving at?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I do not think you understand my point; otherwise you will not ask.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do understand. What are you driving at?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Demarcate between friends and enemies.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This Bill does not prevent that; the Bill gives the authority to government to grant the necessary permission.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I will tell you what the Bill gives. Please refer to clause 4.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: We cannot distinguish between one political party and another.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I understand your legal difficulties. But for a political problem, you cannot find a legal solution.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: Even the Congress Party is covered.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I am not saying that the Congress party should not be covered. But will you put the Congress party and the RSS in the same bracket? I do not like it. Legislation should be such as to curb the activities of such parties who are anti-national, unpatriotic and who are agents of imperialism. Take for instance clause 4. There is a blanket ban on many kinds of people: candidates, correspondents, government servants, members of legislature political parties office bearers and all that. Let me tell you one example. If a communist party leader wants to go and attend a world communist meeting to get a chance to say that the emergency declared in India was good and correct; it was a firm measure against the imperialists and subversive activities, he could not go because he cannot accept hospitality. These parties are not rich men's parties to get tickets from monopolists... (Interruptions). It is not a question of permission. It is a question of accepting hospitality in such cases. We cannot also invite friendly leaders of parties from other countries and we have to go and take a certificate from some small bureaucrat to the effect: he can come to this country. It is ridiculous.

Another thing is this. This Bill leaves the gate open for all kinds of subversive agents to come and work in this country. There is a provision in clause 2 where they refer to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund; they are exempted. I do not know whether government is so ignorant about these things. Why do they mention specifically, those two bodies? I could have un-

derstood if they say: United Nations is exempted. They may also declare from time to time which other bodies are to be exempted. World Bank is an organisation known for its direct intervention in countries where American interests are in danger. You are allowing the World Bank to come and operate here freely. What does it mean?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: World Bank? Is it not an organisation under the United Nations?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: World Bank is an organisation holding high the interests of U.S. Imperialism. It may be under the U.N. It is using U.S. money.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Even the United Nations Organisation....

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Not today; even the United Nations was like that. The World Bank is even today like that; he who gives money dictates the policy. The United States gives money. That is what is happening. And Mr. McNamara, the present leader of the World Bank, was the Chief of Staff in the Vietnam war. You know that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do you want that all these international organisations should be banned here?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: The Bill gives an exemption. I am against it. The Bill should not give exemption to such organisations. In regard to multi-national corporations I will not speak any more. But after hearing the Lockheed scandal and after hearing the Rockefeller report and so many other things, I think they have a direct intervention in assassinating the political leaders. The multi-national organisations play dubious roles. When the words 'multi-national' is there, we cannot say that this Bill is good. Now, we were in the Select Committee. Many prominent persons including Mr. Rajni Patel, who are popular with the Government expressed their doubt as

to what extent the Government was going to succeed in implementing this Bill. They have also said that it gives such wide powers that the bureaucracy can misuse this Bill to a great extent and the Government did accept in that Select Committee certain things. But what Mr. Samar Mukerjee was mentioning is very important. He mentioned about the review body. If it is a review body, why was it denied by the Government? That means what? Now, clause 10 of the Bill and Clause 14 of the Bill remain more or less in the same old fashion providing a very very authoritarian power to the bureaucracy. I do not mind if Mr. Mohsin runs the whole thing. But he will only sign it and the bureaucracy will run the whole show. Government had always been arguing in the Committee when we said that the ruling party might misuse this law and Mr. Mohsin had met this argument by saying that tomorrow we might be the ruling party. But the point is not that. In a democracy there is a possibility that every party can be a ruling party but in a democracy like this when we are enacting legislation, it is not fair, it is not democratic to leave such powers in the hands of bureaucrats. Now, what is power? On the basis of this doubt you are receiving some foreign money, not even on the basis of facts, but a doubt is enough. Your house can be searched. Well, against an individual, it is one thing but the records of the political parties can be taken away by the officers. The offices can be searched. I do not think this will help to strengthen the democracy in this country. If they have reasons to believe, that is one thing; they can believe it, but on the basis of doubt they cannot. Mr. Rajni Patel was telling while giving evidence that there should be a judicial sanction before allowing the officer to search. That was his position. But the Government said that a higher officer will come for search, that is a concession which Mr. Mohsin has given. When the Bill was first proposed, it was mentioned that no officer would come, but now the reply is that a higher grade officer will come. But his coming is inevitable.

[Shri C. K. Chandrappan]

There is no remedy for that. I do not think that will help anyone.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not able to make out what really you want to say.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I really want to say that this Bill is highly bureaucratic.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: With reference to the whole speech, I am not quite clear what you are driving at.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I will tell you that the Government should make a distinction between good and bad, between enemy and friend.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As a general principle, it can be accepted. But friends of today may be enemies of tomorrow.

15 hrs.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Life is not like that. It may be a good philosophy to argue but in the present day international politics, things are not like that. A friend of today is not an enemy of tomorrow. There are definite forces like imperialism which are the enemy of all the developing countries. Can you take bold measures against them and save democracy from their intervention? I have tabled specific amendments which I will move later. I think the government have under-estimated the danger of multi-nations and dangers involved in the present situation when countries are speaking about de-stabilisation and they have brought forward a Bill by which they think they can remedy every political evil. I think that is not possible. That is where we disagree. Otherwise, the objects of the Bill are noble.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS (Mangaldai): Sir, if there is any doubt about the importance of this Bill, we should look to the emergency which has opened the eyes of all to the dangerous role of foreign money and foreign agencies working inside various countries, particularly the developing

countries including India. The emergency has opened our eyes as to who are our friends and who are our enemies.

While supporting the provisions of the Bill, which should have come much earlier, I suggest that the Home Ministry should devise ways to mobilise public opinion as we are doing now under the emergency for the implementation of the 20-point programme. Though there are various Acts, even then it is public opinion and mass involvement to which we have attached more importance for fighting the right reactionary and fascist forces in the country.

The mere passing of this Bill is not sufficient to stem the danger posed by foreign money and foreign agencies working in India. Our friends in the opposition have read out from the background note the different agencies through which CIA is working here. The CIA is a matter of great concern not only of the developing countries where U.S.A. has planned to de-stabilise their governments but also of the peace-loving citizens of America. I can add some more organisations to the list given in the background note because we are aware of the menace of those organisations in the north-eastern part of India, including Assam. One such organisation is the MRA—Moral Rearmament. You might remember, Sir, a question was put in this House to the then Home Minister, Dikshitji, about certain minister of Meghalaya being member of MRA and he admitted it. I may tell you that in Assam all the anti-Government agitations were engineered by the officers from U.S. Embassy and the MRA leaders. Before each agitation, we have records of visits of MRA leaders and also US Embassy officials. What I want to emphasise is that it is not easy to detect CIA because they work through different organisations in our country. In a Committee meeting I asked a question whether it has been possible anywhere to prove any person to be a CIA agent although he is known to be a CIA agent by all. It is very difficult because it needs ideolo-