

खाद्य, कृषि, सामुदायिक विकास तथा सहकारिता मन्त्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री अन्नासाहिब शिन्दे : (क) तथा (ख) जी हां। सरकारने चौबी योजना के प्रस्तावों में भारतीय कृषि अनुसन्धान संस्था के अधीन एक परमाणु प्रयोगशाला स्थापित करने के लिए एक परि-योजना प्रस्ताविल की है जो कृषि सुधार में नवीनतम तकनीकियों के प्रयोग को बढ़ायेगी। परिचोजना के सम्बन्ध में एक संक्षिप्त नोट सभा पटल पर रखा गया है। [पुस्तकालय में रखा गया। देखिये संख्या एल डी—1094/67]

12.08 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES ACT, 1955

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri Annasahib Shinde): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955:—

(1) G.S.R. 988 published in Gazette of India dated the 28th June, 1967.

(2) G.S.R. 1030 published in Gazette of India dated the 3rd July, 1967.

(3) G.S.R. 1038 published in Gazette of India dated the 5th July, 1967.

(4) G.S.R. 1041 published in Gazette of India dated the 7th July, 1967.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1071/67].

12.08½ hrs.

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS 1967-68—

—Contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Now we take up further discussion on the Demands for

Grants under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs.

We have got about 1 hour and 15 minutes left. It may be extended by 10 or 15 minutes. At about 2.30, the Minister may begin his reply. Is it all right?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister will reply at 2.30.

Mr. Nath Pai

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): This year's debate on the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs produced a number of remarkably good speeches, and when I say this, I have in mind the speeches not made by the spokesmen of the Opposition who are good speakers and who always contribute substantially, but I have in mind two or three speeches made by the hon. members on the Treasury Benches. The speech, which I have particularly in mind, is that of Shri Manabendra Shah, who showed courage, and showed that at least some members are capable of looking beyond the brief that the Party normally expects of them. Another remarkable speech, where again a healthy tendency is coming to the fore, where the interests of the nation will be kept above the requirements of the Party exigency, was the speech of Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha. The speech of Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit shows the skill, the subtlety, which a long experienced diplomat can bring to her task. What she wanted to say was very simple and much-needed saying. But she knows how risky it is, in the current atmosphere prevailing in her Party to say the truth. All that she wanted to say was: let us discard the fear-complex, let us have on our banners honesty and courage, and let us face realities courageously. But to say this, she had to use the camouflage of so much denunciation and so much

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

protestation of loyalty to the governmental policy because otherwise even she runs the risk of being denounced, defamed and discredited. I would heartily welcome that sound advice which she gave as a very experienced and successful diplomat of this country.

Whereas I can say this, there were three distinguished participants in the debate who somehow have shown a vested interest in the dogmas and the prejudices of the past. I am always thrilled by the lucid analysis that Shri M. R. Masanj is capable of giving, and the rising eloquence of Shri H. N. Mukerjee is a model for beginners; I regard it as such for myself today. But these two hon. Members and their respective fellow-travellers in the Congress Party, for both of them have their respective fellow-travellers, showed a bewildering reluctance to discard discredited dogmas and showed a tenacity to hang on to their pet prejudices. And in this category comes the speech of the Prime Minister delivered in an extremely pleasant and delightfully resounding voice but which had very little by way of its merit to command the attention of the House. In her very mellifluous voice, during her brief interruption of the debate

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): Interruption or intervention?

Shri Nath Pai: I did not say 'intervention' because it was interruption of the debate. During that brief interruption she reiterated cliches which were a little disappointing, because time has shown that we cannot give the props of cliches for a dynamic world situation. I shall deal in detail with what she said, time permitting, later on. At this stage, I shall turn to our foreign policy. It is a pity that the way we arranged this debate on the different aspects of the working of the Ministry of External Affairs does not give a chance for a careful scrutiny. The debate is so arranged that we cannot take into account the working of the Ministry, the working

of the missions etc. There was a report produced by the Pillai Committee. We had been clamouring during the past twelve years that a close scrutiny of the methods of work of this Ministry was called for. I remember having suggested in 1963-64 to the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru that a parliamentary committee should go into this and make a proper study, and in reply we got the Pillai Committee. Though some of the top-ranking officials were associated with the work of this committee, its report is rather disappointing. I may not have the time to discuss the report here, but I would refer hon. Members to a very brilliant study of this report made by our friend Shri M. L. Sondhi, which he has published, which shows that the instrument of foreign policy, namely the Ministry of External Affairs, is not yet ready to learn that times are changing, techniques need to change, and postures and circumstances need to change too. But I shall come to the policy as such.

Our foreign policy today is at its nadir. Never were we so small and so ineffective in the world as today. Our power to influence the course of events is negligible and our standing as a force for peace and justice is at its lowest. We have an External Affairs Ministry or a Foreign Ministry, but we do not have a worth-while foreign policy. We have a legion of diplomatic missions but we hardly have any diplomats. We have innumerable fair-weather friends, but we do not have any allies in adversity. Taken in its totality, it is a dismal, depressing and disheartening picture. But I would like to say that I am not going to hold Shri M. C. Chagla responsible for this state of affairs. Shri M. C. Chagla, in spite of having sat pretty long now on the Treasury Benches, maintains a sound heart and a patriotic heart. He is an unfortunate victim of policies which are made elsewhere. He is a vehicle, and, therefore, he does not deserve our condemnation as much as our sympathy and understanding.

(Shri Nath Pal)

Having said this, I shall now turn to an analysis of the foreign policy. For we must resist the temptation, as Dr. Lohia very rightly pointed out, of getting bogged down on the immediate issues completely forgetting that the mistakes of the foreign policy flow from something basic and fundamental that is wrong, with the foreign policy. I will try to pinpoint the four evils from which the foreign policy of this country suffers.

To start with, the foreign policy of India does not have a framework of reference, no long-term perspective; only we have some cliches and a few slogans. And the most sacred of these cliches, the most sacred of these slogans, the holy cow of the Indian foreign policy, is the cow of non-alignment. Nobody dare touch it; nobody dare say a word against it. The moment you say anything, you invite the wrath of the powers—that be and you are to be maligned, condemned, discredited. You are to be identified with this group or that group.

I would like the Prime Minister to ponder for a minute over this. She certainly knows that Mr. Fulbright is Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the US. It is a powerful committee. The US is engaged in a war in Vietnam where every day a number of Americans are dying. We have our own view of what the Americans are fighting for in Vietnam (Interruptions) L L L L I do not like it; I thoroughly dislike it; you know that I dislike it.

Mr. Fulbright never hesitates to say what he thinks. It is good for the American nation. It may not be in the interest of the Johnson administration. But he as a patriot believes that the American policy in Vietnam is wrong, that the bombing is wrong. But there is no American who will denounce him as belonging to the Chinese lobby.

But look at this country. The moment you say that the Government of India's West Asia policy is wrong, you are to be denigrated, to be run down.

Every means of maligning is to be used privately, publicly, in the press, in the lobbies, in the Central Hall, that he belongs 'to this lobby'. Madam Prime Minister yesterday said that there is no lobby in the foreign Ministry except the Indian lobby. I would like her to try to convince herself that we who disagree with Government's policy have nothing but the interest of this country in our hearts and there is no other kind of loyalty with us.

I would say that about non-alignment as well. Every time we say that there is no foreign policy, we are told that our mouths are to be gagged up. And what about alignment? At best, it was a principle I would like to tell this to hon Members, particularly the friends in the Congress Party. Gandhiji used to say about non-violence, that there is the non-violence of the brave and the non-violence of the cowardly, the weak and the opportunist. I would say the same about non-alignment. There is the non-alignment of the brave, of the courageous, of the honest and there can be a non-alignment of the opportunist, the cowardly, the timid and the weak-kneed. Right now if there is any exposition of non-alignment, it is not the parrot-like repetition of this mantram by Government of India spokesmen. But Gens. De Gaulle is implementing it. That is called non-alignment. Incredible as it may seem to you—it will take sometime to swallow—Pakistan is slowly, timidly edging towards non-alignment. It is the arch-priest of non-alignment, the Government of India, which gradually is seeing to its erosion and to its discrediting by its double standards.

What is non-alignment? We thought it was basically a simple thing, that is, the absolute freedom of India to take her stand on any issue on the intrinsic merit of any issue. But what has non-alignment become in the hands of the Government of India? When we are in Moscow, we are the votaries of Russia. But when we are in Washington, we can see what is

wonderful and glorious land is the USA. When we are in Moscow. We will denounce the bombing of North Vietnam, but when we are in Washington, we will sympathise with Mr. Johnson's predicament and will agree with the necessity of bombing.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): This is not true.

Shri Nath Pai: This is called non-alignment.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi rose—

की वजु लिखते (यूरो) बोलना है तो जरा जोग ने बोलो।

Shri Nath Pai: I am ready to sit down for a lady any time.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I only wanted to say that this statement of the hon. Member is entirely false.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): It is a fact.

की वजु लिखते. यह बिबकूल 100 प्रति-
शत सही है।

Shri Nath Pai: I shall take it as a beginning for the future, I do not think it is a refutation of the past.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: This is of the past. He has only to look at the statements.

Shri Nath Pai: I will produce two documents. I hope my memory is fairly good still. I can show that she had not defended the bombing, but had appreciated the difficulties of the US administration. I hope I am right.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: That is quite different.

Shri Nath Pai: I am putting the record straight.

की वजु लिखते : यह जान लिखा सही
जुद्धों में कहा था।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: What he said was that I had defended the bombing.

Shri Nath Pai: What I said was—I requested the Prime Minister to recall, it is now 17 months old—during your

visit you showed sympathy, which means sympathy for their predicament.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Along with sympathy with their difficulties, I had condemned the bombing, I had advocated the withdrawal of the American forces.

Shri Nath Pai: In Moscow

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Also in Washington and New York.

Mr. Speaker: Your time is over.

Shri Nath Pai: I have hardly begun.

Mr. Speaker: Eleven minutes were left for your party. Please conclude. I have already given you more time.

Shri Nath Pai: Let us see the world as it is, the realities of the world. There are no two nations in the world. There are no two countries which have greater community of interests than the USSR and the USA, who are trying to keep neutral. They are coming closer, and we are non-aligned. It is healthy. I do not want to act as a spoke in the running wheel. If they are coming together, it is good, except when they try to gang up against India, as they may when it suits them. The nuclear non-proliferation treaty is one example. Let the Prime Minister and her advisers on foreign policy remember that the Soviet Union and the United States of America are free to come together the moment such a coming together will be in harmony with their long-term interests. They did at Yalta, they did at Glassboro, they are going to do it when it suits them, and we will be left standing high and dry chanting the mantra of non-alignment.

The Prime Minister in a rhetorical flourish asked: with whom shall we align? In the first place she began by saying that non-alignment does not mean neutrality, we are aligned with somebody. I listened to it with great hope and greater attention. And then in a rhetorical flourish she asked: with whom shall we align, will you specify? That was a good strategy. She deliberately, shrewdly and, I must

[Shri Nath Pai]

say, intelligently pinned down Mr. Masani who is rather vulnerable on this point in order to hit at all. That was good strategy, hitting out at the weakest link to make an attack, but that will not do. We are different. We do not want this country to be aligned slavishly to anybody except the paramount long-term interests of India. That is the alignment we want. The criterion, the touch-stone as to who is our ally is not the hit or the certificate or the pat on the back we get from another Capital, but the perpetual furthering sustaining and upholding of the legitimate interests of India. That is the touch-stone, the criterion, the scale of balances on which we judge these things.

I will now turn to the second failure of the foreign policy of India, i.e. we have never bothered during the 20 years of our independence to define the irreducible, basic minimum of India's foreign policy. The Prime Minister yesterday said—it was an innocent exaggeration which can be pardoned—that if the world is having peace today it is because of India.

An hon. Member: What about Korea?

Shri Nath Pai: That is true. I will give you credit. It is true we did play a useful role. When the Korean war was on the edge of explosion into a world conflagration, India played a useful role. Very largely the credit goes to India, I am not going to deny it. It was to a certain extent true in old Indo-China also. But for the India of today to claim . . .

An hon. Member: What about Suez?

Shri Nath Pai: In Suez it was not only we, there were others. I am giving you your basic credit. We claim credit for peace in the world today rather wrongly.

The third failure of the foreign policy of India is the failure to understand the basic attributes of sovereignty and to exercise those attributes. Very often, pardon my saying, it hurts, it bleeds our heart, particularly of the young men, and I

am sure it applies to many people in that party; India very often gives the picture not of a sovereign, free, independent nation, but of a satellite. The reaction is not what will be good for us as a sovereign nation, but what somebody may think of us, who will take offence, who will be angry, who will be pleased. That is the supreme consideration. Here is the failure to exercise the attributes of sovereignty; and therefore, the unpredictability of our foreign policy.

The fourth, Mr. Speaker, is the failure to forge the External Affairs Ministry as an able, as a dynamic instrument of foreign policy of India. I will now quickly go over what happened in West Asia. Mr. Speaker, listening to the speeches yesterday not only of the Prime Minister but of others, I thought like beauty, aggression also cannot be defined. They say beauty lie sin the eyes of the seer; it seems aggression also, after West Asia, lies in the eyes of the seer. That was the inevitable conclusion because it was very clear. I am not going to attempt to dispute what should be the meaning and the connotation of aggression. But I will briefly say here that the acid test is not only of the might of the UAR or of perhaps Israel which is a minor thing, but the acid test is of the honesty of India, the Government of India, and I am afraid we have miserably failed.

There are two other casualties, apart from the many Israeli youth, many Arab youth who have been killed and the Indians who have lost their lives. There are two unaccounted casualties in the Sinai desert. One is the authority of the United Nations and the other, the prestige of the Government of India.

An hon. Member: Shame, shame.

Shri Nath Pai: There will be perhaps enough Arab resurgence to recover Arab territory. But those who have been trying to deprecate us apologists for Israel ought to have pondered over what we want. As everyone has said, we do not want to

say that as a result of the quick success of the Israeli arms, those arms shall be rewarding with Arab territory. This, we must resist; we shall resist. I wonder if the Government of India will be in a position to resist it. It thoroughly, totally, completely, compromised the position, first, to prevent the outbreak of hostilities by the sycophantic identification of the stand; on one side, we totally destroyed a useful part which India could have played. We could have refrained the others if we were in a position, we could have perhaps refrained the Israeli troops. In the United Nations, we could have played a useful part. But what a pathetic picture? Where is the picture of India, that the Prime Minister was describing today, in the corridors there? Mr. Chagla there was shuffling along and trying to claim somebody's attention and saying, "I am here, the Foreign Minister of India; anybody wanting to talk to me!" That was the pathetic picture. Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, I think, was trying to pinpoint this tragedy yesterday when she said that we have to go through a pilgrimage to the capitals of other countries. So now we have fallen.

What did we do? I must say that many fought in the desert; some overtly, some covertly; some openly and some secretly; some lost, some won in the battle—a three days' war in the desert of Sinai. But India is the only country which suffered a major defeat without firing a single shot. The damage in money is a minor one; it can be recovered. But the intangible damage to the image of India to the prestige of India—is a very great one, and it will take a long time to get it back. I said it hurts them; but why should it hurt them? (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. He has taken double the time.

Shri Nath Pat: I am concluding. I am saying this; in the desert of Sinai there used to be miracles. Christ also rose from the grave. There is a little

mound on which there is no stone. But I want this epitaph. It hurts me to say this; non-alignment has not so much been damaged by those who disagreed, those who criticised, as much as by the timidity and pusillanimity of the Government of India. In the desert of Sinai, along with the graves of the Israelis and the Arabs, there is one, something, hurried without a stone and an epitaph. "Here lies buried."—it would say—"the non-alignment of India, unwept, unhonoured and unsung."

I will be now concluding by saying only a few remarks in relation to the United Nations. (Interruption). Today, the United Nations is reduced to helpless impotence mainly due to the guilt of India, because had India remained neutral, had India remained impartial, had India carried the banner of justice, India, alone, should have persuaded the two blocs: let the Prime Minister never forget that behind the fighting forces were the two blocs. We could have brought a resolution adopted by the House, by the Assembly, acceptable to the overwhelming majority. No such resolution was possible because the foreign power which should have acted as a go-between, as a negotiator, as a bona fide helper in that cause where there was tragedy—its prestige, its influence, its very standing was sabotaged and destroyed by the Government of India. Therefore, we are reduced to this spectacle that nobody can bring peace there. There is threat of outbreak of hostilities. Once again the Government of India should try. It is very difficult to accept a mistake. To make a mistake is easy and human. To admit it is divine and to correct it is really super-human. Let us have the courage to say that we went wrong and let us try to rectify it.

I will say one word about China. The shadows of China are lengthening across our borders and across northern Burma. The recent developments in Burma are not to be brushed aside as an outburst of Chinese anger. The Chinese are cool people. One of the

[Shri Nath Pai]

tragedies of the foreign policy of India is, we never seriously try to understand China. China needs to be studied and understood. But we swing between two extremes—either "bhai, bhai" euphoria or panicky hysteria. We go from one end to the other end. God, knowing what kind of people we are, gave us the Himalayas for our protection. Knowing what kind of Governments will be coming, in His merciful kindness and foresight, God created for our defence the Himalayas, the Nagadhraya. But the Chinese have an indefatigable capacity for hard work, toil, suffering and sacrifice. They built their Himalayas—the 1500 mile long wall of China. Between 1848 and 1948, 72 million Chinese died in civil wars and revolutions. Such is their capacity for suffering and sacrifice. Such is the adversary. Let us remember, this adversary shall not be wished away by hysterical stances. One day we say, if they come, they will get a hot reception. The next day, of course, we think something equally hysterical. That is not a substitute of an adequate policy towards China. Let us remember that the shortest route to India lies through Burma. What is happening in Burma is very ominous and menacing.

I would request Mr Chagla to take this House into confidence and tell all and the truth about what is happening and what has happened during the past week in Bhutan. I will stop here without saying much. Sir, you need not be alarmed; I would not disclose prematurely anything that may not be. But I want to warn him. There are certain developments which are to be linked up with what is happening in north Burma—the sudden outbreak of violence in Nagaland and of course,—I hope my friends do not mind Nazalbari. I am not out to blame, I am not condemning; I am saying that Peking every day is claiming credit for what is happening. Last night the radio said that they are following I leave it there. But the significance for India cannot be lost so easily about what China is about to

do. We shall not be able to meet China with a platoon or a division of slogans and clichés or by beating about the bush here in Connaught Circus. That will not do. We need a cool, well worked-out, coherent policy. That policy of the defence of India so far as China is concerned can have the Soviet Union or Japan or Burma as an ally; it can have all the countries which are threatened by the Chinese intransigence as an ally.

The so-called nuclear non-proliferation treaty is a charter for the division of the world between the super-powers and their satellites. It is an open proclamation of a new kind of colonialism. The Prime Minister, well-meaningly perhaps in the still fresh idealism of her heart, yesterday said that if all the powers of this bloc and that bloc give a guarantee, so much the better. Does she know the meaning of it? This is accepting the division of the world between two groups of nations. The super-powers which already have the veto in the UN now have the veto of life and death of the rest of mankind. Why do you want to do it? Why do you want perpetually to be a colonial power? Why should we want to be a kind of protectorate of the super-powers? Did you tell them that they must destroy the stockpiles, that they must stop production of nuclear weapons and that they must not explode? It is not there. Any time you take the correct stand, we will have the courage to support you. We do not see such a policy.

I therefore appeal to the House, let us work for a policy whose concern will not be a certificate from any foreign country, but whose basic concern will be what posterity will say about us, not what Johnson or Kosygin will say. Any time the Prime Minister wants to go for summitry, let her remember that she is the Prime Minister of a nation of 800 million proud people. I am not interested in mini-summits. If she wants a summit, let her have a summit with Kosygin, DeGaulle, Johnson and if the time

comes, with Chou En-lai. India must go into summitry worthy of a proud nation of 500 young people.

An hon. Member: Take Nath Pai along with you.

Shri Nath Pai: Let us have a kind of foreign policy whose motive force will be self-respect of India. I hope we can make a beginning at least with such a foreign policy.

Shrimati Lakshminathanamma (Khammam) Sir, several hon. members have referred to our utterances during the West Asian crisis. Nobody says that we should not take a decision; nobody says that we should not give up the basic tenets of our policy, nobody says that we should let down our Arab friends in their hour of crisis. But there is always a correct method of helping our friends. Somehow opinion in India seems to be that the method that we have adopted during the West Asian crisis is not the correct method or the useful method in which we could have helped our Arab friends. Even the Arab friends could not endorse the way in which we have said things as the correct approach.

During the past five years, we ourselves were in trouble more than once. UAR, Russia and Ceylon and other friendly countries have helped up, but they did not help us by mere verbal feats alone. Our Arab friends would have appreciated it more had we adopted the same method to help them. Everyone knows who helped whom during the West Asian crisis. But ironically more than those who helped the Arab friends, we have angered one party or the other, without correspondingly winning the abiding friendship of the other party. The fact of the matter is that while mere talk can make no abiding friendship, it can make abiding enmity. We can adhere to our policy without offending others or creating tension or estrangement in our behaviour. What we say in international relations is even more important than

what we do. The postures and attitudes of nations in regard to various issues being well known, they are taken for granted by and large. But it is the statements made in relation to a given issue that really determine our usefulness and effectiveness and create the necessary image in the international sphere.

In connection with our foreign policy, we have to ask ourselves some fundamental questions. It would be good for all concerned if we give up at least now talking abstractly and academically. There is actually nothing abstract or academic about a country's foreign policy, anything more than about a country's domestic policy. In both cases, ideology and practice should go together and subservise the best interests of the country. In 1962 soon after the Chinese invasion, Panditji made a very significant statement. He said we are living in an unreal world. It was a summing up of the past policies and it also contained an indication for the future. He said in his inimitable way that we were living in an unreal world and that we should be ready to face the facts from then onwards. Any appraisal of our foreign policy should have this as the starting premise. If that is so I would like to ask how far we have progressed in this direction. As several hon. members have said and as the Prime Minister also referred to the basic approach in our foreign policy, in international affairs is said to be non-alignment.

No one can seriously question the validity of the policy of non-alignment. At the time of the Chinese invasion we did have conflicting views or arguments expressed on the floor of this House in favour of non-alignment or against non-alignment. But we do not hear them now. It has become a normal feature in international affairs and more and more foreign countries are taking to non-alignment. Sometimes we ourselves do not know how far we endorse their non-alignment particularly when

[Shrimati Lakshmi Kantamma]

we feel that on certain issues we ought to have been supported unequivocally and they let us down. But it is inherent in the policy of non-alignment itself and we cannot have it both ways. Now we have come to a stage when non-alignment will no longer be debated. It has become a normal feature of several sovereign nations, firstly because the bi-polar alignment of nations has largely disappeared giving place to multi-polar alignments and, secondly, because almost every nation is finding non-alignment a safe course from the point of view of world peace.

Thus, it appears to me that in today's context of international relations a mere statement of our adherence to non-alignment would not only be grossly inadequate but it will actually show us up as obsolete and stagnant. In order to spell out our policy more accurately, what is required is something more than non-alignment—a desideratum which includes non-alignment but which is not co-terminus with it. A non-aligned nation is generally believed to have neither particular friends nor particular foes. But India being a very large country having a very vital position, we have particular friends and particular foes—especially the latter.

This realisation on our part will bring us out of the 'unreal world' to which Panditji referred after receiving what may be called the rudest shock of his career in 1962. I am sorry to say that this realisation does not seem to have come to us and our response, and utterances are still modelled on the era of the 'unreal world'. We seem to have understood non-alignment to mean the art of antagonising everyone equally. This mechanical approach should be given up at once. We should learn to live with the menace on our borders. To live with it does not mean to close our eyes. It means preparedness minus panic, strength minus effervescent excitement, courage minus bellicosity.

I would like to say a few words about China. The hon. Minister has not convincingly explained to us why we should continue our diplomatic relations with China even after their barbaric behaviour with us. I do not say that we should give it up, but he should reasonably explain to us what are the reasons, what usefulness will be served by this. At least, if we give up our diplomatic relations, I feel, our self-respect will stand vindicated and other nations may follow suit so that it will start a re-thinking in China itself.

About our foreign embassies, I would like to say a word. It is unfortunate that though our policies are of a high order and they are never open to any doubt, still there is so much of misunderstanding and misinterpretation about our policies either of secularism or of non-alignment or of our championing the cause of backward States. How is it? There has been a promise made on the floor of this House that an evaluation of the working of our foreign embassies will be made and a report submitted to the House. Our policies are not based on exigencies but on certain fundamental values. How is it that these are misunderstood or misinterpreted by other countries. The hon. Minister may come forward and say that our embassies are doing their work, but the policies of those countries are based on political grounds or exigencies and therefore they refuse to be convinced. It is not so much a question that we educate the governments of those countries, but the question is how far we have educated the people of those countries. It is the people who can help us in the form of reports in the Press or in the form of favourable publications in those countries. So the long overdue and immediate need is that the hon. Minister of External Affairs should evaluate the work of our foreign embassies and submit a report within six months to this Parliament.

Shri Swell (Autonomous Districts):
Mr Speaker, Sir, the Demand for

Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs provide an annual occasion by which this House can appraise the performance of this Ministry as well as the success or failure of our foreign policy. In trying to make this appraisal may I submit that it is only right and proper that we do it in the context of the prevailing international situation and in terms of whether that policy has been able to uphold and advance our national interest.

Yesterday, we had the opportunity of listening to the Prime Minister on this subject. She spoke at length on the question of non-alignment and referred to the desirability of having a guarantee against nuclear attacks. Significantly, however, I missed in her speech any reference to peaceful co-existence. I do not know whether this was a slip on her part or it indicated a shift in the policy of this Government. This debate, coming as it does, almost at the heels of the West Asian crisis and judging by the policy that we followed in that connection, I personally am inclined to think that the absence of any reference to peaceful co-existence by the Prime Minister yesterday indicated a shift in our policy. In fact, in the West Asian crisis, in the Arab-Israeli conflict, I think by our action and our utterances we have repudiated that important part of our foreign policy—peaceful co-existence.

May I Sir, refer the Minister of Foreign Affairs to his own statement on this question before this House on the 25th May, where he started by saying:

“The creation of Israel has given rise to tension between Israel and the Arab countries”.

By this we would understand that he and his government held the existence of Israel to be the cause for all the trouble in West Asia and that, by inference, if Israel could be removed, the cause for the trouble in West Asia would disappear. The Foreign Minister is here and it is for him to

confirm or deny this understanding of his statement.

Now, may I remind you that Israel came into existence by a resolution of the United Nations, and that Soviet Russia and other countries not seeing eye to eye with Israel on many questions, and this country as well, have recognised the existence of Israel? Therefore, for us now to go and say that the very existence of Israel was the cause of the trouble, or in other words to say, to endorse though indirectly the claim or assertion of UAR and the Arab countries that Israel should be destroyed and annihilated is, to me, a complete repudiation of our declared policy of peaceful co-existence. What we should have done under the circumstances, if we have been consistent, was to caution UAR and the Arab countries and to tell them that whatever might have been their differences, they should have pursued the policy of peaceful co-existence with Israel.

Now, there were many things that we did in connection with the Western Asia crisis which we should not have done, and if we have not done those things, we could have prevented perhaps the breaking out of hostilities in that part of the world. There were many things which we could have done and which we did not, and if we had done them, we would have been able to contribute to the stabilisation of peace there. In doing what we did we have not served the interests of our friends, the Arabs and had we cautioned them in the beginning, they would not have landed in the position in which they find themselves today. We have only succeeded in harming the interests of our friends, as well as our own interests, and the image that we projected of ourselves in the entire West Asian crisis is not a very desirable image. It is an image of monumental ineptitude; it is an image of kowtowing, especially to the big powers, like Soviet Russia. I would not like to refer to the many details of the West

Asian crisis which would substantiate my contention, for I do not have the time.

Mr. Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Swell: I shall now revert to the question of non-alignment, on which the Prime Minister dwelt at some length. As far as non-alignment means independence of thought, as far as non-alignment means the freedom to judge the issues on their own merit and to have our own say in the matter, I think there is nobody in this country who will have any bone to pick with the Prime Minister. We may not have any things but at least we must assure to ourselves the freedom to think for ourselves, for if we lose that freedom we cease to be a nation. But I think the Prime Minister yesterday was trying to oversimplify the question of non-alignment. I have the feeling that she still works with the out-moded impression that this world is a bi-polar world, with America on one side and Soviet Russia on the other side. But any student of current affairs realises this, that the world as it functions today, has ceased to be a bi-polar world, it has become a multi-polar world and, in that situation, to put a question to us on this side of the House, in a rhetorical manner, "with which side would you ask as to align ourselves?", is to be very simple and very naive.

The Prime Minister yesterday correctly referred to the blurring of the edges between America and Soviet Russia. It is true that in recent months and years there has been growing evidence of a *detente* between Soviet Russia and America, and there is no better evidence of this growing *detente* between these two super-powers than in the West Asian crisis and on the question of nuclear non-proliferation. The two countries have demonstrated to the entire world that where it suits their interests, whether it suits the interests of the world or not, they are prepared to ride rough-shod over the feelings of the weaker and smaller nations.

Therefore, the question of polarising the world into the Soviet Union and America has become a little out-dated.

Mr. Speaker: His time is up. He should conclude.

Shri Swell: Then, why should we forget France? France is a new power that is emerging in Europe. Under the leadership of President de Gaulle, it has become a nuclear power. It has pronounced its own decided views, whether on Vietnam or on West Asia. It has cut itself loose from the domination of America, and today it is spearheading a new movement in Europe, the United States of European from the Urals to the Atlantic. The European Common Market is only a means towards the achievement of the new United States of Europe. This is a new force emerging.

Then, nearer home, we have got China. China has emerged as the third nuclear power. It has got not only the hydrogen bomb, but has tested, and I believe tested successfully the inter-continental ballistic missiles. With its growth, China has become a third pole in the world and with its unconventional and shocking ways China is asserting itself not only within its own boundaries but in countries in the periphery and in the whole of Asia. China has made no secret that its aim is to bring the whole of Asia under its domination.

In this context, I think the Prime Minister's reference to the acceptance of a nuclear guarantee has got a compelling importance. But, then, over this question too I think the Government has not applied its mind to the problem with that perspicuity, with that penetration which it should have done. Now, what kind of guarantee do you want? I believe it would suit the book of the Foreign Minister and the Government to say that the guarantee also should be non-aligned. I would think that they would like this guarantee to be a joint guarantee, given by both Soviet Russia and America. But what I want to have

is—I am not interested in the guarantee being aligned or non-aligned—a guarantee that is credible, a guarantee that is dependable, a guarantee that is capable of instant action, if our country is attacked.

Now, the operational arrangement for this . . .

Mr. Speaker: He has taken more than his time, in spite of my ringing the bell more than twice. Also, this is the time to adjourn for lunch. Now I call Shri D. C. Sharma. Let him start so that he can continue his speech after lunch.

Shri Swell: Sir, You did not allow me to conclude my speech I would have done it in a minute

Mr. Speaker: I gave him sufficient time. Still, he went on. Now everybody wants double the time allotted to him. Now, Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to participate in this debate . . .

Mr. Speaker: He will continue his speech in the afternoon.

Shri F. K. Deo (Kalahandi) Sir, we have got 11 minutes to our credit

Mr. Speaker: Only 8 minutes not 11 minutes. It has been accepted by his own party. Now we will adjourn for lunch.

13 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at four minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]
DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1967-68—
contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma. He will have to abide by the time-limit of 10 minutes, not a second more.

1438 (aj)LSD-8.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, please permit me to congratulate Mr. M. C. Chagla for his able stewardship of the Ministry of External Affairs and for his very eloquent exposition of our foreign policy at the recent session of the United Nations Assembly.

It was said on the floor of the House today that our foreign policy has no framework of reference, that our foreign policy has no irreducible minimum and that our foreign policy has not anything which savours of our sovereignty. I would ask the hon. gentleman who made these points that he should close his book of Israel and read the speech which the hon. Minister of External Affairs delivered at the United Nations Assembly recently. If he had done that, I am sure, he would have come to know that our foreign policy has the framework of our Indian culture and tradition which has lasted for thousands of years. It is rooted in the philosophy which Mahatma Gandhi gave us and it is also grounded in the theory and the practice of the foreign policy which Pandit Nehru expounded to us and to the whole world.

Our foreign policy is that we should de-escalate aggression if it exists anywhere and we should be a fruitful party to the up-keep of peace in this world. If this is not the irreducible minimum, the basis, of our foreign policy, I do not know what it can be and, I think, there is no country in the world which I know of that has upheld the principles of the United Nations Charter as much as we have done. We have always stood for peace and we have always stood by the United Nations in their peace-keeping activities. We have sent our soldiers and other persons to different countries so that they can be stalwart champions of peace. If this is not the irreducible minimum of foreign policy, I do not know what else it can be.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

The only policy, I think, that the world needs today is the policy which India pursues. I was just reading an article by Mr. Kingsley Martin in the *New Statesman* of the 14th July, 1967, entitled "Is World War Inevitable?". It says:

"On 11 May U Thant remarked that he feared that 'the initial phase of World War Three had begun. Einstein stated that when it came, it would be fought with H-bombs which would 'annihilate all life on the earth'."

And this is how he concludes:

"The one prospect which seems ruled out is that sanity will take possession of humanity's rulers. All prophecy is impossible. The only thing one can say is that the expected never happens. It is always something else."

When I read this article, I came to the conclusion that if a knowledgeable person like Mr. Kingsley Martin thinks that Third World War has already begun in its initial phases, I think, the only country, one of the few countries in the World, that has always stood against the World War, whether Third or Fourth or any other war, is India and, therefore, India should be proud of its traditions of peace-keeping in this world. This is the grass-root of our foreign policy.

It has been said that we give up our sovereignty when we pursue our foreign policy. I was amazed to hear that. Sometimes a gentleman runs away with the words he has memorised. When he described our Foreign Minister as shuffling about in the corridor of the United Nations like somebody who was a lost soul, I felt very hurt. I do not think that any Minister of my country or any national of my country is unaware that he belongs to a sovereign democratic republic and, I believe, that our Foreign Minister went about his work there as a person who was fully conscious of being the representative of 500 million self-respected persons. We

may not be proud, we may not be arrogant—we do not want to be like that. But, I think, if India can be proud of one thing, it is this that we have preserved our self-respect and our Foreign Minister did give expression to that self-respect which characterises our nation as a whole.

Of course, there is one thing about which I do feel slightly and I hope our Foreign Minister will look into it. It is this. I know that our External Affairs Ministry is a good instrument of our foreign policy. That is good, but things which are good can be made better and things which are better can be made the best. I do not see any reason why we should not vitalise our External Affairs Ministry and why we should not make it a little more energetic and a little more electric, if I can use that word, in order that the foreign policy of our country is put across the nations of the world ably and properly. Some persons have been talking of the Pillai Report. I think, Mr. Pillai belonged to the old school of diplomacy and that school of diplomacy is dead, forgotten and buried. Even if the report comes, I doubt how much of it will have validity now. I think, it is necessary that we think in terms of the new diplomacy, the diplomacy of friendship, the diplomacy of negotiations between equals, the diplomacy of fraternity, which is now prevailing in those parts of the world which are democratic and which are trying to become forces to reckon with in the world.

It was said that the policy of non-alignment is our sacred cow. I do not think that it is a cow. I do not talk in terms of zoology as my friends have talked. I feel that non-alignment is the grass-root of our foreign policy. But I would say to the Minister that he should try to come to terms with certain movements which are very necessary for our country. For instance, Pakhtoonistan Movement. I do not see any reason why we should not encourage Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and help him in this

movement, which is a very brave movement about the sovereignty of a people who have a different culture, who have different ethnic attributes and who have a different history. I also do not understand why we should not try to come to terms with the East Pakistan Liberation Movement. If the Pakistanis can create trouble for us in Manipur and other places, I do not see any reason why we should not try to encourage this East Pakistan Liberation Movement. Then, the question of human rights of Tibetans must also be pursued. We may not give constitutional or any other kind of political status to His Holiness the Dalai Lama, but a Parliamentary delegation should be sent abroad along with some diplomats, so that the human rights of Tibet are brought to the notice of the peoples of the world so that the people of the world know how the human rights of Tibetans are being trampled under the feet, and how they are being liquidated. We should also think of Rhodesia and we should help Mr. Kaunda, who visited this country recently. We should also build up good relations with East Germany, with Taiwan and other countries of the world. Our non-alignment should not remain as something exclusive, but it should be all-inclusive.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will conclude.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am concluding.

There should be a very vigorous department in the External Affairs Ministry dealing with Indians abroad. The other day a reply was given about the plight of Indians in Aden. I tell you, Sir, that no reply would be farther from the truth than this. The Indians who are coming from Mozambique, Angola, Kenya, Aden, Burma and Ceylon must be looked after properly. There should be a vigorous cell in the External Affairs Ministry which should keep a watch over these activities.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will conclude.

Shri D. C. Sharma: My next point is this and I will finish it in one sentence. We are having some super powers in this world. Some hon. members mentioned this, USA, USSR and so on. These super powers are in terms of military potential, in terms of their armies and wealth. Let us build up super powers of peace. I think, the super powers of peace will be France, Japan and other countries who have known the bitter fruits of war. To counter these super powers of high military potential, we should have super powers of peace.

Another suggestion is this. I read in some very sober papers that the UN is practically going to be extinguished like the League of Nations. Therefore, I would say that we should try to strengthen the United Nations as much as we can and we should listen to the sane and wise voice of U Thant and we should keep him going as the Secretary-General. If the United Nations goes, the cause of peace goes. The strength of world peace lies in the United Nations and we must try to build up a bulwark of peace in the United Nations.

Shri P. Ramaswami (Madurai): Our foreign policy naturally must have some relation to the situation in the world. What is the crux of the world situation today? Some time back, some time last year—I find it in the report of the External Affairs Ministry—there was a meeting between our Prime Minister the President of the United Arab Republic and the President of Yugoslavia. They issued a joint communique. I will just read out one sentence from there:

“The Presidents and the Prime Minister remain resolutely opposed to colonialism and neo-colonialism in all the forms and manifestations which seek to curb the freedom of action for newly independent countries, distorting their national goals . . . and to exploit the natural human resources.

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

They deprecate the use of economic and financial assistance as an instrument of pressure and noted with satisfaction...." etc., etc.

To-day this is the fundamental problem facing the world today and if we shut our eyes to this basic fact that after the end of the Second World War when many countries had had to be given their political freedom, imperialism today is seeking to function in a different way and it is seeking to impose neo-colonialism on all those countries, we will not be able to have a proper foreign policy. Unless we also realise that we are a part of this pressure of neo-colonialism in our country—we have had bitter experience of that neo-colonialism, of that pressure, in this country for the last 30 years; particularly during the last two years, we have had growing experience of this tremendous, increasing pressure of neo-colonialism in our country as a result of which devaluation and so many other things we have had to agree—we will not be able to have a proper foreign policy.

The question of West Asia has got to be looked at from this point of view. It is not a question of the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba or something else. Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit stated the correct thing yesterday when she said that they were seeking to change the balance of forces in this area. Why should they seek to change the balance of forces in this area? It is because in this area the Arab nations are today rising to their own nationhood and they are trying to throw off the shackles of imperialism on their oil resources. Today, it is a well known fact that as far as the British and American imperialists are concerned, their oil investments in this area are much more than their oil investments in any other part of the world. Today, the oil resources in West Asia the known resources as well as the prospective resources, amount to 22,000 million tonnes whereas the oil resources of the entire

Mexican Gulf area comes only to about 8,000 million tonnes. This is the fundamental fact with which we have to reckon.

If Israel has been able to fight, it is not because Israel has been a very powerful nation. We all know how much money was poured into Israel ever since it was brought into existence. We also know who poured that money. We also know who poured a tremendous amount of armaments into Israel. Israel, a tiny nation of 25 lakhs of people cannot obviously have got all this military hardware by paying for it. That military hardware was given to Israel for the purpose of changing the balance of forces in this area. It is also well known that the planes that came from Israel and destroyed the entire fleet of the UAR were not Israeli planes actually; it is well known, after all, that there were as many as one thousand planes that had come, and those one thousand planes were not the planes of Israel. It was stated that the USA was keeping that fleet away at a long distance. But you will recall that when that ship Liberty was hit, it was said that it was hit within 15 miles of the Arab sea coast; then it was found out that that ship was there helping the Israeli planes. Therefore, let us understand the basic problem in West Asia. We are also a part of that West Asian problem. We are also part of the tremendous pressure that is being brought to bear. After all, we know what is happening.

Today, we have got our quarrel with Pakistan. But is it really quarrel with Pakistan alone? We referred the dispute to the United Nations. All these years, if this problem has been pending, what is the reason for it? Does not our experience tell us who helped the Pakistani all these years from 1947 onwards in the UNO to keep this pending? Do we not know who armed the Pakistani army? After all, when the Pakistani army was armed by the UAR, it was stated at that time that it was being armed by

fighting China. Are the Americans such boobies that they do not know that the tanks would not go over those heights of 18,000 feet? They knew that these tanks were going to be used against India. They did that for the simple reason that they wanted to maintain tension in this sub-continent, and they wanted to maintain tension in this sub-continent for the simple reason that if they did so, India and Pakistan could be brought under their control. We have been seeing that mounting pressure all these years.

This is not the problem of Asia alone. The other day, President de Gaulle of France, when he had gone to West Germany had stated openly that people had got to act together in order to safeguard their freedom and independence against American enslavement. He was not a communist or any such thing. This is the position taken by a free country like France which has experienced the growing pressure of American investments and of American economic pressure on a developed nation like France. This is also our feeling. Today, the biggest colossus in the world, American imperialism, is seeking to bring nation after nation under its neo-colonialist drive. This is the basic fact of world life today.

The entire South American continent was tremendously aided by the USA, but what is the position of any State in the South American continent today? What is the wonderful democracy that is prevalent there? The moment the government of any State is not liked by the USA, immediately that government is toppled down. This is the type of thing that the American imperialists want to do everywhere.

It is the same pressure that we are seeing today in Viet Nam. I am sorry that my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani did not say a word about it. He had talked so much about other things....

An hon. Member: The hon. Member has not said anything about China.

Shri P. Ramamurti: I shall come to that. We have nothing to hide. We shall come to that later.

What about Viet Nam? To those countries where there are such leaders as would be leading the national movement for independence, who would be prepared to continue the foreign investments in their countries so that they could come back, these imperialists certainly gave political freedom, but to a country like Viet Nam where they knew that the communist leadership was not going to tolerate foreign investments, they would not give independence. We know that the people of Viet Nam have had to fight for their freedom, and we know what had happened.

The other day, some Member had talked about the great role that India had played in Viet Nam in bringing about those things. But we must also remember the basic facts behind the Geneva Agreement. In spite of the tremendous help that the American imperialists gave them, when the French army was being defeated at Dien Bien Phu and other places, they came to this Geneva Agreement. Today, it is said that the North Viet Nameese are fighting with the South Viet Nameese, or that the Viet Nameese are fighting with the Viet Nameese. Was there any partition of Viet Nam at that time? Under the Geneva Agreement was there any political partition as in the case of India and Pakistan? Were any new countries created at that time at all? After all, for eighteen months, there was a military cease-fire line; after that period there were to be free elections in both parts of that single country. But who torpedoed that election? It was the United States that had torpedoed that election and imposed the Diem regime on the people. When the Diem regime was overthrown, when the people of that country rose in revolt against them, there came the Geneva

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

Agreement. Now come the American imperialists who say that today North Viet Nam is aggressing over South Viet Nam. They could not keep the people suppressed. And we know what is happening today. Today, about 600,000 American soldiers are fighting the people there.

I agree with Shri Nath Pai on this point that our Government do not have a firm policy on these issues. How could we have a firm policy? Shri Nath Pai was saying that he wanted our Prime Minister not to go to some meetings of such chota States but he wanted her to go to some meetings with Mr Kosygin, Mr Chou En-lai, Mr. Johnson, Mr de Gaulle and others. When our country is dependent on the American imperialists for our very food, when this is the fundamental policy, how is it possible to go and attend such meetings? How is it possible for us to take a forthright stand and an independent stand? After all, we could take a forthright and independent stand only to the extent to which we are not dependent on any other country economically.

An hon. Member: China imports its food

Shri P. Ramamurti: Why should we have to import food? Why should we not have our own food? If we do not have enough food, let us not go and beg of others. I do not want my country to go and beg anywhere. I want my country to stand on its own legs. I admire China for the simple reason that during these twenty years, it has not depended upon other countries; it has not gone begging for food; it is not going begging for technical know how etc. It is not going in for technical collaboration with foreign imperialists or anybody else.

Shri D. C. Sharma: But China has imported food from Australia, New Zealand and other places.

Shri P. Ramamurti: It pays for the imports. If we also pay for the imports, I have no objection. We should not go and beg for food. This is the fundamental point.

Today, in the face of this tremendous pressure of the big colossus of American imperialism, if we are able to rally round the entire people of this country as well as the people elsewhere who are now facing this pressure, I am sure our policy will have a rudder and will have a firm basis; if we adopt that policy, I have no doubt whatsoever that we shall also be able to settle with China on that basis. This is the fundamental issue.

Shri P. K. Deo: China should vacate the aggression

Shri P. Ramamurti: If the hon. Member gets me another 20 minutes from the Chair, I shall be able to explain the position.

Therefore, that is the fundamental question that is facing us today. Somebody was saying that if India had adopted a neutral policy, she would have been able to bring about peace between these two countries, Israel and the Arab countries. I disagree that no such thing would have been possible for the simple reason that you cannot bring Israel to terms on this question. How can you give Israel dollars and other war materials that have been pouring into that country from USA? That is the fundamental question.

Therefore, the problem today is how all those nations which are feeling this pressure of American imperialism have got to come together. That is the basic issue in West Asia. That is the basic issue throughout Asia, may throughout the world.

Instead of seeing this problem in its reality, unfortunately, I find that many people in our country are raising other questions. Yes, sidetrack the whole issue by bringing in other questions. We had one such the other day in this House where a demand was made that you should have an emigre government of the Dalai Lama set up here. The simple question, apart from what the External Affairs Minister said that we cannot wash away the history of the last few years.

is: is there a single scrap of paper which shows historically at any time Tibet having been recognised as an independent country by any country in the world? You cannot find any scrap of paper to that effect. Therefore, if you want to turn back the wheel of history, do it.

Then people say that we have got cultural affinity with Tibet. When I hear it, I laugh in my sleeves for the simple reason that I know only one thing took place 1400 years ago, when that Namboodiri Brahmin from Kaladi in South India came to the north, the ancestors of these people who talk of cultural affiliation between us and Tibet, rallied under the banner of Sankaracharya and drove Buddhism—both Mahayana and Hinayana—out of this country. That is the wonderful and tremendous affinity of culture between us and Tibet. I cannot understand this. If you want to have a fight, be straightforward, say so and have it. Adopt that policy by all means, but keep your eyes open. Then have a settlement of the border issue with the Dalai Lama here. You need not have to go to China for a settlement because Tibet belongs to him. Tell them we have no problem. Arrive at any settlement or any such thing with him and say 'we are going to be with you'. If you want to do that, declare it so, go about it and face all the consequences. Let us be prepared for that. I agree with Shri Nath Pai in this respect; let us not be frenzied over things. Let us not be impotent. Let us take on something in our hands.

In the absence of that, let us understand the realities of the situation. Today unless we are able to understand basic facts, we will not be able to take a forthright and decisive stand on the issues involved. The issue facing the world today is that American imperialism has become a tremendous colossus for gobbling up nation after nation. We will not be able to have a rudder for our policy unless we realise this fact.

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bettiah): What about Chinese imperialism?

Shri P. Ramamurti: Let him get for me ten minutes from the Chair. I will deal with it.

What I have to say is that we cannot solve issues by merely adopting postures. On the question of a settlement with China, we have missed so many opportunities. Our policy towards China has been one of drift. It is not paying us dividends. On the other hand, it is getting us into more and more trouble. We had opportunities before which we did not seize. I would only point out one thing. Today we are saying that we are prepared to talk on the entire border question if they accept the Colombo proposals, this and that. Till the conflict of 1962 took place, our position, when three or four times they proposed talks, was that there is nothing to talk about with you—there are those letters on record—withdraw from the whole of Aksai Chin and then we shall talk with you. Do we stand by that today?

Shri Pilleo Medy (Godhra). No

Shri P. Ramamurti: He is not in Government. I want to know what is the Government of India's position. Today they do not say, 'withdraw from Aksai Chin'. They say, 'We are prepared to talk to you if the question with regard to small posts is settled'. Therefore, Government have been changing their position from time to time. Opportunities got at that time were missed. If on the 15th October 1962, they had accepted the proposal to talk, the question of 8th September would not have been there, because then we would have an 8th September line and they would have an 8th September line. But Government refused and today we are drifting and drifting. With day by day, the position is becoming worse for our country. This bodes no good for the country, from the point of view of the interest of our country. We have got to break this stalemate. How to

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

break it, I cannot say. But you have got to do it as it is your problem, it is a problem created by you all these years, because you refused to do what was required to be done when the opportunity was there. Therefore, this position has come about.

In conclusion, I would say that it is because of the failure to have a clear perspective and clear vision as to what is facing us today on the political, economic and military spheres that we are where we are today. We are not alive to the dangers implicit in the neo-colonialism of one country mainly—from a set of imperialist countries—and are making ourselves more and more dependent on them. It is this that is preventing us from playing an independent role in world affairs. Unless we are able to reverse this, we will fall between two stools. On Vietnam, you say: Stop the bombing. But you do not say anything more; you do not rally the people of the world against American imperialism. Today you do not do anything to settle the problem with China.

On the basic issue confronting the whole world, namely, the growing pressure on all the nations of the world, including the European nations, exerted by the neo-colonialist American imperialism, Government do not have an independent foreign policy. Their foreign policy is, on the other hand, geared to get help from the American imperialists. That is the fact of the country's state of affairs today. Unless we are able to see through this colossus, unless we are able to rally the people of the whole world who are reeling under the growing pressure of American imperialism, politically, economically and militarily, we will not be able to chalk out an independent policy.

It is not a question of our supporting the Arab nations; there is no question of reciprocity in this. It is a question of our own survival. If some mistakes had been committed by

the UAR, that is not the question at issue today. Today the fundamental question is whether all these countries are going to stand together to repel the growing American pressure on their political, economic and military life.

I therefore appeal to Government to rise to the occasion, not just dilly-dally. You cannot stand between these two things. You will fall between the two stools, if you do not take a forthright stand on this basic issue.

Shri Pilleo Mody: And take a great leap forward.

श्री विक्रित मिश्र (मोतीहारी) : उप-
ध्यक्ष महोदय, जो डिमार्श वेज की गई है मैं
उम्मा समर्थन कर रहा हूँ।

मह: बात मैं सुनना चाहता हूँ। कामकाज
ने छपने शुरू से कहा है कि परराष्ट्र की चिन्ता
बिना राजतन्त्र चलाया रहता है और परराष्ट्र
का ध्यान रहे बिना स्वराष्ट्र सम्बन्धी कार्रवाई
पूरी नहीं होती है। दूसरी बात उसने बतलाई
है कि जब तक मोहता गरम नहीं होता तब तक
लक्ष्मी से मिलना नहीं है। वैसे ही जब तक
राजाओं में नाकत नहीं रहती है तब तक
राजाओं का मेल नहीं होता है। तीसरी बात
उसने कही है कि देश की सजावट छपने देश
की प्राथमिक स्थिति और साम्प्रतिक संभव में
संश्लेषण रहना चाहिए। इनका कहने के बाद
मैं बनवाना चाहता हूँ कि भीष्मपितामह ने
कहा कि राजा का कर्तव्य है कि पहले छपने
देश की सुरक्षा का इन्तजाम करे। हमारे देश
की स्वाधीनता के बाद और चीनी हमले के
पहले हमारे देश की इज्जत दुनिया में थी।
चीनी हमले के बाद हमारे देश की इज्जत गिर
गई, हमारे देश की प्रतिष्ठा खत्म हो गई।
हमारे पड़ोस में नेपाल देश है जिसकी। करोड़
की आबादी है। आप वहाँ पर जाकर
देखिये कि हिन्दुस्तान की क्या इज्जत है।
वह चीन से बिलगा डरता है जब बाह्य है,
जबना हम से डरता नहीं है। लखन

कारण यह है कि हम में ताकत नहीं है । चित्त भी हमारे असीमितता के अन्तर्गत ही कोई विद्यमान बना गया कोई वेस्ट एशिया बना गया । जब उन्होंने अपने देश की चित्ता छोड़ दी तब हमारी ताकत कब बढ़ेगी । जब तक हमारे देश की ताकत नहीं बढ़ेगी तब तक हम में शक्ति नहीं आयेगी और कोई भी हमारी इज्जत नहीं करेगा ।

प्रायः दुनिया के पांच देशों की इज्जत है । अमरीका, रूस, इंग्लैंड, फ्रांस और जापान । इन पांच देशों के अलावा किसी दूसरे देश की इज्जत नहीं है । चीनकी विषयवस्तु पश्चिम ने कहा कि हम सभी नान-एलाइनमेंट को मानते हैं । नान-एलाइनमेंट ठीक है । इन वर्षों में रहते हैं । जो आदमी ताकतवर रहता है उस की सब पचापती मानते हैं । जो कि ताकतवर नहीं रहता है उस की पचापती कोई नहीं मानता । आप के नान-एलाइनमेंट की क्या इज्जत है । आप की इज्जत तब तक की जब तक चीन का हमला नहीं हुआ था । चीनी हमले के बाद नान-एलाइनमेंट के कुछ माने नहीं रह गए हैं । आपकी नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी में अमर ताकत होगी तो आप चीन ने अपनी चौदह हज़ार वर्गमील भूमि को आपस में लेने । अमर आपकी इन नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी में ताकत होती तो आप हाजीपीर पाम और काश्मीर के दूसरे जो क्षेत्र पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में हैं उनको वापिस ले लेते । लेकिन आपकी इन नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी में ताकत नहीं है । इसलिये जरूरत इन बात की है कि आप अपने अन्दर ताकत पैदा करें । ताकत पैदा करने के लिए यह जरूरी है कि जैसे जैसे पड़कर चुनाव है कि जो राजा होता है उसको अपने देश की रक्षा का सब से पहले ध्यान होना चाहिये, उसको अपने ऐज और आराध पर कब शर्ष करना चाहिये । अवर राजा कब शर्ष करेगा तो प्रजा भी कब शर्ष करेगी । आज बहुत ही शर्ष के शर्ष हो रहे हैं । यह शर्ष होने चाहिये ।

जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम अपने देश को शक्तिशाली बनायें । इस के लिए यह जरूरी है कि हम एटम बम बनाएं । देश को शक्तिशाली बनाने के लिए ओहचिबार है जो मार्डन वैपंड है वे भी अपने देश में बनने चाहिये । यदि हम एटम बम नहीं बनायेंगे, यदि हम अपने हथियार खुद नहीं बनायेंगे तो हमारी स्वाधीनता अतरे में पड़ जाएगी । हमारा एक नम्बर का दुश्मन चीन है और दूसरे नम्बर का पाकिस्तान है । इन में मिच्छा हुआ है कि जब पड़ोसी देश दुश्मन हो तो हुयेसा मजग और नाबघान रहना चाहिये और ताकतवर बनना चाहिये । आराम्य जैसा बहा राज-नीतिज्ञ इन देश में पैदा नहीं हुआ है । चीन और पाकिस्तान से निपटना है तो हमको अपनी ताकत बढ़ानी होगी । जब तक ताकत नहीं बढ़ायेंगे दुनिया में कोई हमारी इज्जत नहीं करेगा । फिर आप वेस्ट एशिया में चले जायें या विषयवस्तु में चले जायें या एटी भी चले जायें और कुछ भी करे या कहे आपकी इज्जत नहीं होगी । प्रायः इज्जतइल की क्यों इतनी इज्जत बढ़ गई है । पञ्चीम नाभ की उमकी आवादी है । उमने दस करोड़ को आवादी जाने अमर देशो को हरा दिया है । उनकी अर डिम्पन नहीं है कि वे उनके आगे बोन सके । इज्जतइल के पाम ताकत है । मैं कहना चाहता हू कि नान-एलाइनमेंट ठीक है लेकिन उमी बस्त जब आपके पाम ताकत हो । प्रायः आपकी नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी में ताकत नहीं है ।

हमारे मलानी माहब ने टायनको नःहब ना हवाला दिया और उनके बिचार आपको बतायेंगे । मैं आपने कहना चाहता हू कि आनकब का आप पडा, शोम्य पिनामह ने शान्तिपर्व को पडा । आपको पता चलेगा कि किय तरह से राजनीति बनता है । जरूरत इस बात की है कि देश की ताकत को आप बढ़ाये । जब हमारे पास ताकत होगी तब हमारी पूछ होगी और अमर हमारे देश के पाम ताकत नहीं होगी तो हमारे देश को कोई नहीं पूछेगा दुनिया में ।

[श्री विद्युति मिश्र]

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जित तरह की धाज हवाई देश की स्थिति है और जित तरह से हम अपनी राजनीति को चला रहे हैं, उनमें धाजको अपने घर को दुस्त करना पड़ेगा। हम राजदूत नियुक्त करते हैं। लेकिन देखने वाली बात यह है कि कौन सांग है जिनको राजदूत नियुक्त किया जाता है। रिटायर्ड मिशिन सर्वेंट को नियुक्त कर दिया जाता है, उनको राजदूत बना दिया जाता है। जोबन घर के मिशिन मिशिन में रहते हैं और जब रिटायर होने को जाते हैं या रिटायर हो चुकते हैं तो उनको राजदूत बना दिया जाता है। मैं चायना माहल से कहना चाहता हूँ कि विदेशी मामलों में चीन करने के निम्न दुनिया की बहुत सी बातों का अध्ययन करना पड़ता है, दुनिया की हर एक चीज का जानना पड़ता है। हमारी सरकार में नां यह है, और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर श्री जवाहरलाल ने ने कवन में लेकर धाज तक यही जाना आ रहा है कि जिनको चाहे जो पार्लामेन्ट दे दिया जाता है, जिनको चाहे जो मिनिस्ट्री दे दी जाती है। जो एग्जुटिव में चाहे में नहीं जानते हैं उनको एग्जुटिव विभाग दे दिया जाता है, जो विदेशी मामलों का नहीं जानते हैं उनका विदेश विभाग दे दिया जाता है। किन्हीं का उह विषय का ज्ञान हा या न हां, उनको वह विषय सौंप दिया जाता है। यही बजत है कि धाज चीन घर के बाद भी हमारे देश की ताकत नहीं बढ़ी है। अबर ताकत बढ़ी तो हमारी जो धाज स्थिति है वह न होती, वह कहीं अच्छी होती।

हमारे देश के ऊपर पंचम धाज के कलकन कर्वा है जिनमें से चीन धाज नां हमारे परसिक सेक्टर में बना हुआ है और चीन धाज धाज कर्वा है। इसना धारी कर्वा हल धाज तक देते रहेंगे, कीसे इसको चुकानेंगे? हम चीन धाजके के निम्न जाते हैं, धाज की चीन हल धाजके फिरते हैं, हलधारी

की चीन हल धाजके फिरते हैं। हलधारी धाज धाज के लिए हल कर्वा लेते हैं, धाज चीनके के निम्न विदेश की कोर देखते हैं। ऐसी धाजना में हमारी ताकत धाज बढ़ सकती है। किस तरह से चीन की ताकत बढ़ी और वह नाकतवर नहीं हुआ। उतने धाजने यहाँ के लोगों की कम्प्लेन पर कंट्रोल किया। नहीं नहीं धाज भी यहाँ वह करते हैं। स्वाधीनता के बाद चीनी चीन की हातत भी उतने हमारी हासन धाजकी की। लेकिन चीन उतन बाद हल धाजनांग में गृह गए, धाजने चीने में हमने धाज कर दिया, नाच गाने में हल धाजने रहे जिन की धाजसे से हल ताकतवर नहीं बन सके। चीन में धाजनी पूरी धाजिन लया कर धाजने देश को धाजने बढाया और वह ताकतवर देश बन गया। इन्फिन्ट में कहुना कि धाज भी देश को ताकतवर बनाने की धाज ध्यान दे।

बहुन में धाज कम्प्लेनट धाज कम्प्लेनट कंट्रोल को गृह देखते है, उन से मर्पेट लेना चाहते है। मैं उनमें कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह देश मुम्ताग है। इनमें मुम कम्प्लेनट साधो, साधो-धम नाचा, कीपर्टामेज नाको नेरिन धाजने देश को स्वतन्त्रता का किलो भी हातत में हाथ में न पाने वा। नेरिन कुछ हमारे कम्प्लेनट धाज चीन की धाज जा गृह है और कुछ धम की टाक जा रहे है। मैं उनमें कहुना कि वे यहा के धातावरन को देखें, यहाँ की धाजति को देखें, यहा की हातत को देखें। कंसिन्त हमारी यह धाजी धाजिदे कि यहा की धारी धाज हो। मैं भी धाजने यह चाहता हूँ कि लयाधवाद यहाँ धाजने। धाजी जो कहुा करने के कि जो धाजी धाज है वे इम्प्टी बनें। धाजी जो कधीर हो कर रहे लेकिन देश को उन्हीं धाजने बढ़ावा। मुझे धाज के नाच करना पड़ता है कि चीन धाजने धाज हमारे हाथ में सरकार की धाजधोर रही है लेकिन देश को हमें जैसा बनाना चाहिये वा हल नहीं बना सके है। मैं धाजधारी की धाजने से धाजना चाहता हूँ कि चीन की धाजकी दुनिया में धाज धाजने है। धाज धाजने धाजने

नेपाल धरें और वहाँ चल कर देखें कि कितनी दुष्कृत जायकी है। जिस दिन चीन ने वन का बिल्कॉट किया वा मैं वीरपंच में वा। वह नेपाल का लैफ़्टि माजॉस्ट स्टिटा है। वहाँ हमारी कोई इज्जत नहीं है। चीन ने हाइड्रोजन वन का बिल्कॉट किया। एक करोड़ की आबादी का वह पकोसी देज है। उसकी भी हमारी कल्चर एक है, रहन महन सब एक है हमने तो उन बिल्कॉट पर बिना व्यक्त की लेकिन वहाँ कोई बिना व्यक्त नहीं की गई।

मैं कहना कि नान-एलाइनमेंट सब ठीक ठीक है अब तक आपके पास ठीकत हो। बिना नाकत के आप पचान जगह दीजते जाये, कोई फंरं नहीं पड़ना है। हमारे मधोक माहब ने कहा कि हम पढ़ते नहीं हैं। मैं उनको बताना चाहता हू कि बिना में पड़ना हूँ वह नहीं पढ़ते हैं। वह जन संघ के हांकर अरोजी में भाषण कर सकते हैं, मैं हिली में करना हूँ। ये टाबनबी को कोट करते हैं। मैं कहना कि आचक्य की नीति को पढ़ो, भीष्य पितामह को पढ़ो, मुक्तोति का पढ़ो। आपको पता चलेगा कि किस तरह से राज काय चलाया जाना चाहिये और किस तरह से और क्यों ताकतवर बनना चाहिये, किस तरह से राजनीति चलनी चाहिये।

Sarj Sriraj Megharajji Dhraugadbra (Surenranagar): Sir, in rising to support the cut motions that were moved from this side of the house last Saturday, I should like to begin by saying that I have been a great believer in non-alignment. The Prime Minister, speaking yesterday in this House, gave an exposition of the Government's stand. What I have now to propose to her and her Government is not a total reversal of the Government's foreign policy. I subscribe to the view that a country's foreign policy should be governed by its own self-interest, and at the same time I wholly accept that national self-interest, in the world of today, is wound up with the international in-

terest and the maintenance of world peace. If by being nonaligned we are able to act, to serve as mediators, or like to the Swags to remain uninvolved, that is a consummation devoutly to be wished. But, Sir, there is one circumstance in which I should abandon nonalignment with colertry, that is when I am attacked. Another circumstance, Sir, in which I would be wise to modify my nonalignment, my aloofness, is which I am under a constant threat. That is to say under such fear that a major part of my time and my resources is spent in the anxiety for my safety. Sir, I ask the hon the Foreign Minister and the House if this is not the situation today in our confrontation with Communists' China.

We have been their voluntary, and now it seems, gratuitous champions in the counsels of the world. As a reward, they have lost no opportunity of attacking us and of insulting this great peace-loving nation. The recent brutal assaults, the absolutely uncalled for humiliation suffered by our diplomats at the hands of the Chinese, is merely a symptom, but this humiliation, Sir, is a humiliation offered to and suffered by every citizen of this country.

Is it not then abundantly clear that China is after our blood? We champion them in the United Nations; we acquiesce in their rape of Tibet and say it is a good thing for Tibet, we commit the childish folly of Hindi Chini bhai bhai, we prefer to overlook their continuing aggression and occupation of Indian territory, a continuing shame to our national honour of which the Government is the Prime custodian, and finally, Sir, we would rather not see their interfering hand in South and Southeast Asia. We begin by being the powerful self-appointed advocates of China, we go on to make concessions, and ultimately we bow to abject humiliation. And whilst we still maintain formal diplomatic relations with China, all in the interests and hopes of peace.

[Shri Sriraj Meghrajji Dhrangadhra]

What is the consequence? The Chinese have not conceived their utmost contempt for us. Sir, I should like to put a few questions to the Government. Are they left in any doubt as to the hostile, aggressive attitude and the ebullience of China? Do they doubt that their vast legions are at present idling on our eastern borders, waiting for the word to pour into Assam? That anything can spark off this onslaught, and that it may very possibly happen in concert with Pakistan, which is still chafing at its rude treatment by the Indian Army? Do they think that our defence on land and in the air are equal and adequate to combat the nuclear weapons of China? Do they think that our long-sustained neutrality is a sufficient answer to the Chinese Bomb? Have they considered the shock that our precarious economy must sustain, the utter shambles to which it will be reduced, if we have to go it alone with China, even for a short space? Do they think that our aloofness from, and indeed our all-too-ready criticism of those who are striving to contain the menace of China, the expansionism of China, is helpful to us, or will help the world? By the "world", I mean the world of small countries that lie on the verges of the Chinese empire.

These countries our trusted neighbours of South-East Asia, look to us for some initiative and for some signs of leadership. I must congratulate the hon. Minister of External Affairs, Shri Chagla, for the initiative he has taken at the conference in Kuala Lumpur in May last. It was he who put forth the proposal for a collective security for economic co-operation. That was a very good start. The suggestion has met with enthusiastic support of the Malaysian Prime Minister and a conference for this very purpose, has been called to meet in Bangkok on the 19th of August. All the countries have agreed to attend. But I understand that there will be one absentee—India.

According to the PTI report of 18th June, the Malaysian Premier, replying to a question in his legislature, is reported to have said:

"Mr. Chagla had promised to send me detailed of his proposals, but so far there are no new developments."

I hope that this report is out-of-date and that some development, taking stock of our common plight, is afoot. My hope stems from the fact that an hon. Member from the Congress benches, Maharaja Manavendra Singhji of Tehri-Garhwal, speaking in the Lok Sabha last Saturday, was bold to advocate some form of collective, regional security for the countries of South and South-east Asia. We on this side of the House wholly and wholeheartedly welcome this suggestion from the Government benches.

Weakness added to weakness will not of course make for strength. We must certainly harness our own resources and our every strength. We must not allow ourselves to slide into dependence. But we are in no position to spurn the preferred help from any quarter. Our present resources and strength are not adequate, alas, to meet the Chinese challenge, possibly a nuclear challenge, which, when it comes, may come suddenly. Our regional security will have to be underwritten by those who share our apprehensions and our aims, the containment of China, and who have the means—which we lack—to make their presence and their deterrent power felt.

Sir, I hold no brief for the great countries of the West. I hold a brief as we all do, for India. Is not our rapid economic development, our material prosperity, the first concern of every Indian and of every political party? Is it possible that we can pursue this urgent common aim of the whole nation, if a good part of our available resources are to be deployed for our mere defence, a task for which we know them to be unequal or inade-

quote? Sir, what I am proposing, and proposing urgently, is not a total reversal of the Government's policy. I am only proposing some kind of regional security arrangement which is able to say to China, "Hold enough: Thus far and no further."

The Prime Minister yesterday asked, with whom should we align ourselves. Shri Nath Pai also referred to the same question earlier today. Had she read the order paper, she would have formed the answer in the cut motion No. 66, moved from this side in which we have suggested the countries with which we should be aligned. By your leave, I shall read out the names of those countries; they are: Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, South Vietnam, Philippines, South Korea, Republic of China, Japan, Australia and New Zealand.

I put it to the Government that if we are to retain our hard-won Independence, with honour and without blemish, the least that they can do is to employ every device they can to preserve our territorial integrity and to guard it against encroachment and further annexation

Sir, one more point and I have done. This was an issue which my hon. friend Shri Masani was anxious to submit to the House last Saturday, but he was prevented from doing so for want of time. He mentioned the welcome change that has now come about in the relations between the United States of America and Russia. The whole attitude of Russia towards the rest of the World has undergone or is undergoing a happy change. She is no longer Olympian or didactic in her attitude as in the past. But it is regrettable that she has not given up her active interest in trying to influence the internal affairs of this friendly country

During our elections, the Soviet Radio, "Peace and Progress" carried on an active propaganda against the hon. Shri Morarji Desai, Shri Patil

and Shri Rajagopalachari. It naturally boosted those it considered nearer to its own line of thinking. Sir, it has been reported that more than 10 million dollars have been spent by Russia in India for publicity intended to sway our politics and our public opinion. I command to the persual of hon. Members a book by Mr Peter Sagar, *Moscow's Hand in India*. Messages for the Indian press came from Moscow and were relayed by their Embassy in Delhi. The book I have mentioned cites intelligence reports and gives photostat copies, establishing that these despatches were typed on typewriters in their embassy. This is surely a serious matter. It is a breach of the third country rule. The hon. Minister of External Affairs, replying to a question in the Rajya Sabha during the last session, said that he had asked the Russian embassy about this, and the embassy had disowned any responsibility. The absurdity of such a bald question and the good sense of the answer need no comment

Sir, the small countries of Ceylon and Ghana have had the courage to expel journalists and diplomats who have tried to influence their internal politics. We respectfully but strongly commend their example to the Government of India.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the external relations of every country must be based on certain principles, and these principles must be accepted and adopted, taking into consideration the history, the culture, the traditions of that country and also the national interests, security and integrity of the country. Foreign policy is the policy which implements these principles. I agree that these principles must be kept constantly under review. They are not immutable, and when the principles are found, not to conform to national interests, not to conform to the security of the country, not to conform to the integrity of the country, then the principles must be changed. But I do not

[Shri M. C. Chagla]
 mit that the principle of non-alignment has been basic to our policy.

My friend Shri Nath Pai, I think, rather inappropriately used the expression that non-alignment has become a sacred cow. This is a well-known English expression, but it is not at all applicable to India. The cow is very sacred to this country, and if he means that non-alignment is a sacred cow, in that sense, I accept it, but when you look at the results of non-alignment since the freedom of our country, you will agree with me that it has been the right policy.

It is flattering that those friends of mine who used to attack us for pursuing a non-aligned policy are now quarrelling with us for departing from it. There can be no greater tribute to the policy of non-alignment than this type of criticism from the opposite benches.

15 hrs.

We were almost the first country to propound this doctrine. I think the greatest contribution that our late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made to political thought was his contribution with regard to the doctrine of non-alignment. At that time, may I remind the House, ours was a voice in the wilderness. Let us remember what the famous and notorious American Secretary of State Dulles said about non-alignment, which he mixed up as many hon. members opposite have done, as I shall presently show, with neutrality. He said, neutrality was immoral. He could not understand any country being non-aligned. According to him, every country should belong to one bloc or the other.

In the beginning of our independence, the world was polarised between USSR and USA. Dr. Swell is right in saying that polarisation is coming to an end. Let us cast our mind back to those years when the world was polarised between USA and USSR, the allies of USA and the allies of USSR. Today the situation is changing. But in those days, it re-

quired courage, independence, a sense of confidence in one's own country, not to belong to either of those two blocs. It was very difficult and yet, India had the courage and the statesmanship to refuse to be inveigled into one bloc or the other. Because of our refusing to join the USA, the USA armed Pakistan, because Pakistan joined the SEATO and CENTO. We said, our people are a determined people, we can rely on our own strength and we will not join either of the two blocs merely to receive arms. Throughout this time, we remained friendly with both the blocs. Non-alignment did not mean that we should show any hostility either to the western bloc or to the eastern bloc, because one of the inevitable concomitants of non-alignment is peaceful co-existence. It flows logically from the doctrine of non-alignment. While we believe in non-alignment, we also believe in maintaining friendly relations with all countries and all blocs. There is nothing more difficult than the art of living together. It is a difficult art.

Shri Pileo Mody: He is talking about the Ministry.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Mody is learning to specialise in interruptions. I hope he would get up and make a speech, rather than sit and interrupt.

Shrima I Tarkeshwarj Saha (Barh): You invite him and make him your salesman. That is what he wants.

Shri M. C. Chagla: There is no art more difficult than the art of living together. It is difficult among individuals and within a family. It is difficult in a nation. It is even more difficult in the international field. We are trying to practise that art domestically and internationally. Our principle of secularism is based on the same principle. In this great country, a country of diversities and different religions, we have tried to live together. Throughout these years, we have tried to live together internationally.

The scene has changed. Today, as has been pointed out by many speakers, there is a detente between the two blocs and they do not want alien-

The result has been a process of gradual dissolution of blocs like SEATO, CENTO, even NATO and the Warsaw Pact. They are all in the process of dissolution. With the detente between these two blocs, the necessity for alliances has largely disappeared. Therefore, I said the scene has changed.

What does non-alignment mean? I am sorry that there is a tendency to use that word as if it were synonymous with neutrality. My friend, Mr. Madhok, did the same. He said, we were not non-aligned in the dispute between Arabs and Israel. What he was really meaning was, we were not neutral. Neutrality and non-alignment are entirely different concepts. It is very necessary, in order to understand the Government's policy, to realise the fundamental distinction between these two concepts. Neutrality is passive, a withdrawal from the world outside into our own shell, a folding up of our tents and going into isolation. Non-alignment on the contrary, is positive and dynamic. Being non-aligned, we have the independence to judge world events on merits and in accordance with our own national interest. Therefore, whatever decisions we may arrive at, they may be right or wrong, you may agree with them or not, you may criticise them or may not criticise them, but there is this assurance that our judgments, our decisions and policies are independent and not pressurised by any power, they are not arrived at because we belong to some bloc or because we are the allies of some country. It is a matter of pride to me and it should be a matter of pride to every member of this House that when we look back and think of the contribution that India has made in 20 years in international affairs.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Guna): You have lost 14,000 square miles.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have great respect for the Acharya. I did not interrupt him when he was speaking.

Shri Nath Pai: He is not interrupting; he is only correcting you.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: You are the spokesman of the Government. We expect a reply to the points we have raised. We know your stand. (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You must have a little patience. He has got to give the background of the policy. He is within his rights in doing so.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I vividly remember the year 1946 when India sent its first really Indian delegation to the UN. It was selected by the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. I had the honour of being a member of that delegation. It was for the first time in the UN that the voice was raised against apartheid. We condemned the policy of South Africa and that resolution was carried out by one vote although it required a two-thirds majority in a House of 54 members. I make bold to say that since 1946, India has raised her voice constantly, continuously, emphatically and unequivocally against colonialism against apartheid and in favour of peace.

Shri Banga (Srikakulam): What about Tibet? (Interruptions)

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have fought battles in the forum of the UN and in other forums too.

Therefore, Sir, when I heard Shri Nath Pai's speech this morning, I admired his eloquence and wit but it was a poison dagger with which he tried to stab the Prime Minister and my own humble self. But I said to myself these rare qualities might have been used for a worthier cause; he could have used these qualities to praise this country to fight the enemies of this country to point out to the world how very often India had been misunderstood. Sir, I have sat on these Treasury Benches for the last four years. I have seen character assassination in many manifestations. I have seen the character assassination of Ministers of Members, of institutions. Today I have heard with sorrow and dismay the character

[Shri M. C. Chagla]
 assassination of our country indulged
 in by Shri Nath Pai. (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.
 Please resume your seats.

Shri Nath Pai: No, no. He will
 not be allowed to continue. He should
 withdraw his words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You may
 disagree.

Shri Surendramath Dwivedy (Ken-
 drapara): He will have to withdraw
 his words.

Shri Nath Pai: He will have to
 withdraw every word that he said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I may tell
 Shri Nath Pai that nobody disturbed
 him when he spoke. (Interruptions).

Shri Nath Pai: The Prime Minister
 disturbed me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: She only
 corrected your statement. There was
 no disturbance from anyone on this
 side. (Interruptions). Order, order.
 Please resume your seats. If any ob-
 servation that the hon. Minister has
 made is found to be objectionable or
 which is not borne out by the state-
 ments made in his speech by Shri Nath
 Pai, he will be within his right to ask
 a question. (Interruptions).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-
 North-East): Sir, I rise to a point of
 order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please ask
 your colleagues to resume their seats.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, my
 point of order emanates from the
 basic rights of the Chair in regard to
 regulation of the debate. Sir, I wish
 to tell you—I for one, personally
 speaking, disagree with very much
 of what Shri Nath Pai has said, but
 that is a different matter—when a
 Minister of Government says in re-
 gard to another Member of this House,
 whoever he may be,—and Shri Nath
 Pai is Shri Nath Pai—that he has
 committed the character assassination
 of his country, it is a kind of accusa-

tion which goes against the grain in
 every sense of the term, it is against
 parliamentary propriety, it is casting
 a slur on the patriotic character of an
 individual Member of this House. I
 differ from them on so many matters.
 I shall never take lying down a charge
 in regard to me as having character
 assassinated my own country. Fool-
 lings, little creatures on this side or
 that do not matter, but my country
 matters and "character assassination"
 of the country is an allegation which
 has never been heard in this Parlia-
 ment, which can never conceivably be
 pronounced in this House. I plead
 with you, Sir, to see to it that this
 kind of observation is not allowed to
 pass muster, and I request the Leader
 of the House to intervene and say
 something, something acceptable,
 something with some little sense be-
 hind it—which she never does. She
 should do something about it (In-
 terruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot al-
 low a discussion on this. I will listen
 to hon. Members one by one. Please
 say what you want to say in one or
 two sentences.

Shri Kaaga: Sir, I need not say
 anything more. I agree entirely with
 what my hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee
 has just now said, that it is wrong on
 the part of the Minister of Foreign
 Affairs to have made this charge, and
 I hope that he would have the good
 sense to withdraw it.

Several hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.
 At least on this side hon. Members
 should resume their seats.

श्री कलराज लखोड: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
 हम जनता के द्वारा चुनकर आये हैं। हम
 देश के किसी पार्टी के नुमाइन्दे नहीं,
 पहले देश के नुमाइन्दे हैं, देश की जनता
 के नुमाइन्दे हैं। हमारे सामने देश का श्रेष्ठ
 है। अगर हम आलोचना करते हैं, तो
 देश के श्रेष्ठ के लिये करते हैं। यदि कोई

कहता है कि इन देश के चरित्र की हत्या करते हैं तो यह हमारी देशवक्ति, सारे भारत की देशवक्ति पर स्तर है। इसलिये जो कुछ माननीय हीरेन मुजर्जी ने कहा है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि इन शब्दों को एकसपज किया जाय, इन शब्दों को वापस लिया जाये।

श्री मधु लिखवे (मुंगेर) : मेरा इतना ही निवेदन है कि इन तरह के दर्जनों ऐसे लोग हैं जिन्होंने अपने बचन से अपने मुल्क को धाजाद कराने के लिये कुर्बानिया दी हैं। इन सरकार की यही बड़ी खतरनाक प्रवृत्ति है कि व्यक्ति, दल, सरकार और राष्ट्र का ये मिला देने हैं, व्यक्ति राष्ट्र बन जाता है। इन के ऊपर जब हमला करने हैं तो क्या यह कह सकने हैं कि यह राष्ट्र के ऊपर हमला है— मैं इन्हीं बातों का खुलासा चाहता हूँ।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Sir, the whole thing is very simple. The mistake that has been committed is to identify the Government with the nation. Government is not the nation. When we criticise, we criticise the Government, we do not criticise the nation. I hope the Foreign Minister will have the courtesy to withdraw these words.

Shri P. Ramaswami: Sir, I may disagree with Shri Nath Pai on many questions and it is open to the Minister to say that Shri Nath Pai's speech will do harm to the country. But what he has said is that it is character assassination of the country, which is a subjective thing. When you say character assassination it is not the interpretation of the speech; it is something done consciously and deliberately that is the meaning of the term character assassination. Therefore, it is an allegation that he has deliberately assassinated the character of the country. This is what it means. Therefore, I hope the Minister understands the implications of the words he used. He is free to

differ from Shri Nath Pai's speech and say that this speech has done harm to the country. That is his own look-out and that is a different point. But here a deliberate, subjective motive is imputed to a speech, which should not be tolerated. The Minister must understand the implications of the words used by him. So, I would request him to withdraw those words.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I wanted to be clear on one point. The image of the nation, which he meant, must be distinguished from . . . (Interruptions).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, sitting in that Chair it is very highly objectionable for you to say this. Let us see the records.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has not completed his sentence. He meant the image. Do not make a mistake.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Sir, it is not your job to interpret them.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You are not concerned with what he meant. Sitting in that Chair, you must behave yourself. You should only regulate the House properly. You should not interpret the statements of Ministers . . . (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should also behave himself.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I submit again that the Minister has used words which are highly objectionable . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He meant the image of the country, the country's image.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri (Hapur): Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give you an opportunity later. There is no point of order now. I have called the hon. Prime Minister.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : जी नहीं रहते थाप को मेरा प्वाट जीक चारेंर दुपला

[श्री प्रकाशचौर सास्त्री]

पूजेगा क्योंकि यही नियमानुसार है। आप इस कुर्सी पर बैठकर इस कुर्सी के गौरव की रक्षा कीजिये..... (अव्यवधान) आप को यह अधिकार प्राप्ति प्राप्त नहीं है कि किसी मंत्री के वक्तव्य का क्लेरिफिकेशन आप इस कुर्सी पर बैठकर करें..... (अव्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I never did that, I only said this is what he was going to say.

श्री प्रकाशचौर सास्त्री : कुर्सी पर बैठकर यह अधिकार दिया गया है कि सदन में शान्ति और व्यवस्था बनाये रखने की जिम्मेदारी आप की है। लेकिन किसी मंत्री के वक्तव्य के स्पष्टीकरण करने की जिम्मेदारी इस कुर्सी का नहीं है। आप ने विदेश मंत्री के वक्तव्य का स्पष्टीकरण करके इस कुर्सी के गौरव को बचाया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बात के ऊपर आप व्यवस्था बाँजिये कि आप को अधिकार है या नहीं।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, you are forgetting that you are not a member sitting here with us but you are occupying the chair of the presiding officer.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give my ruling. I have not defended the statement that was partly heard, by myself at least. He has not completed his sentence. What I felt and said was, there is distinction between the image of the country . . . (Interruptions). Now I call the Prime Minister.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I have been trying to get up ever since the excitement arose here, but so many people were standing and there was so much noise that it was difficult to make myself clear. All I want to say is that I am sure Shri Chagla did not mean to cast any personal reflection on Shri Nath Pai, or any hon. Member of the opposition . . . (Interruptions).

An hon. Member: Why is Shri Chagla not speaking?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Shri Chagla can certainly speak for himself. But several hon. Members shouted that I should say something. Now, make up your mind whether you want me to say something . . . (Interruptions). I really wanted to say on behalf of the Government that we do not want to cast personal reflections on anybody, although such reflections are cast on all of us, not only as members of the Government but even as individuals and members of this hon. House. But, nevertheless, even though this is true, we ourselves do not wish to do that sort of thing. Now, while I do not want to interpret what Shri Chagla meant, I am sure he did not mean the words he used in the House as the members have taken them.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let him withdraw his words.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: But you do not give anybody any chance to do that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We are happy the Prime Minister has clarified the position. Now, let the hon. Minister withdraw those words.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I do say that the hon. Members should not get so excited. One person can get up and say something. Then the Minister should be given a chance to reply. But, one after another, everybody starts shouting and it becomes very difficult for anybody to intervene or clarify.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I do not wish to impute any motive to Shri Nath Pai or any hon. Member of the opposition. It was far from my intention. I did not suggest, far from me was it to suggest, that any hon. Member opposite is less patriotic than a member on this side of the House. I only intended—never mind what I had intended, if Shri Nath Pai and other members of the Opposition

have taken this expression I used to mean, what Shri Madhok has suggested, I certainly withdraw it.

Sir, I hope what I am going to say next will not be objected to as in any way unparliamentary, because I am including most of us in that. What I was going to say was this, that it is our national characteristic, it has become almost our national characteristic to denigrate ourselves, to run ourselves down, not to see any good in us. We leave it to the outsider to discover what is good in us. Many foreigners have come and told me in admiration here and outside what progress we have achieved, what we stand for but we run ourselves down, in season and out of season. It is really sad that this should happen. I know it may arise from a sense of modesty or perhaps from a sense of philosophic outlook, but I think occasionally we should find something good in ourselves.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: We see it from inside; they see it from outside.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Shri Nath Pai said—I hope I am putting it correctly, because I am saying it only from my notes—that our influence was at its nadir and our prestige was at its lowest. I have just come back from the United Nations and I want to assure this House that India should feel proud of the honour and respect in which India is held in that organisation.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I wish it is true.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is true. I have seen it for myself. If the hon. Member will go there, he will see it for himself. The non-aligned countries and other countries look up to India for guidance and leadership. They look up to India as an elder brother and if we are giving guidance and leadership they are prepared to accept it. Yet, here we are saying that our influence is sliding and we have lost all prestige in the international world. Shri Nath Pai said that we have reduced the

importance of the United Nations. If any country has tried to uphold the dignity, the usefulness and prestige of the United Nations, that is India. Even in the last crisis, I shall point out as I go along, India did her best to see that the influence of the United Nations was in no way removed or reduced. The Secretary-General has the greatest confidence in India, the Secretary-General consults India's representative very often. We have supported and cooperated with Secretary-General at various stages of this unfortunate conflict. To say that India is reduced to the level of importance is defamatory of the Government, I will not say of the country.

Mr. Nath Pai also said that India has failed to uphold peace. I shall again prove, through documentary evidence I have, the steps which India took from time to time and from stage to stage in this crisis which will satisfy the House, that all along we were trying to ask both the parties to exercise restraint.

Shri Nath Pai: You aggravated it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: My friend talks in the air, I have got the documents to prove that.

Shri Nath Pai: I talk from my heart; you talk from your brief. That is the difference.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Mr. Nath Pai also said some unflattering things about my going to visit the U.A.R. and Yugoslavia this evening. I am surprised that Mrs. Pandit also should have said the same thing. I am really surprised she with her knowledge, vast knowledge of diplomacy of international affairs, should have actually said that I should not go to gather wisdom from President Nasser and President Tito and that they should come to us to gather wisdom from us. I am really surprised this.

Let us see what has been happening. Just before Mr. Kosygin came

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

to New York, he went and saw President Nasser

Shri Nath Pai: He did not see you.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The President of the USSR was consulting President Nasser while the United Nations Assembly was sitting in New York. Important Russian officials and Ministers had been visiting President Nasser. President Nasser sent his Special Envoy to meet the Prime Minister. President Tito sent his Special Envoy to meet the Prime Minister. This is a return visit to the U.A.R. and to Belgrade. See the situation in which we find ourselves today. The United Nations is deadlocked, the Suez Canal is closed. No compromise seems to appear on the horizon. It is time for us to consult people who are vitally interested in these matters.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Do you want to meet Mr. Eshkol? You meet President Nasser and Mr. Eshkol and try to bring them together.

Shri M. C. Chagla: When I was in New York, Mr. Eshkol came to see me. I saw him and I heard his point of view for one hour. I am accessible to everybody; I do not shut my ears to any side. We have often been told, why don't we keep quiet; how does West Asia concern us; how does Vietnam concern us; how does this country or that country concern us? Let us not forget that India is a Member of the Security Council. As a Member of the Security Council, it has got to review and pass judgment on world events. Is it suggested that as a Member of the Security Council it should take no notice of what is happening in different parts of the world? Injustice, aggression, breach of faith or confidence, tyranny, colonialism are all the concern of India and will always remain so. I think it is wrong for anybody to say that India should keep quiet when things are happening which call for our judgment, our decision and our appraisal. I would, therefore, ask the House to judge the West Asian

conflict in this context. May I produce this by saying that although we are non-aligned, although our West Asian policy was not dictated by any power—it was our own independent policy—we could not remain neutral. We had to pass judgment and it is for the House—after I have stated the facts—to judge whether our judgment was right or wrong.

Let us first come to the most important question on which the House has taken up such a strong attitude about Israeli aggression. Let us see what President de Gaulle says.

An hon. Member: Everybody knows it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: On June 2, a statement was issued in the name of President de Gaulle after a French Cabinet meeting in which it was stated that the country which is the first to use arms, whichever that be, will neither have our approval, that is, the French Government's approval, nor French support.

In another statement issued on the 22nd June, after a French Cabinet meeting, President de Gaulle said:

"France condemns opening of hostilities by Israel."

That is President de Gaulle's view. That is not all. Let us come to the paper which is very dear to the hearts of many, the American publication, the Time. It says:

"(Israel scarcely bothers to deny any longer that it started shooting first. On the day before the guns opened up, the Israeli Cabinet met secretly to discuss whether to launch a pre-emptive attack before the gathering Arab armies struck. Mr. Abba Eban argued for further diplomatic efforts; Defence Minister Mr. Dayan insisted that the safety of the nation could not permit delay. Mr. Dayan carried the day. The attack was authorised by a vote of 16 to 2...., the only vote being cast by the left-wing ministers."

Here is the evidence of 2 completely detached objective witnesses, President de Gaulle and an American publication like the Times.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: There is nothing in what you have quoted.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Then, Mr. Masani said, in the course of his interesting speech, that we are isolated. Mr. Nath Pai said that we have lost our influence and we are isolated. May I for the information of the House point out which countries, apart from the socialist bloc, apart from the Arab bloc, voted for the non-aligned nations' resolutions? It is very revealing.

Shri M. E. Masani (Rajkot): I referred to the Soviet Union's resolution.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The basis of the non-aligned nations' resolution was the aggression committed by Israel and the resolution wanted Israel to vacate the aggression, to give up the fruits of aggression, and to go back to the line of the 4th June from where they started. It is worth seeing who voted with us. Were we alone in the camp? Were we isolated or was there a large volume of world public opinion on our side? Look at the countries who voted with us, Spain, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Camaroons, Ceylon, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Greece, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Malaysia, Mauritania, Nigeria and Pakistan.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: They are all our friends.

Shri M. C. Chagla: That was not the point that I was making.

Shri Pille Mody: We have no friends. That was the point.

Shri M. C. Chagla: There are two significant and important facts about the Israeli aggression to which I wanted to draw the attention of the House. The House will remember that President Johnson told President Nasser that he wanted to send Vice President Humphry to confer with

him and the reply that President Nasser gave was that he would not like to receive Vice President Humphry, but he would send his Vice President, Mr. Mohiuddin, to meet President Johnson to discuss the ways and means of settling this problem. Vice President Mohiuddin was to have left for the United States on the 5th June and before he could leave, before he could confer with President Johnson, Israel struck the blow.

The second important fact to which I wanted to draw the attention of the House is that U Thant, largely at our personal initiative had gone to see President Nasser after the blockade of the Gulf of Aquaba and withdrawal of UNEF. They were discussing ways and means of settling the Aqaba problem; they were discussing how the Gulf of Aquaba could be used, what would be the *modus operandi* within the sovereign framework of Egypt. While the discussions were going on, Israel struck the blow, which made any settlement impossible.

It has been said, and I think erroneously, that a pre-emptive strike, a preventive war, is permissible. I say that it is a complete violation of the Charter; it is not open to a country to indulge in a pre-emptive strike or a preventive war, and the most that the advocates of Israel say is that this was a preventive war in which Israel indulged.

I was sorry to see a member of the Congress Party.

An hon. Member: Please address the Chair.

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend, Mr. Manabendra Shah, compared the Israeli conflict with the Indo-Pakistan conflict. (Interruptions)

Shri M. E. Masani: He is right.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am surprised at my old friend Ranga of course. Mr. Masani would say 'yes'—comparing the Indo-Pakistan conflict with the Israel conflict. In saying this

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

does the House realise that we are accepting the Pakistani propoganda? What does Pakistan say? Pakistan says that we committed aggression... (Interruptions)

Shri M. R. Masani: Our action was justified.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am telling you what Pakistan says. Pakistan says that we committed aggression because we crossed the international line, taking the date of the conflict, as if it was the date, on which we crossed the international line, forgetting completely what happened before. The House knows full well what the facts are. The facts are that infiltrators were sent by Pakistanis to Kashmir. Then their Army marched towards Chhamb, they wanted to cut off our life-line to our armies in Ladakh. It was at that stage that we crossed the international line and our armies marched towards Lahore and Sialkot. (Interruptions) How can you compare this with the Israel conflict? Did Egypt march her troops into Israel? Did she send infiltrators? (Interruptions)

Shri Piloo Mody: They blocked their life-line. It is the same as sending infiltrators.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: What happened before they fired the first shot (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. This is not fair. They were patiently hearing this side. Now let the Minister be allowed to say what he has to say.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I now turn to the pleasant subject introduced by Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha. I was surprised to hear from her that no aggression could be committed because Israel and Arab States were in a state of war. This is an astounding proposition to make. It means that as the Armistice had not been followed by a peace treaty according to Mrs. Tarakeshwari Sinha, it was open to Israel to attack the Arab count-

ries and this attack would not constitute an aggression. It is absolutely opposed to every principle of international law and international relations. Two countries stop fighting; they may have an armistice; they may not have concluded peace treaty. It is not open, while the armistice is there and there is no conflict going on, for a country to attack another.

Shri Ranga: The closure of the Canal came first. Why is he forgetting that? (Interruptions)

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am not forgetting that. I am coming to the canal. Mrs. Sinha.. (Interruptions) has a great deal of eloquence, she has a very fine.. (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I appeal to the members to keep silence?

Shri M. C. Chagla: She pleads her case with very persuasive advocacy. But, if I may say so, there is one shortcoming once she has got hold of an idea, she fondles it, she plays with it, she nibbles at it, she does not let it go even after the idea has lost all its substance. One of the ideas she has caught hold of and which she has repeated on several occasions and at several places is that the whole trouble is due to the first sentence in my statement. Let me read out this classic sentence which, according to Mrs. Sinha, has created the trouble. I will read and explain it. This is the sentence:

"The creation of Israel has given rise to tension between Israel and the Arab countries."

It is a factual statement. Any one who knows the history of the Middle East knows the feelings of the Arabs aroused by the creation of Israel because they felt that the Palestinians were driven out and the Jews were put in the place of the home of Palestinians. As a matter of fact, tension was created. But does it mean what it has been suggested to mean that we have not (Interruption) recognised Israel or that we agree that there should be tension. We have recognised Israel... (Interruptions).

An hon. Member: But no diplomatic ties.

Shri M. C. Chagla: That is not the question. I am only saying this. What is wrong in this sentence? It is factually correct.

The other part to which Mrs. Sinha has referred is what I said in the statement about the Gulf of Aqaba. This also will answer the question about the closure of the Gulf of Aqaba being a *casus belli*

This is what I said...

Shri Nath Pal: Why repeat those mistakes again and again?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Because the point has been raised here constantly. We said only this:

"News has been received of the UAR decision to close the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli-shipping and to other shipping carrying strategic goods for Israel. So far as the Government of India are concerned, we have taken the position as far back as 1957 that the Gulf of Aqaba is an inland sea and that the entry to the Gulf lies within the territorial waters of the UAR and Saudi Arabia. We adhere to this view."

Shri P. K. Deo: So, they can stop it

Shri M. C. Chagla: Two views have been put forward. Is the Gulf of Aqaba within the territorial waters of the UAR? Or is it an international waterway?

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: May I give a personal explanation? I had not referred to that. What I had actually referred to was the fact that Shri Krishna Menon in 1957 took a stand in the General Assembly that the General Assembly had no competence to discuss this issue. He did not go beyond that. He did not say any other thing except this.

Shri M. C. Chagla: That is not correct. I have also carefully read Shri Krishna Menon's speech....

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: I have also read it. I did not refer to it in any other sense except that in which Shri Krishna Menon had put it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Now, may I read out what Mr. Dulles had said about it in 1957, that is, about the Gulf of Aqaba.

Shri S. K. Taparish (Pali): Let him read out what Shri Krishna Menon had said.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I take it that for some of my friends opposite, Mr. Dulles is a greater authority than Shri Krishna Menon. This was what Mr. Dulles had said:

"I think that it is the fact that a certain amount of shipping is or shortly will be passing through the Straits of Tiran; although I also think that it is important to get a decision by the International Court of Justice as to what the legal rights of the parties are. It would be very helpful, I think, and it should be helpful also from the Egyptian standpoint to get a decision on that matter, and consideration is now being given to ways and means of seeking an advisory opinion on that matter from the International Court of Justice..."

So, it is clear that on the 26th March, 1957, the Secretary of State of the United States had said that it was not a settled question, and he had wanted the opinion of the International Court of Justice

This is what Mr George Brown Foreign Secretary, says ten years later in the House of Commons:

"I am bound to say that there is a case which the Arabs can deploy; it is a case which has not only plausibility but legality and force."

Now, in the face of this, how could it be said that when Egypt exercised her sovereign rights, which according

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

to her are sovereign rights, in closing the Gulf of Aqaba which she said was within her territorial waters, it constituted a casus belli for Israel? How could it be said:

Shri M. R. Masani: Why did Egypt not go to the International Court? Why did she use violence?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Is there any prescriptive right in law? May I enquire from the great lawyer whether there is any prescriptive right in law? When prescriptive rights are extinguished, is it something that is inimical to the country? Is there any such right in law?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I know that prescriptive right is recognised by municipal law. I am not sure whether there is prescriptive right in international law.

श्री मधु लिखने - अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में कानून कहा है वहा तो जगत का कानून है।

Shri P. K. Deo: What about Dardanelles or Gibraltar? What about the Panama Canal?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Shri J. B. Kripalani has said, and I was surprised to hear from him that kind of statement that U Thant should never have withdrawn the UNEF.

Shri Ranga: He should never have done that. It was the biggest blunder.

Shri Pille Medy: He should have delayed it.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta (Delhi Sedar): Why is Egypt agreeing to the posting of UN observers now?

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is clear beyond any doubt or dispute and it is a matter of record that the UNEF was located in Egyptian territory with the consent and approval of the UAR and when the consent and approval was withdrawn, the UNEF had no locus standi to be in Egypt.

Shri Ranga: He should have consulted that Security Council.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Shri Ranga says that he should have consulted the Security Council. It was not necessary for him to go to the Security Council. Shri Ranga seems to know more about the UN procedure than perhaps U Thant knows.

Shri Ranga: I can tell the hon. Minister a little more about it.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Let me satisfy this House as to what steps we took in the Security Council in order to preserve peace. It was largely at our instance that U Thant went to see President Nasser to try and see if some settlement could be arrived at, and we wanted the Council to be adjourned till he came back with a report. We felt that to have the Security Council without the presence of the Secretary-General would be like enacting Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark.

Then, we wanted—and this is very important—a holding resolution to be passed asking parties to exercise restraint. We actually moved it; it was not carried, but we said, call upon both parties to exercise restraint, let there be quiet diplomacy, let there be a breathing spell. We were urging the Members all the time to accept a resolution of this character.

Then, on the 5th June, Israel started hostilities against the Arab countries, and on the same day, we proposed a resolution for cease-fire and withdrawal. On 5th June we did not know how the fortunes of war had gone. We did not know who was winning and who was losing. But on principle we said that if armed conflict broke out it was necessary for the parties immediately to have a cease-fire and to withdraw. This was the resolution we moved on the 5th June.

Ultimately as the House knows, on the 6th June, a simple cease-fire resolution was passed as a first step. Then came the emergency statute. Why

have we supported the non-aligned resolution on withdrawals? We supported it because our view is, and I want the House to endorse this because this is an important matter from the point of view of not only this conflict but of the future, that no aggressor should be permitted to retain the fruits of aggression, that no aggressor should be permitted to negotiate from strength derived as a result of military conquest.

Shri Abdul Ghani Dar (Gurgaon): Except China.

Shri M. C. Chagla: The cease-fire resolution has mentioned cease-fire as the first step.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: What is the hon. Minister's comment about China?

Shri M. C. Chagla: And we said that both in logic and in sequence of time, the second step was to be withdrawal. We did not say that the other matters should not be discussed such as the navigation of the Suez Canal, the navigation of Aqaba, the recognition of Israel, the question of refugees etc.; we said that all those should be discussed, but first thing should come first, and the next step after cease-fire was the withdrawal of troops.

Now, may I read a passage from the statement I made in the General Assembly? And I would ask the House's endorsement of what I said there because, as I have said, it has important repercussions with regard to the future. This was what I said on the question of withdrawal:

"Mr. President, we are second to none in desiring a return to peace in the area but it must be a lasting one. It is important for us to remember, however, that an enduring peace can be established in West Asia and elsewhere only if in this world body, we can all act together to ensure strict adherence to certain basic values and fundamental principles of international law, practice, morality and behaviour . . .

I will attempt to summarise some of these cardinal principles. First, it is not open to a country to start a war merely because it feels that a threat to its security exists. If it thinks that such a threat exists, the Charter prescribes various courses of action open to it through peaceful means, and of course, it can come to the Security Council. But it is in the spirit and letter of the Charter illegal to deal with a threat which one State thinks is being held out by a neighbouring State through recourse to arms.

Secondly, no aggressor should be permitted to retain the fruits of his aggression.

Thirdly, it is not permissible for a country to acquire territory of another State in order to be able to bargain from a position of strength.

And finally . . .

—and this is very important—
... rights cannot be established, territorial disputes cannot be settled, boundaries cannot be adjusted through armed conflict."

श्री कलु लिववे : श्रीर किस तरीके से ऐसा किया गया है दुनिया में ?

Shri Ranga: Why did he not stipulate a sixth condition or rather as the first condition that they should be prepared to recognise and respect each other's existence and territorial integrity? Why did he not do that? Why do we accept continued belligerency on their part towards Israel?

16 hrs.

Shri M. C. Chagla: All that we say is that first you must go back. You cannot remain in some other's territory and try to settle your dispute through military force or military acquisition. Just see what would happen. All over the world, there are boundary disputes, in Africa, in Asia. Are you

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

going to permit a country to march its troops into the territory of another country, sit tight on it and then say 'Now negotiate; till you negotiate, I will not withdraw'.

What is happening today in West Asia? The Israelis are there on the territories of the Arabs.

Shri C. C. Desai (Sabarkantha): And will remain there.

Shri M. C. Chagla: If they remain there, they are in violation of the principles of the Charter. What we are trying to see is to prevent violation of the principles of the Charter.

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore): Leave the Sinai Desert now and come to some other point.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Another result of this, as you must have seen, is that Israel goes on consolidating her strength. She has annexed Jerusalem. Their Prime Minister said the other day that she wants to annex the Gaza Strip. I do not know where this matter will end.

Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that there should be withdrawal of the Israeli troops (*Interruptions*). I have been told that this policy is not in consonance with our national interests. Fortunately, the policy we have followed in West Asia is in consonance with both right and justice and also our national interests.

Shri Balraj Madhok: No.

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I point out what our national interests are? It is absolutely necessary in our national interest that we should have a friendly Middle East. It is a strategic part of the world. It is the cross-roads of the world, and strategically it is of the utmost importance for India to see that we have a friendly Middle East. We have trade of a hundred crore of rupees with the Middle East.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Is Israel a part of that?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have got 50,000 Indians residing there . . .

An hon. Member: Much more in East Africa.

Shri M. C. Chagla: . . . engaged in gainful occupations and professions. It is essential from our point of view that the Suez Canal should be in friendly hands. It is essential from our strategic point of view that oil, which we import from the Middle East, should come from countries which are friendly to us; and it is also in our national interest that the Persian Gulf, because of strategic reasons—I hope the House will understand—should be in friendly hands.

Therefore, as I said, the justice of the Arab cause and our own national interest dictated the policy we pursued . . .

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Have you been able to make them your friends? Is Jordan your friend, is Syria your friend, is Iran your friend, is Saudi Arabia your friend? Are they your friends? They are not going to be your friends.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am coming to that.

Some hon. Members said that the friendship between Prime Minister Nehru and President Nasser was the basis of our friendship with Egypt. Foreign policies are not evolved out of personal friendships, and the reason why India stood by Nasser, and stands by Nasser, is because he represents in the Arab world certain forces which we must support. These are the forces of progress, of socialism, of non-alignment, of secularism . . .

Shri Nath Pai: Saudi Arabia?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As a student of History, Shri Nath Pai should know. He is resisting reactionary forces.

Shri Nath Pai: Saudi Arabia is progressive? Jordan is progressive? Iran is progressive?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Shri Nath Pal knows that an axis is being formed against India . . .

Shri Nath Pal: I am not worried about them (Interruptions).

Shri M. C. Chagla: . . . by Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Turkey, Iran and Pakistan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he addresses the Chair, he can avoid interruptions.

Shri Hardayal Devgan (East Delhi): Is the slogan of jehad progressive?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As I said, he represents the forces of progress. (Interruptions).

He was opposed to Muslim fanaticism, he was opposed to the Muslim Brotherhood and, therefore, it was in the interest of India to support and strengthen the causes for which Nasser stood.

Now, one more thing about West Asia and I have finished with that. I am surprised that my hon. friend, Shri Madhok, should not have said one word of condemnation of Israel about the 14 brave and gallant Indian soldiers in the UNEF who were killed.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I hope you will not send any contingent in future.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: Read my speech.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I have read your speech.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I said that the responsibility for the murder lies equally on the shoulders of Government for their failure to evacuate them in time.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Shri Madhok is trying to give extenuating circumstances and excuses for the Israelis' deliberate act in murdering these 14 brave and gallant soldiers. I will deal with the excuse.

Shri Madhok: suggested that we are guilty in not evacuating them by air,

that we were carried away because of some considerations of economy (Interruptions). That is not so. I have got the document. The UNEF continued to remain as an organisation under the orders of UNO upto the 17th of June.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: How were the Canadians able to evacuate their men?

Shri F. K. Das: Read the report of General Rikhy to the Security Council on the subject.

श्री मधु निमये: वह नागरिकों को हमारे हैं, नयकन राष्ट्र मध के नागरिक नहीं है ।

एक मानवीय तत्व : कैनाडा ने कैसे अपने शरणियों का उठा लिया ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: The UN had drawn up a programme of evacuation till 17 June of the various countries' contingents. Six countries were involved. With regard to Canada, because of some reason, President Nasser asked the Canadians immediately to get out, and they were a member sitting here with us but evacuated by that country. In our case and in the case of the countries like Brazil, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Yugoslavia, a time schedule was laid down. Till the evacuation was completed, our contingent was entirely under the orders of the UNO. Therefore, this is no excuse or explanation for the action of Israel.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Nasser asked Canada to withdraw her people and had not the courtesy to ask us to withdraw immediately our soldiers.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It was not a matter of courtesy. Nasser trusted us; he did not trust Canadians.

16.06 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri D. C. Sharma: Nasser is one of our best friends.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I agree that our security should be one of the most important aspects of our policy. Shri

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

Masani suggested that we should get under somebody or other's nuclear umbrella and we should sign the non-proliferation treaty on the dotted line. Now, I disagree with both these propositions. (*Interruptions*).

An hon. Member: What did the Prime Minister say?

Shri M. C. Chagla: The Prime Minister said the same thing. I wish to make it clear that a guarantee depends upon its credibility, not credibility today but credibility when the guarantor is called upon to implement the guarantee. We do not know what the alignments of power might be after four or five years. Therefore, before we accept a nuclear guarantee or come under anybody's nuclear umbrella, we have to consider what effect it will have on our defence and security.

I think Shri Masani is also wrong and is not fair to our scientists when he said that the nuclear gulf between China and India is so wide, and is widening every day, that it was impossible for our scientists to bridge it.

Shri M. R. Masani: I am afraid it is so.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not that we cannot manufacture the bomb.

Shri M. R. Masani: Ask your own scientists.

Shri M. C. Chagla: We will not manufacture the bomb as a matter of policy. I have great faith in our scientists, and if we determine upon a different policy, our scientists can do what we ask them to do. I do not think Mr. Masani is being fair to our scientists.

Shri Ranga: What about your ability to do it, money?

Shri M. C. Chagla: As regards the nuclear treaty I gave an answer at some length in this House yesterday. I do not want to repeat it, but want to make this clear that the question of guarantee should not be mixed up

with the question of signing the non-proliferation treaty. The two questions stand apart.

I will briefly deal with some other questions about China and Pakistan. China's explosion of the hydrogen bomb has naturally added a new dimension to our defence problem, and we have to carefully consider what effect it is going to have on our defence strategy and also on our policy decisions.

It is not right for me to comment on the internal affairs of another country. The cultural revolution of China is its own affair, but when that cultural revolution impinges upon our own security and threatens our security, it is but right that we should comment on it and consider its implications. There is no doubt that recently the Chinese note has taken on a greater bellicosity and a greater belligerency. She is more and more interfering in the internal affairs of other countries including our own, and her whole attitude seems to be that she wants to subvert the governments of independent countries through setting up revolutionary bodies in those countries with dissatisfied elements, secessionist elements, rebellious elements, so that the Governments could be overthrown. It is happening now in Burma, they are threatening Nepal, Malaysia has its own problems, Indonesia has its own problems.

An hon. Member: Viet Nam.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will come to Viet Nam separately.

In our opinion, the best way to meet the Chinese threat is economic strength. We have to see that the Southeast Asian countries are friendly to us and are strong. We are very happy in our relations with these countries. Burma is on the best of terms with us. We have just signed a boundary agreement. Nepal is on the best of terms. So are Ceylon and Afghanistan. As regards Southeast Asia, we have friendly countries in

Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia, and our policy is to have bilateral agreements with them, to have economic co-operation with them, to strengthen them economically, so that they are in a position to resist Chinese subversion.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: What is the position with regard to South Korea?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Why don't you think of North Korea also?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I also agree with Mr. Madhok that we should have stronger cultural ties with Southeast Asia. Indian culture, Sanskrit culture, has spread to all these countries. In Malaysia they had the finest ballet depicting stories from the *Ramayana*. Malaysia has got a large number of Sanskrit words in its language and there is a great deal of Sanskrit culture, and we should try and see that these cultural ties are strengthened.

The question was also raised about Indians who have accepted foreign citizenship. Our policy on this is quite clear. When Indians accept foreign citizenship, we tell them that they must show loyalty to that country of which they have become citizens. They may have cultural ties with India, but they must show an involvement in the affairs of their own country, join economic ventures, invest money, because they have become citizens of those countries. As far as those who are Indian citizens who have not given up their citizenship are concerned, we accept the responsibility and we try to look after them.

Coming to Pakistan, I am sorry to report to this House that, as the House knows, notwithstanding all our efforts, relations between Pakistan and ourselves are not good, and all our attempts at implementing the Tashkent declaration have so far failed. Mr. Madhok said we should not show any appeasement towards Pakistan. I agree. But settling with Pakistan without sacrificing national interests is not an easement, but statesmanship, and I assure the House that whatever

agreement we may arrive at with Pakistan, assuming we do, would not be at the sacrifice of our national interests.

Pakistan should realise that we have no design on her territory. Pakistan should realise that however much some of us might deplore the partition of 1947 we have accepted this as a fact of history, we recognise Pakistan, and therefore it seems to us that there is no reason why Pakistan should increase her armed strength. Against whom is she arming except against us, because she has no other country except India whom she looks upon as her enemy.

But Pakistan's alliance with China adds a new dimension to our relations with Pakistan. There is no doubt that the two countries are acting in collusion. My colleague, the Defence Minister, said the other day that both countries are helping the Naga hostiles, the Mizo hostiles and other rebels and secessionists on our frontiers, and, as I said, this adds a new dimension to our relations with Pakistan, because, let us not forget that China is interested in seeing that there is no settlement between India and Pakistan. She was the only country that denounced the Tashkent agreement, and she desires nothing more than the fact that conflict between India and Pakistan, or the bad relations between India and Pakistan, should go on.

One word about the Pillai Committee's report. The position is this, that the report was studied by us soon after it was submitted. Certain decisions have been taken; but the implementation depends upon two or three factors which has taken time. It involves inter-ministerial decisions. It also involves the question of finance, and to the extent this has got to be resolved I am sorry that some time has been taken before it could be implemented.

One word about Viet Nam, I do not think that Mrs. Pandit was fair to the Government when she said

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

that apart from stating from time to time that we wanted an unconditional cessation of bombing Government had not done anything in the matter. I assure the House that ever since this conflict started, India through diplomatic channels and other channels has been working for a settlement. It is a misfortune of the External Affairs Minister that he cannot divulge many facts to this House, and therefore when he is criticised his lips are sealed.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peermade): Have you condemned aggression in unequivocal terms?

Shri Ranga: Whose aggression?

Shri M. C. Chagla: We have said what we thought was right. I was meeting Mrs. Pandit's point that we have done nothing in the cause of peace, of settlement. I assure her that we have supported U Thant's mission, and we are constantly in touch with various countries diplomatically to see how this terrible conflict can be brought to an end.

One word and I have finished, and this is about what Mr Madhok said, I am sorry he said it, about the lobbies in the External Affairs Ministry. I wish he had not said it.

Shri Raj Raj Madhok: I wish this is wrong.

Shri M. C. Chagla: I must say this He said there were Pakistani lobbies, Arab lobbies, American lobbies, Russian lobbies, in the External Affairs Ministry, but not Indian lobbies. I wish to assure the House that since I became External Affairs Minister and since I have seen the work of my officers, I am absolutely convinced that no Minister could have had a body of more dedicated and devoted people than the officers of the External Affairs Ministry. Their patriotism is beyond all doubt and dispute. They might have different opinions and they express them, which they should. Do not forget that it is the Minister who decides. I must take the responsibility for their

action. Do not blame the officers behind me. You attack me; I will face it. But do not attack people who cannot come here and defend themselves. You are undermining the morale of a very fine service. And it is not right that these allegations should be made—baseless allegations. Why don't you attack me if anything goes wrong? After all, the officers give us advice, and we Ministers are ultimately responsible. That is the meaning of ministerial responsibility; in Parliament, the Minister takes responsibility for the action of his officers. I take the full responsibility. If there is a wrong decision, if a wrong act is done, you attack me and say I am wrong. But please do not say that this is due to a lobby or is due to want of patriotism on the part of the officers of the Ministry.

I am sorry I have taken such a long time, but the debate has been long and there were some interruptions, and so it took me some time. As somebody has said I wish our foreign policy is bipartisan; and is the foreign policy of the nation and the whole nation should accept the foreign policy of the country. It strengthens the Government when everybody is agreed with the foreign policy I hope that by and large not only those behind me but those opposite me will support the foreign policy of the Government and say that the Government has done its best to enhance the prestige of the country, to improve the image of the country and to fight for just causes the cause of freedom, the cause of peace, the cause of anti-colonialism and the causes which have always commended our respect and our loyalty.

बी कानून कमी वार : क्या बागसा
 नाहव बतवायने उग्रहीने को बीकरी
 विषय ककमी पणित के वारे में कहा बा ।

[श्री महेन्द्र लाल - डार - को]
 صاحب ہلالہ کے انہوں نے جو
 درویشی وچر لکھی وقت کے ہارے
 میں کیا تھا -]

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am on my legs. No questions. I am now putting cut motion No. 21 by Shri Madhok, to the vote of the House, first. The question is:

"That the Demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to take effective steps to secure the liberation of Tibet. (21)].

The Lok Sabha divided.

*Division No. 10

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is as follows:

Ayes 81, Noes 144.

The cut motion was negatived

Division No. 11

Amat, Shri D.
 Amersey, Shri M.
 Amin, Shri R. K.
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
 Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Bharat Singh, Shri
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
 Chittybabu, Shri C.
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.
 Dandekar, Shri N.
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
 Deb, Shri D N
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri P. K.
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh.
 Desai, Shri C. C.
 Devgun, Shri Hardayal
 Dhrangadhra, Shri Sri-
 raj Meghrajji.
 Digvijai Nath, Shri Mahant
 Dipa, Shri A.
 Dwivedy, Shri Suren-
 dranath
 Fernandes, Shri George
 Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
 Girraj Soren Singh, Shri

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Mr. Masani's cut motion No. 68.

The question is:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to take an objective and impartial attitude in the dispute between Israel and the Arab countries and to work for a just and stable peace in West Asia. (63)].

The Lok Sabha divided.

AYES

(16.32 hrs.)

Goel, Shri Shri Chand
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
 Jena, Shri D. D.
 Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
 Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao
 Joshi, Shri S. M.
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kameshwar Singh, Shri
 Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali
 Khan, Shri Zulfiqar Ali
 Kisku, Shri A. K.
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kundu, Shri S
 Kushwah, Shri Y. S.
 Lamaye, Shri Madhu
 Lobo Prathu, Shri
 Madhok, Shri Bal Raj
 Maiti, Shri S. N
 Majhi, Shri M.
 Mangalathumadom, Shri
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Misra, Shri Setnibas
 Mody, Shri Pilloo
 Molahu Prasad, Shri
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Naik, Shri R. V.
 Nayar, Shrimati Sha-
 kuntala
 Nihal Singh, Shri

Onkar Singh, Shri
 Padmavati Devi, Shri-
 mati
 Patel, Shri J. H.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Ram Charan, Shri
 Ramamoorthy, Shri P.
 Ramabekhar Prasad
 Singh, Shri
 Ranga, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Roy, Shri Chittaranjan
 Santosham, Dr M.
 Sequeira, Shri
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash
 Vir
 Shastri, Shri Raghuvir
 Singh
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shastri, Shri Shiv
 Kumar
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Solanki, Shri P. N.
 Sreedharan, Shri A.
 Suraj Bhan, Shri
 Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand
 Tyagi, Shri O. P.
 Xavier, Shri S.

*Names of members who recorded Votes have not been included as the photograph of the Division result could not be taken.

NOES

- Ahmed, Shri J.
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Shashibhu-
 shan
 Banerjee, Shri S. M.
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
 Ba'u, Dr. Maitreyee
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bholu Nath, Shri
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Chakrapani, Shri C. K.
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati
 Jyotsna
 Chandra Shekhar Singh,
 Shri
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitraj
 Singh
 Chavan, Shri D R
 Choudhary, Shri Val-
 miki
 Dar, Shri Abdul Ghani
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 Dhillon, Shri G. S.
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Esthose, Shri P. P.
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganpat Sahai, Shri
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram
 Ghosh, Shri Ganesh
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Gupta, Shri Lakhmal
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Heerji Bhai, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.
 Jagiwan Ram, Shri
 Jemir, Shri S. C.
 Kamala Kumari, Ku-
 mari
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Khadikar, Shri
 Khan, Shri Lafafat Ali
 Khan, Shri M. A.
 Khanna, Shri P. K.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kotaki, Shri Liladhar
 Kripalani, Shrimati
 Sucheta
 Krishna, Shri M. R.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kushok Bakula, Shri
 Lakshminantham:
 Shrimati
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra
 Singh
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Menon, Shri Vishwa-
 natha
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mohammad Ismail, Shri
 Mohsin, Shri
 Mohinder Kaur, Shri-
 mati
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Mulla, Shri A. N.
 Murti, Shri M S
 Nageshwar, Shri
 Naghnor, Shri M. N.
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
 Nair, Shri N Sreekan-
 tan
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pahadia, Shri
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandit, Shrimati Vijaya
 Lakshmi
 Parmar, Shri Bhalji-
 bhai
 Parthasarathy, Shri
 Patel, Shri Manubhai
 Patil, Shri A. V.
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Raghu Ramiah, Shri
 Rajasekharan, Shri
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Kishan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Subbag Singh, Dr.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramani, Shri K.
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Ramchir Singh, Shri
 Ranen, Shri
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri Eswara
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony
 Reddy, Shri Surendar
 Rohatgi, Shrimati
 Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saigal, Shri A. S.
 Saleem, Shri M. Y.
 Sambesivam, Shri
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara
 Satya Narain Singh,
 Shri
 Sayyad Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
 Sethuramae, Shri N.
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Shri M. R.
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri B. N.
 Shastri, Shri Ramava-
 tar
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sheth, Shri T M.
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shiv Chandika Prasad,
 Shri
 Siddeshwar Prasad,
 Shri
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Solanki, Shri S M.
 Sonar, Dr. A G.
 Sonavane, Shri
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.
 Surendra Pal Singh,
 Shri
 Tamaskar, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tripathi, Shri K. D.
 Umanath, Shri
 Venkatasubbalah, Shri P.
 Venkateswamy, Shri G.
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh
 Chandra
 Yadav, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra
 Jeet

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is as follows:—

Noes*—143.

Noes—143.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put all the other cut motions to the vote of the House.

All the other cut motions were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 15 and 16 relating the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

[The Motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha, are reproduced below—Ed.]

DEMAND No. 15—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,05,93,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'External Affairs.'"

DEMAND No. 16—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,94,70,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum

necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1968, in respect of other Revenue Expenditure of the 'Ministry of External Affairs'."

16.37 hrs.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 66 to 70 and 130 relating to the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation for which 3½ hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House who are desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND No. 66—MINISTRY OF LABOUR EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 52,53,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation.'"

DEMAND No. 67—CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 32, 23,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968 in respect of 'Chief Inspector of Mines.'"

*Actually, 144 Members voted for NOES.
1638(A) LSD—8.