

[Mr. Speaker].

for National Atlas and Geographical names for a term of three years commencing from the date of notification in the Official Gazette, subject to other provisions of the said Resolution."

The motion was adopted.

12.28 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—*contd.*

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs, and also further discussion on the Cut Motions printed on separate lists moved on the 12th May, 1962.

Out of seven hours, one hour and twenty-five minutes were taken up on Saturday, and there are five hours and thirty-five minutes remaining. And that is exactly the time that we have till six o'clock. I will request the hon. the Prime Minister to reply at about 4-30 p.m. Will that be all right?

The Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I hope I shall not take so much time.

Mr. Speaker: Then I can call him at 5 or 5-15.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would require at least an hour.

Mr. Speaker: Then I will request him to speak at five o'clock. **Shri D. C. Sharma** might now continue his speech.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): **Mr. Speaker,** I was submitting very respectfully on Saturday that it does not become us to speak slightly of the honourable men who have presided over our foreign missions abroad and

of the members of our delegations to the U.N. Our foreign missions have been presided over by such eminent persons as Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Shri K. P. S. Menon. And even today there are some younger men who are doing their job splendidly, men like Mian Azim Hussain and Shri R. K. Nehru. In the same manner, our delegations to the U.N. have been manned by a great constitutional expert like Shri G. S. Pathak and an eminent jurist like Shri P. N. Sapru. Therefore, I believe that so far as these two things are concerned, we have been fortunate in finding persons of such eminence and calibre to do these things.

✓ **But I will be failing in my duty if I do not give expression to the concern which this House has been expressing every now and then about our external publicity. In the report that has been given to us there are four long paragraphs on external publicity and they make a very good story. But when one analyses them one finds that most of this publicity has been along routine and stereotyped lines. I do not think that by means of this publicity we can project India and its policy and its plan as effectively in the other countries of the world as we should do. I therefore, think that our external publicity must be given a new face lift. We must find ways and means of putting a little more dynamism, a little more drive, a little more imagination into this service. One of the most disheartening things about this Publicity service is that though it is stated in the Report that its gradual integration has been taken up since 1959, I find that most of the members of the External Publicity Service are yet temporary. You cannot expect temporary men to put all their heart into their work. Moreover they, are not given all those advantages, all those amenities which are the privileges of the Foreign Service men. I wish the Minister for External Affairs will be**

kind enough to overhaul external publicity. I would also suggest that some time before the External Affairs Demands are taken up in this House, there should be a small sample exhibition in which we should be shown the kind of material that is distributed by our foreign missions, and also the kind of brochures that are published by our foreign missions and also the issue that they bring out on the occasion of the Republic Day. We would like to look at these things so that we can find out what our foreign publicity is doing. I hope something will be done to speed up this foreign publicity. ✓

There are two problems which concern us internally. One of the problems is Kashmir and the other problem is China. On both of these problems some hon. Members have given their opinion. Much has been made of the violent statements which Mr. Khurshid, the so-called President of the so-called Azad Kashmir has been making. In the first place, I would submit that the very election of Mr. Khurshid was challenged by the people of Azad Kashmir. They thought that his election was held in a way which was not in conformity with whatever principles of democracy you find in Pakistan. At the same time, I think this Azad Kashmir is a misnomer. There is no freedom there, not even freedom from hunger. Our U.N. always has some committees to go to certain countries to find out the conditions there. I think the U.N.O. should send a committee to find out the conditions of the people who are living in Azad Kashmir. They are suffering from all kinds of lack of freedom, especially freedom from hunger. At the same time, it is misnomer to call it Azad Kashmir. I think somebody should go and find out how many of the native population of Muzaffarabad and Poonch and all those areas are living there. Most of these persons have been driven out of these areas and now most of these places are colonised by persons who have come from the North West Frontier

Province or from West Pakistan or from other States. Therefore, to take anything that Mr. Khurshid says seriously is to put a premium upon something which is non-existent.

He has been threatening us with some kind of an Algerian type of warfare. I think we all sometimes indulge in exaggerations. We all sometimes do some kind of fantastic thinking. We are sometimes given to opiate dreams. I think no sensible man would have thought that the people of Azad Kashmir, who are groaning under the heel of oppression there and do not have even the elementary amenities of life, will ever think of fighting a war on the Algerian pattern. Patriotism is a great thing. But, these persons who have been taken there to colonise these areas, do not feel for either Pakistan or for Azad Kashmir. They think that Azad Kashmir would be a kind of a slave camp where they have been brought together in order to subserve the political ambitions of a clique that is to be found in Azad Kashmir.

So far as China is concerned, I was surprised to find that some of the hon. Members in this House tried to plead the case of China, the case *vis-a-vis* China much more vehemently than they should have done *vis-a-vis* India. I find that our relations with China are not happy. To say that we should continue our negotiations with China is to give a counsel of despair. Such counsels of despair are always coming from the mouths of the members of a party, who are always trying to soft-pedal the gravity of the situation which we have with China. I think that the time of negotiations is past. As has been said in this report, our officers' report has proved the hollowness of the case of China. So far as international usage goes, and so far as tradition goes, so far as all these things go, there is no 'China case', and anyone who tries to think in terms of a China case in this country, I think, is not doing justice to his own country.

I believe that the days of negotiations are gone. We waited for four-

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

teen years to negotiate with Portugal about Goa, and nothing came of it. We have been waiting all these years to negotiate with China, and nothing has come of it, and I shall not be a dismal prophet to think that nothing will ever come of it. Therefore, I think, that at the present the only policy that we should have towards China is the policy of retaliation, and I think that my country will not be found wanting in this policy.

I submit very respectfully that 44 crores of free Indians will be more than a match for 60 crores of Chinese, who are living under a regime for which they have absolutely no sympathy, which is bringing about near-famine conditions in that country, which has denied them even consumer goods, and which has denied them all kinds of freedom. I believe that the Chinese people, the good people, the peace-loving people the good-neighbourly people are the victims of this new warlordism preached by Mao Tse Tung and his party men. I believe that as the Chinese people did away with warlordism at the State level and liquidated the warlordism of Chiang Kai-shek, the day is not far off when the good people of China will eliminate this warlordism of Mao Tse Tung and others. But we need not wait for that. We shall have to embark on a policy of retaliation, so that the Chinese people understand that behind the sweet words of the Prime Minister of our country and behind the statesman like utterances of our leaders, there is also that great desire to get this occupation vacated as early as possible.

There are one or two other points to which I want to refer before I resume my seat. I am very proud of the performance of our people at Geneva, so far as the disarmament conference is concerned and also so far as the nuclear test ban treaty is concerned. I shall not be so vain as to say that all the wisdom of the world is to be found in the non-com-

mitted nations, but I would be failing in my duty if I do not say that if we want to have disarmament, and if the world wants to have an easy time, the proposals given by the non-committed nations should be made the basis of the disarmament proposals and the proposals for banning nuclear tests. And what are those proposals? The first of these is that no country should transfer nuclear weapons to non-nuclear countries. Then, there should be atom-free zones in Africa, Central Europe and the Americas. We should make peaceful use of outer space. We should prohibit war propaganda of all kinds. We should avoid the production of fissile material for nuclear weapon purposes. We should take measures for prevention of war through accident, miscalculation and surprise attacks. I think if we undertake these precautions, the world will be a safer place for all of us to live in, not only for the members of this bloc or that bloc but for all the peoples of the world. At the same time, I would say that so far as disarmament is concerned, we should try to arrive at some kind of agreement between the two blocs as suggested by the non-committed nations.

I would conclude by saying this much. Though there may be criticism of our policy here and there by one group of persons or another, there is no doubt about it that the three-pronged approach of our foreign policy, the desire for peace, the liquidation of colonialism and the policy of non-alignment, has been accepted by the world.

I am very sorry that the Prime Minister recently took ill. During his illness, we saw the world Press round-up referring to it. Every country in Europe, Africa and even America referred to the great services rendered by India along these three lines under the leadership of our Prime Minister, who is the architect of this policy. We all depend upon the implementation of that policy by giving free scope to

the United Nations. We already find that there is a peace corps. So far as Indians are concerned, they have gone to Gaza, Korea and the Congo; they are in Viet-Nam and other countries. I believe it is peace crops like these which will bring about the cessation of hostilities between one bloc and another and which will bring about peace in the world which all of us want so that we can live in peace and children also will live in a world which will be free from all the turmoils, all these upheavels and all these tests and troubles.

Mr. Speaker: I would request hon. Members to respond to the bell. I have to ring three or four times. That does not look nice.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sometimes when one is speaking, one does not hear your bell.

Mr. Speaker: Then in future, to those who do not hear, I will have to show this bell.

Shri D. C. Sharma: That is much better.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): While the threat of nuclear destruction seems to cloud the international horizon and while I have no doubt that India will play her traditional role in attempting to relieve world fears and hatreds, I have always felt very strongly that our foreign policy must necessarily be directed to meet the dangers or threats that are immediate to us.

I feel that recently we have been going through a somewhat unhappy phase. There have been so many tangled threads in this skein of our relations with our immediate neighbours that there is a tendency to oversimplify our problem. There may be a tendency to magnify one issue at the expense of another so that our view tends to become unbalanced, perhaps a little distorted. Yet I feel that I should very respectfully venture some analysis and attempt to put

into focus what I feel are the major issues in their order of priority.

Better late than never, our Government, while perhaps understandably going out of its way to conciliate our Chinese neighbours, appears to have come to a somewhat grim and disillusioned conclusion. In a recent communication to the Chinese authorities our Government has underlined the fact that Chinese policies are against the fundamental interests of Asia, and more especially of South-east Asia, and that Chinese policies are directed deliberately to creating situations of tension and conflict particularly in South-east Asia. I have no doubt that we will continue to attempt to negotiate not only with China, but also with our other neighbours, but I have also no doubt that today our Government has come to a long overdue realisation that in China we are dealing with a country whose rulers are not only militant but intransigent too, with a country whose policies have proved unfortunately to be not over-scrupulous.

At one time, we appeared to go through a rather dangerous phase, a phase of somewhat dangerous credulity marked by unreal and not seldom almost hysterical proclamations of *Hindi-Chini bhai bhai*. I have no doubt that today the Government has come to a realisation—I think the Prime Minister said it perhaps in somewhat different terms—that China is wedded militantly to the Leninist theory or Leninist thesis of the inevitability of war and that a world Communist revolution can only be achieved by resort to war.

I have also very little doubt—I do not know whether many people will agree with me—that it is a basic tenet of policy of Chinese rulers today to over-run Asia, and it is in that larger context that I want to pose this particular problem. I have little doubt that China is committed to liberating, as they call it, for Communism Thailand, Burma, Malaya and the Philippines. The Prime Minister will per-

[Shri Frank Anthony]

haps remember that as recently as 1950 even India was marked down for Communist liberation from the running dogs of imperialism. So far as Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim are concerned, the approach is a little more intimate, almost touching. They are marked down not only for liberation, they appear to be marked down for reunion with their original motherland, China. I have always felt this. I said four years ago that China was committed to over-running Asia, and that she would over-run it if possible by subversion, if necessary by force. And what I said four years ago unfortunately happens to be coming true.

There is no doubt today that China is avowedly irridentist. This irridentism perhaps draws its inspiration more from China's legend than history, the legend of Chinese dominion over Asia. That would be danger enough, but an edge is given to that danger. What do we see? We see China's population today increasing at a fantastic rate, bursting at her territorial seams. This means that an unlimited number of millions of Chinese can be used as expendable cannon fodder. And added to this, as my hon. friend has just pointed out, in spite of their much-lauded leaps forward, which appear to have emerged into rather pathetic limps, there are millions of half-empty mouths in China looking hungrily to the rice bowl of Asia. And that is the pattern as I see it, a multi-pronged Chinese expansionist scheme. I do not know whether even today we are looking at the picture in that context. The conquest of Tibet, which in a weak moment, we accepted—what has that done? It has brought to our northern borders for the first time in our history, millions of Chinese soldiers. No one knows what is the exact strength of the Chinese on our borders. While Tibet is enduring the humiliations of communist liberation, according to some newspaper reports, dozens of jet airfields have been com-

pleted in China. Whether it has been completed or not, it has been said that a 1500 mile railway line has been built from Peking to Lhasa. It has also been said that they have built a network, a vast network of roads, dumps and arsenals for our particular benefit, along our borders.

As I said no one knows—apart from the fact that most of our cities are within an hour or an hour and a half-flying distance, our cities which are completely vulnerable—what the strength of the Chinese forces along our borders is. I seem to remember having read a newspaper report towards the end of last year that the Prime Minister said that the number of Chinese troops in Tibet alone would exceed 50,000. That was at the end of last year.

So far as Nepal is concerned, the position to me appears to be not only dangerous but dangerously precarious. It is a little unfortunate that our relations with Nepal, recently, have not been as cordial as, perhaps, they might have been. There seems to have been some resentment on the part of certain of the Nepal authorities that people who were indulging in anti-Nepalese activities were operating from Indian soil. I think that that particular accusation has been repelled. But, what I feel is this: that the process of communist infiltration is taking place in Nepal and taking place rapidly.

My own view was that deliberately, to drive a wedge between Nepal and India, anti-Indian propaganda was mounted. But, mounted by whom? By a so called front of opposition parties led and inspired by whom? By the communists.

The purpose was obvious. And, temporarily at least, King Mahendra fell into the communist trap. And, what has happened? Perhaps, King Mahendra was a little resentful because, like all good democrats, we are inclined to shoot our mouths off,

to give gratuitous advice to people as to what form of government they ought to have. And, perhaps, he resented our sermonising him as to whether he should have controlled or guided or any other form of democracy. May I suggest, with a great deal of respect, that King Mahendra surely knows that India is not interested in Nepal, its territory, that we certainly recognise the right of Nepal, as a sovereign country, to pursue her own economic and foreign policy? But, may I say, with great respect, that I wonder if even today King Mahendra realises that he is playing dangerously with communist fire? It will not only burn his fingers; but it will destroy him first and the people of Nepal next. That is this agreement—I do not know how far it has gone—to build a road from Lhasa to Khatmandu. Chinese aid is pouring in apparently, increasingly, to Nepal. What is little Nepal going to do. Once, administratively economically and psychologically the Chinese and their agents dig their tentacles into Nepal, how long will it take before Nepal is embraced fatally to communism? That is the danger that is there to Nepal.

Then, there have been reports—I do not know how far they are true—of infiltration of one sort or another into Bhutan and Sikkim. We have heard of aggression through maps cartographic aggression and so on. I remember to have read somewhere that it has already taken place so far as Bhutan and Sikkim is concerned. Chinese maps at one time appeared to recognise Bhutan and Sikkim as Indian protectorates. I do not know whether I am right but I seem also to remember having read that from 1959 Bhutan and Sikkim are now shown in the Chinese maps as independent States. I hope the next Chinese step will not be to claim Chinese suzerainty over Bhutan and Sikkim. This, I feel, is our immediate and grave concern. I do not know what our Government feels in the matter but as I say there is this multi-pronged aggression. My own view, very respectfully, is this.

One of the major prongs today is directed at and through Viet Nam. One of my hon. friends on that side flaunted some paper and said: look at the massive aid American are giving to South Viet Nam. They forget conveniently all the massive and sustained aid that the Viet Cong are getting, immediate aid from the Chinese. This morning papers, one of our leading papers speaks of China helping the red drive in Laos. I do not know whether the Government feels that we can afford to be neutralised in Laos and more especially in Viet Nam. My own respectful view is that this is one of the prongs in the trident. We may not agree with many of the things that the president of Viet Nam does. I think his name is spelt Diem but pronounced 'jem'. If Viet Nam is over run, will it not mean that this noose that China is deliberately drawing around India will be tightened to to that extent? Militarily, economically and psychologically the China pattern is clear: expansionist, to isolate us and to drive us into a corner. When we interpret or attempt to interpret Chinese policies in that background the whole plan becomes obvious. Why has China sought to negotiate with Burma, Nepal and, very recently, with Pakistan—the same, obvious, consistent, sinister motive: to drive a ring around us and as I say, to isolate us and to drive us into a corner. I have little doubt that at the appropriate time backed by a powerful fifth column in this country, China will move to liberate India either through massive subversion or even by frontal attack or by a combination of both. That is clear.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): We may also liberate China.

Shri Frank Anthony: Let us hope so; if we recognise this pattern early enough we may very well liberate China and the rest of Asia for democracy. But this clear pattern as it appears to be clear tends to become a little blurred because of our recurring pre-occupation with the sabre-rattling of Pakistan.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

While we must necessarily be prepared against any stupid adventurist action by Pakistan's present rulers, my own feeling is—perhaps what I say will not be welcome to certain sections of this House or the country—there are certain sections in the country that batten on tension between India and Pakistan. They exult in it. There are even certain parties that are not avowedly communal, that are avowedly non-communal, but they also secretly exult in it because every time there is tension between India and Pakistan, it helps them to divert attention from the real threat to India, the Chinese threat.

13 hrs.

I say this: sometimes, I hope sooner than later, somehow, we will have to seek a *detente* with Pakistan. To say so today seems extremely inappropriate. But, as the Prime Minister has remarked, these two countries are of the same bone, the same blood and the same flesh. And while our destinies may not be completely bound up, there is no doubt that when there are violent political differences, even strong economic rivalries, we are like Siamese Twins trying to strangle each other. Let us hope that the rulers of Pakistan—you may say that these hopes do not come easy *vis a vis* a dictatorship—but let us hope that the rulers of Pakistan sometime will realise in their saner moments the utter criminal folly of mounting up attacks against India.

A war between any two countries is a tragedy, but a war between India and Pakistan would be an unspeakable tragedy. No one else realises this perhaps more acutely than the Prime Minister. The first ghastly offerings at the altar of mass hysteria which synonymises a nation in arms would be the minorities—the millions of Hindus in Pakistan and more millions of Muslims in this country.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur):
Nothing in this country.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am not usually over-convinced when Satan quotes scripture. As I have said, Pakistan too must realise that we are facing a common danger. We can only face it by facing outwards, not by facing inwards or by facing each other. I say this too: that this *detente* can only be achieved, can only happen in the life time of the Prime Minister. I have no doubt about it—that he alone has the authority, the stature and indeed the vision to be able, even in the most unfavourable circumstances, to attempt to achieve a *detente*. I venture to say this: if he could achieve it—and no one else can—it will be certainly the greatest legacy that he can leave to this sub-continent.

This also applies to Nepal. As I have said, surely the King must realise that we have not the slightest territorial or economic ambitions in Nepal and surely he must realise that the survival not only of the people of Nepal but of himself, the monarchy, depends on maintaining the friendliest of relations with India and facing outwards towards the common danger.

It is in this context that I venture to submit with respect that certain aspects of our foreign policy may require reassessment. We have been the most ardent champion of seating in the UNO of China, but what return have we got for our often passionate advocacy? We have got duplicity; we have got aggression; we have got increasing aggression. I know that the Prime Minister may say that it is logical that the UNO cannot function effectively unless numerically the largest nation in the world, China, is seated there. But may I say that so far as this particular logic is concerned, it is completely opposed to our own security. I know that the Prime Minister would not be able to answer me frankly as he might like to because he is the head of the Government. But what would be the effect of China being seated in the

UN? Taiwan (Formosa) would certainly almost have to be restored. The American Seventh Fleet would have to be withdrawn. What would happen? Millions of Chinese soldiers pinned down there would be ready to throw in against the whole of South-east Asia and more especially against our northern borders. I know that perhaps what I have said—this particular line of argument—will not commend itself to the Prime Minister.

Then again, so far as Vietnam is concerned. I pose the question, can we afford to be neutralist? Will not the over-running of Vietnam by the Chinese agents bring the dagger thrust—as I said, these dagger lines are drawn clearly and deliberately—closer to the throat of India?

I have this suggestion to make. Since the Chinese have violated obviously the understanding which we had with them to respect Tibetan autonomy, since they are practising genocide, have been for a long time, of the Tibetans according to the various Chinese refinements, what prevents us from allowing the Dalai Lama to function freely in this country? It would give heart not only to the Tibetans, but I submit with great respect, it will give heart to Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, who have the strongest spiritual affiliations with the Dalai Lama and with Lhasa.

I feel that if we look at it in this over-all context, in that context, friendly relations with Nepal, a *detente* with Pakistan and giving some kind of heart to the people of Tibet, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim will help to close the ranks on this sub-continent against what I have no doubt is a common and growing danger.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Sir, I should first like to mention that the External Affairs Ministry have brought out a report which gives very concisely and very clearly an account of their work and of our relations with other countries. I would like to thank them for doing so. Shri Anthony has spoken about our rela-

tions with our two neighbouring countries, which are so vital to us. First of all, regarding China, it is deplorable that while as a people we had spontaneously held out the hand of friendship to China, she should have hit us in the back and that the illusions which we had have been completely wiped out and shattered. During last year too, we find that there have been further incursions into Indian territory. But what is more, this *modus operandi*, this technique of turning and twisting and saying that it is India who is greedy with aggrandizement is something fairly new, but which seems to have been quite developed recently by China. What has been India throughout centuries historically and geographically is now being challenged and if our troops are in our own land, we are told that they have gone beyond the frontiers of India. Such is the position with China today.

Turning to the other side, regarding our Missions in China, the External Affairs Ministry report tells how difficult the position is and also how difficult the position is for our traders regarding trade with Tibet and China. On the other side, we find from the statement made by the Prime Minister yesterday in answer to a calling attention notice that the Chinese Mission in Kalimpong shot air guns towards the police headquarters of India. That has also resulted in one policeman being hurt. If that is so, to what extent have they been allowed to probe into our country. I am glad that the Chinese nationals who had gone in for subversive activities in India have recently been turned out. I am also glad that in regard to the renewal of the treaty with China India has been firm. It is strange that they should ask—I suppose it is not really strange—that we should continue our agreements regarding trade, but that the border violations by China can go on uninterrupted.

Sir, there are certain sections in this country who plead with the Prime Minister to follow the path of peace

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

and negotiation even today. What else has our Prime Minister done so far? Is it not India's policy always to follow the path of peace and negotiation? But it is China which has been slapping us in the face, which has been turning down any offer of negotiation. And today, if those whose loyalties are beyond the borders of India still ask the Prime Minister to negotiate, I would ask them to see what we did in the matter of Goa. We negotiated for a long time. We tried to follow the path of peace. India may be non-violent, but she does not believe in losing her self-respect. So at a time may come—let us hope that it does not come—when if China continues this policy India will have to answer in the same manner she did in Goa. I do not believe in war. I believe in non-violence. Mahatma Gandhi himself told some young men who had gone in for violence that it was better to go in for violence than to lose one's self respect, one's dignity. Therefore, that is the attitude that we will have to take towards China for whom we had shown the greatest friendship.

Turning to Pakistan, as Shri Anthony and our Prime Minister have said, Pakistan is more akin to us than any other country. This sub-continent has been left behind for centuries in regard to development, and if we are to develop in a proper manner it is only if India and Pakistan are together in peace and friendship that we can develop. But things are getting worse. It is surprising that after all these years, when the bitterness and the tragedies of partition have gone, we should still be in this position. It is extremely sad that Pakistan should go to the United Nations over the Kashmir issue when they have themselves occupied Indian territory in what they call Azad Kashmir. It is extremely sad and even worse from the point of view of the ordinary people living in this land that things have become so bad in some of our border areas.

Sir, I come from Malda. I represent that area here. I would like to say a few words about what I personally know of the affairs that took place there. I was there myself until the morning of the 5th of April. Two events took place, very tragic incidents between the Muslims and tribals. They did not create any tension throughout the district. I know it for a fact that in the town this matter had died down. Although everyone regrets the incidents tension was created by giving some news about it. On the 5th evening the Pakistan Deputy High Commissioner and his First Secretary passed through Murshidabad in a car. They met many persons some of whom said they were trying to incite them against the Hindus. That failed. They have reported in the Pakistan Press and also in the New York Times of many events; of lot of killings burnings of houses etc. in Murshidabad. But not a single thing happened. Then they travelled from there via Khajuria Ghat and Sujapur which is the nerve centre of Muslim activity in Malda. At Sujapur they stopped and started asking the people there about their complaints. It was pointed out to them by the District Magistrate that they should continue their journey and visit the affected areas because the Kalia Chowk Thana was not an affected area. But they went on and on the way they stopped and had meetings in that place. Although the majority of the Muslims were not swayed by what they said, it did have a great repercussion in the town. In the town the First Secretary went from house to house. He ignored the orders of the District Magistrate and the Security Officer. As a result of this tension grew. Some people said: "Is it Pakistan that has come to Malda saying, we shall give you redress, we shall give you protection?" That is why things got bad there. On the 8th they left. On the night before they left there was an incident

in Khajuria Ghat where Hindus were the victims, where six Hindus were

burnt alive. On the 15th evening there were incidents of arson and loot in the town.

Sir, I certainly decry these incidents—25 houses burnt, seven shops gutted or looted and people were injured on both sides—but that was what happened in the town of Malda. Anyone can go and find out even to-day. This has been magnified first into 100 deaths and then into 12000 deaths. It does not matter if they malign us had there been no other consequences. But that maligning has led to further repercussions in Rajshahi and in many other districts.

It is very sad that passions have been roused. The result is that the minority has really been affected very badly. It is not for us to say how badly they have been affected, but it is for the people who without going to Malda speak about what happened in Malda sitting in Rajshahi to tell us at least what happened in Rajshahi and in the rest of Pakistan.

There are, Sir, certain countries who want that Pakistan and India should never come together. They know that if this sub-continent was friendly much of their grip would go. This is something from the past that still remains. Yet it is necessary, whatever be the incidents that have taken place, as Shri Anthony said, for Pakistan to realise that her future will be inter-woven with that of India, that Hindus or Muslims who live in East Pakistan or in West Bengal are the same people, they are the same type of people who think in the same way and they are much more akin than even people from other parts of India or Pakistan.

Sir, it is sad that this has happened. I have got copies of *Dawn* where all kinds of things have been said. Some persons who stayed there all night and prevented the thing from flaring up and becoming widespread have been attached in *Dawn*. The Secretary of the Congress there, who is an M.L.A., has been attacked in the *Dawn* as having brought about these

incidents, while it was he who stood up all night, organised other persons even before the police came, and prevented the happenings from going on. This kind of inflationary statements in the Pakistan papers have certainly made things terribly bad.

I do not want, as I said, to make things worse. It is necessary, ultimately, for these two countries to work together if we both are to go ahead. Even though many things have been said against the Prime Minister by many people in the country, he has consistently tried to be friendly with Pakistan. Even now he will try to do that. He also believes fundamentally that to be friendly with Pakistan is the only way. But what is to be done if the present regime that country behaves in this manner? It is time that Pakistan came to her senses and realised that it is not help by way of loans or gifts from other countries that will help her to go ahead.

Before I end, Sir, I want to make a point regarding U.S. aid to India. We saw in the papers yesterday that the Senate Committee had suggested that U.S. aid to India should be cut down. Why? Because of Goa, because of Kashmir. Well, Sir, whether threats come from China or from the U.S. Senate Committee, India will not swerve from the policy that she has followed.

She will continue to be a non-aligned nation and she will try always to give her help in bringing about an end to the nuclear tests.

One more word about nuclear warfare and I will finish. It is a very sad thing that while talks are going on in Geneva about disarmament and ban on nuclear tests, those countries which are powerful are paving the way to the extinction of the human race by indulging in nuclear tests. I hope it will be possible for the people of the world, men and women, to bring enough pressure on them to make them put a stop to this mad race through which human beings will disappear for ever.

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

With these words, I support the demands relating to this Ministry.

Mr. Speaker: I will request hon. Members belonging to the Congress side to condense their remarks within as few minutes as possible because there are a large number of hon. Members who want to participate in the discussion and the time is limited.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Speaker, I differ from those who think that friendship with Pakistan has got any meaning for this country. Nothing worth preserving is common between India and Pakistan and nothing that is worth preserving has been jeopardised by partition. And if there is anything that is worth preserving, it will be jeopardised if India and Pakistan become one once again. There is nothing in common between India and Pakistan which is of permanent value. India and Pakistan share all the virtues and vices that are common to humanity in general, and the Afro-Asian land mass in particular. As long as Pakistan is a separate political entity, it will remain on hostile terms with India. But Pakistan's hostility towards India cannot injure India to any material extent. Pakistan has got a nuisance value. If we want to get rid of this nuisance, it can be done either by the handing over of the defence portfolio to the United Nations Organisation by India, which means the transformation of the United Nations Organisation into a world government, or by the establishment of Russian hegemony over Pakistan. If a political settlement is arrived at between Russia and America, Russian hegemony will be established over Pakistan. If a political settlement is arrived at between Russia and America, the terms of the political settlement, will be the handing over of Western Asia to Russia and some of the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific to the United States of America.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): What will happen to China?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: China will be partitioned.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Between Communist and democratic countries?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members should have more of patience if they want to hear more from him.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Hence I am opposed to any political settlement between Russia and America.

13.24 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

The entry of certain units of the Seventh Fleet in South East Asian area is an affront to all the nations of Asia and Africa. India may experience tomorrow what China is experiencing today, if the mischief is not nipped in the bud. The gravity of the Sino-India border dispute has palmed into insignificance before the threat posed by the United States of America. The perturbator of the age is the United States of America and not China. China is hemmed in on all sides by Russia and America.

Mr. Ho chi Minh is not a satellite of comrade Mao. Viet Minh is to China what Yugoslavia is to Russia. It would be a triumph for the cause of neutralism if Laos and South Viet Nam are integrated with North Viet Nam under the leadership of Mr. Ho chi Minh. The non-alligned nations in general, and India in particular, should render economic, political and military aid to China if a Sino-American war breaks out on the question of Laos. No such war can break out if Russia gives plain indication to the United States of America that she would support China whole-heartedly.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On the border issue also?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The whole of the Afro-Asian land mass will be

divided into two spheres of influence—Russian and American—if China is defeated in a Sino-American war. The establishment of Chinese hegemony over South East Asia is preferable to the establishment of white hegemony over Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not over India, I hope.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: There is a power vacuum in South East Asia. If I have to choose between the outbreak of a nuclear world war and the establishment of Russo-American hegemony, I will choose the latter and not the former. If I have to choose between a multi-centred world, and white hegemony, I would choose the latter and not the former. If I have to choose between Russo-American or Sino-Soviet hegemony, I would choose the latter and not the former. But if I have to choose between a world Government and Sino-Soviet hegemony, I would choose the former and not the latter.

Attempts are being made by the United States of America, England, France and West Germany to integrate the western hemisphere into one political unit. Russia and China are playing the same part in their respective spheres of interest. Since her participation in the first world war, the role of America in the politics of the Rimland has been a reactionary one. America intervened in the first world war to prevent the political integration of Europe under the leadership of Germany. It was with the same object in view that America participated in the second world war. The central theme of American foreign policy since the cessation of hostilities in 1945 has been to prevent China and Russia from integrating the Rimland into one political unit.

Little do people realise that the *status quo* cannot be maintained on the basis of *panch sheel*. The *status quo* has outlived its utility; it has become obsolete. The American attempt to

maintain the *status quo* by force of arms will lead to nuclear world war. The alternatives to war are either the transformation of the United Nations Organisation into a world government, or the establishment of either Sino-Soviet or Russo-American hegemony. If it is true that the *status quo* cannot be maintained, one has to choose between war, establishment of a world government or the establishment of hegemony. Only a crank or a criminal can be opposed to all the three alternatives. If the time is not ripe for the establishment of a world government, the choice would be between war and hegemony.

The threat of hegemony can be averted by either war or the establishment of a world government. The United States of America can avert the dual dangers of war and hegemony by handing over its defence portfolio to the United Nations Organisation. India will be the ally of United States of America if she does so.

Sir, I have done.

Shri Narasimha Reddy (Rajampet): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when our country became independent we expected that our national leaders would give the highest priority to the defence of our country side by side with economic advancement. Our leaders are experienced men....

Shri Brij Raj Singh (Bareilly): Sir, he is not audible.

An Hon. Member: Our leaders have no experience.

Shri Narasimha Reddy: It is all right. There are pretty exceptions of leaders. There are so many leaders but I am mentioning only the topmost leaders. There might be some exceptions to this rule. Our leaders, I will again say, are men of experience and of knowledge and they must have had in their minds the background of our history.

[Shri Narasimha Reddy]

Everybody knows that the woes of our country during the last 2,000 years have been on account of successive invasions from the North-Western frontier. It is not due to any want of courage or valour that our country was overrun by these invaders but it is due to the fact that our country was disunited with so many kingdoms and principalities very often siding with the invader. But now, after the British left, we have a united India. We have an efficient army with fine tradition and discipline. With these lessons of history we expected that our leaders would keep India fit and strong against foreign aggressors, specially after the creation of Pakistan, a sour and dour neighbour and now our sworn enemy, so much so that from the time of partition till today we have been subjected to all sorts of insults and annoyances.

Our country has been blackmailed; Pledged words have been broken; Our borders have been violated; There have been shootings and kidnappings of our people; Diplomatic personnel have been injured and our civilians have been insulted. Added to all this there have been periodical killings of a diabolical nature as have recently occurred in Pakistan. Our external affairs with regard to this matter have been a sorry mess.

We have been following a policy of appeasement, weakness and of vacillation. If, in the initial stages, we had made Pakistan clearly to understand that a blow would be answered by a blow, there would not have been these ugly developments in latter years. China would not have gulped enormous chunks of our territory. This attempt by our hon. Prime Minister to change the nature of the panther by preaching a sermon on the mount has been a signal failure.

What is happening today? Pakistan is poised to strike at us. It has received plenty of arms and ammunition from America. It is in possession of the latest and the fastest jet fighters. It

is throbbing with an irrepressible sense of power and is itching for a fight with India.

The greatest danger now is that Pakistan and China, both of them, are trying to arrange between themselves how to apportion the spoils of the Indian soil. In this matter we see for the first time a change in the attitude of the Government of India. For the first time our hon. Prime Minister has said that we shall not tolerate any longer these threats of Pakistan. For the first time our hon. Defence Minister has also said that if Pakistan enters Kashmir, the Indian Army will be at liberty to strike anywhere it pleases. This change in the attitude of the Government of India comes as a silver lining to the cloud that has been darkening the Indian horizon ever since we got independence. To some intellectuals who have having apprehensions of our hon. Defence Minister that he would one day present India on a golden platter to China this announcement comes as a pleasant surprise.

With regard to China our hon. Prime Minister has made an unequivocal declaration that our frontier check-posts will not move under the threat of force and if the Chinese use force, it will be resisted by force. We see in this announcement of the hon. Prime Minister a distinct change in his tone. He has always been having affection and admiration for the Chinese. Whatever they might have done in the past, whatever might have been their aggressions on the soil of India, he has been doing everything from the point of view of non-violence and *ahimsa*. Whenever the Chinese advanced, he showed pusillanimity, weakness and nervousness in dealing with the Chinese aggression. But now there is a welcome change in his attitude towards China.

Why did he change his tone? There was a feeling of revulsion throughout the country at his vacillation. He re-

ceived continuous battering from this Parliament from all sections of the House and so he has changed. That speaks volumes to the glory of the democratic system of this Government in that our hon. Prime Minister who was so adamant in his pacific attitude towards China has after all bowed to public opinion.

Now, Sir, Pakistan and China are conferring with each other to demarcate the boundary between them. That means both of them are putting their heads together against India and trying to conspire. These two countries which were ranged in opposite camps have become strange bed-fellows over-night. What is the future for this country if this conspiracy materialises?

Sir, Pakistan is in the American camp; China is in the Russian camp. The Prime Minister has said that aggression by both would be resisted. Now if both these attempt a two-pronged attack, what is to happen to our country? Can we get the help of America in this matter? Certainly not, because America would say that they cannot do anything against Pakistan, their ally. Will Russia, however sympathetic it may be towards India, consent to supply us arms if there is a possible aggression by China? Certainly not, because Russia cannot antagonise its communist ally which is one of the biggest powers of the world. This is the gruesome picture before us and when we contemplate over it, its gloomy forebodings come before us. I am sure the Prime Minister would pay due attention to these things and do the needful.

Sir, with regard to the communal killings in East Pakistan, I have to say this that these were there even when the British were ruling over us. These communal riots used to take place frequently. But there is this difference. Whereas the British were dealing with the riots promptly and efficiently and putting them down, the communal rioters of Pakistan are allowed to run riot and after plenty of blood-shed and massacre of men, women and children, the State comes

at the last hour and makes a show of putting down the riots. Can these riots be eradicated once for all by any human effort, I ask? It is impossible. The communal riots, Hindu or Muslim have been there for the last so many generations and they will be there in an intensive form for many generations to come. This generation and even the succeeding one will have to undergo the experience of gruesome killings of a communal nature.

Sir, the other day I was reading in the paper the statement of the Jan Sangh leader Mr. Madhok at Calcutta who suggested that there should be exchange of population in this regard. Sir, though I am against vast exchange of population, the suggestion of the Jan Sangh leader may be considered by the Prime Minister in a limited manner. It was Mr. Jinnah who first suggested a mass exchange of population which was not agreed to. But now on account of these frequent rioting and killings, it is possible to bestow some thought and attention on this suggestion of the Jan Sangh leader and amicably arrange with the Pakistan Government for an exchange of population on a limited scale and get rid of this communal virus in that combustible portion of the country for ever.

Sir, much has been said regarding the running of foreign missions and the personnel manning these missions. It has been said—and I agree also—that these foreign missions are run on a very extravagant scale, that the personnel running them are given to ease and luxury and are very often inefficient. Though it may not apply to all the members, it might be true of some of them at least. But what can the poor Prime Minister do in this respect? He is a man much overburdened with responsibilities. If those people under him who are in the higher rungs do not realise their sense of responsibility if they do not value the trust, if they do not feel that the destiny, the safety and the honour of the nation is placed in their hands by a trusting Prime Minister, what can the Prime Minister

[Shri Narasimha Reddy]

do? It is impossible for the Prime Minister even if he has a hundred more eyes, to eradicate these things unless the staff working under him feel the pricks of conscience. As Shakespeare said:

"Let us leave them to Heaven
and to those thorns

Which in their bosom lodge to
prick and sting them."

The Prime Minister, we know, is a man very much preoccupied with duties. He is a man having multifarious functions to perform and he is discharging them with an energy which has no parallel in the history of administrators. I only wish that he is not continually pestered by the visitations of political explorers who come to him like locusts with requests to instal them into positions of power. If he is not troubled in that manner, I am sure he would be able to pay greater attention to his duties and be of greater service to the country.

Lastly, Sir, I say that so far as our foreign policy is concerned, our Prime Minister has been steering the ship of State very skillfully amidst quicksands, shoals and rocks, which less expert hands could not have done. I must say that our foreign policy has been honest and straight-forward and I commend our Prime Minister for it.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I feel that never before since the days of Asoka has India enjoyed a better foreign policy than the foreign policy that has been given to this country by our great Prime Minister. Not only India, not only the Afro-Asian countries, but almost all the countries of the world look towards him in their efforts for disarmament, in their efforts to destroy the nuclear weapons, in their efforts to avert another war and to bring peace in their life-time. I, on behalf of Members of this House, congratulate the Prime Minister in his efforts to bring about peace in our life-time. And I hope and trust that his efforts will succeed and the time

will not be far off when the leaders of the East and the West will come to Delhi and stand before the samadhi of the Father of the Nation in Rajghat and pledge that in our life-time there will be no war and all the settlements will be made by negotiations, by talks, by discussions and that we will not revert to the barbarian method of war and warfare.

We are often being criticised for our policy towards China. We know it very well that our Prime Minister had only three alternatives before him. One alternative is war, the other alternative is negotiation and the third alternative is surrender. I want to know here and now, is there any man or woman in this country who believes that as long as this country is led by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, as long as this country has the honour and bride to have him as the Prime Minister of India, India will ever surrender to China? We know it very well that in those days when we were an unarmed people and we were suppressed by the British imperialism it was this undaunted soldier of India's freedom who did not surrender to Britain. Does anybody expect that he will surrender to China? The other alternative is war. We know very well that to talk of war is very easy. Many people in this country have not seen the devastation of war. But those who have seen it know very well what it will mean, not only to India and China but to the entire world. The third alternative is negotiation. We know very well that our great Prime Minister has learnt the art of negotiation at the feet of the Father of the Nation. It was through negotiation that we achieved our independence. We, therefore, hope and trust that through negotiation we will be able to convince China of the absurdity of the policy that the Chinese friends are adopting towards us. We all know that India and China are two of the greatest countries of Asia. If we do not unite then the future of Asia is doomed. I, therefore, hope and trust

that the time is not far off when China will realise the need of extending its hand of friendship to India and that India and China will be able to lead Asia and Africa....

Shri Ansar Harvani: And we are now it is giving us kicks, take note of that also.

Shri Ansar Harvani: And we are kicking back also.

We know that there is a tiny little country in our neighbourhood, Nepal. Let us remember that as long as Britain ruled over India, the position of Nepal was not very much better than that of many of the Indian States whom they called Native States. The Indian States were divided into different categories: there were some which used to have Political Agents, there were some which used to have Residents. Nepal used to have a British Ambassador. We know it very well that in those days Nepal had not got any ties with any other country except Britain; and the Nepalese desk was not in London, it used to be in New Delhi. Then came the days of revolution in Nepal. It was from Indian soil that a Nepali patriot went to Nepal and liberated Nepal from the Ranas, and with the help of a democratic King, democratic system was established in that country. But unfortunately the present King did not follow in the footsteps of his father. Today democracy has been destroyed there, the parliamentary system has been abolished and the monarch is acting as a dictator. At the same time we find that instead of extending the hand of friendship towards India and fostering the traditional friendship that India has towards them, that is being destroyed in the streets of Kathmandu. I hope and trust that the External Affairs Ministry and the Prime Minister will pay more attention to Nepal and see that the traditional friendship that always existed between India and Nepal is restored. I find that objection is being taken against those Nepal refugees who are in this country. I know many of them personally.

Many of them have been my personal friends. I know it very well that they are keen to go back to Nepal. But they can do so only on this condition, namely, if democracy and parliamentary system is restored there. We have known it in the past also when efforts were made to overthrow the Ranas that it was the Indian patriots who assisted them and helped them to get democratic system established in Nepal. And we feel that we are perfectly justified in helping these people to see that once again a democratic system is set up there.

While talking of the External Affairs Ministry's Demands my thoughts go back to the hundreds of those countrymen of ours in occupied Kashmir who are groaning under the iron heels of a military ruler. Let us take a pledge here and now that India will not rest till that part of India which is known as Occupied Kashmir is liberated. Let us here and now send our greetings to them from here that our thoughts are with them, that we are always thinking of them and suffering for them, and that we shall see that the day is not far off when that part is liberated and integrated with the rest of our country. At the same time, we also appeal to the conscience of the world, to the big nations, that they should see that those people who are our brethren, those people who are a part of India are restored to us and that Occupied Kashmir is liberated.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the great patriots of Algeria who through the thick and thin of the struggle have succeeded in liberating their country. I hope and trust that the time is not far off when the Government of India will recognise the Algerian Government and we will have diplomatic ties with the Algerian Government in the same manner as we have diplomatic ties with the other liberated countries of Asia and Africa.

✓ Before I conclude I have to say a word about our external publicity. Our External Affairs Ministry has got an External Publicity Division. But I

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

am afraid I do not have a very high opinion about that organisation. Our publicity in foreign countries has failed. We have not been able to bring that impact of our foreign policy, that impact of our importance in foreign countries that it deserves, and the entire fault lies with the poverty of the External Publicity Division. I hope and trust that our hon. Prime Minister will probe into the working of the External Publicity Division and see that it becomes a really effective instrument of the External Affairs Ministry in popularising our foreign policy. ✓

With these words I once again congratulate the hon. the Prime Minister and support the Demands before the House.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, whenever our Prime Minister goes to foreign countries, he receives big ovations and large crowds are there to see him. (*Interruption*). Somebody whispers that the crowds are not large. I have not seen them, but it is reported like that. Unfortunately, it is presumed by us that, because he receives those ovations and big crowds are there to receive him, India has achieved some sort of greatness. But we must realise that those idle crowds that come to see him are no indication of the love that is generated for our country. We have to cast our eyes on all our sides and see whether we have achieved something in the nature of greatness.

We have not to look very far. We start from our position in Burma which was part and parcel of our country up to 1937. At the time when Burma was occupied by Japan in 1942, the total population of Indians in Burma was about 14 lakhs. Today the total population of Indians in Burma does not exceed 4 lakhs 10 lakhs had to come back. The figure has not increased, but it has decreased. And what has happened to their property?

Shri Raghunath Singh: What is the present population of Indians there?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Four lakhs.

Shri Raghunath Singh: No, ten lakhs.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It might be in your figures. I know it better.

14 hrs.

An Hon. Member: Everybody has got his own figures.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: All the properties held by Indians have been expropriated. Even in the case of the grant where the grants provided that 90 per cent. of Indians could live in Kyutaga and Zeyawaddy grants; but only 3 per cent are living there. All the properties of all the citizens have been expropriated and not a single farthing has been paid. The biggest sugar factory in the world, situated in Zeyawaddy, belonging to a big zamindar of Bihar has been expropriated and not one single farthing has been paid to him. Wives and children of unskilled labour, still employed in part of Burma, are not allowed to go to Burma to meet the bread-winner. That is the position that we have in Burma.

We know what is our position in Ceylon. The figures given in this official report will indicate that year in and year out, repatriation of India labour is being carried out from Ceylon. These people are coming over to our country.

We fostered a good deal of love for China. We espoused its cause in the United Nations. This China has slapped us in the face. We talked of paring Sheel with them. We invited its great men. They have done us in the eye and behind our back, they have taken away large chunks of our territory, so much so that, today, when we are now trying to check their progress into our territory, they come round and say that we are trying

to seize territory which belonged to them. With whom are they trying to join hands? It is unfortunate that they have tried to develop a special friendship with Pakistan. Pakistan could not get a better ally than China. Stolen property by both is to be divided between them. Thieves want to divide what they have stolen from us. It is this sad story which faces us when we look on all our sides.

Pakistan was built on hatred against us. Pakistan has maintained that hatred against us. Unfortunately, we have not been on the alert. It was this Pakistan which moved a Resolution on human rights in the United Nations and got a Resolution passed on the question of genocide. It was an irony of fate that the devil was quoting scriptures and saying that we must stop genocide of the poor Muslims in our country. What picture do we get? In Pakistan, regular genocide of the Hindus has taken place. They are being wiped out slowly, but certainly. Slow death is being meted out to them. We have not raised our finger against this. We have not raised our voice in the United Nations against this. We have not asked for sanction against Pakistan on the question of genocide. What are the figures of population? Our own report admits that—we must use mild language—that the position of the minority in Pakistan is unsatisfactory. Is this word 'unsatisfactory' sufficient to describe the position in which the Hindu minority finds itself in Pakistan? It was suggested by an hon. Member who preceded me that we may still try to talk of exchange of population. Can we do it? Can we attempt it? Will the other party agree to it? It is a bilateral thing. It is not a unilateral thing. We cannot even conceive of the idea of driving out the Mohammedans who are here. We cannot, because we have accepted the proposition of one nation. It is on this one nation theory that we wanted to discard communal ideas. Unfortunately, we have not been able to

get out of it. The inheritance which we have received from the British of treating the various communities and different communal bodies still goes on with us. So much so, that I was surprised to read that even today, the Hindu is not trusted in his own country. The Establishment Manual of the Western Railway says that for the purpose of recruitment to the selection posts, one of the Members must be a non-Hindu. Who must that non-Hindu be, it passes my comprehension. Why should there be a stigma upon the Hindu community. The nominated Member, speaking today, could talk even in eulogistic terms about Pakistan. He can conceive of Hindus trying to kill Mohammedans, but he cannot yield on this point that the Mohammedan has remained an aggressor and will continue to remain an aggressor. This is the position we have to safeguard so far as our country is concerned.

We are trying to become now more vocal and more assertive so far as Pakistan is concerned. I hope the policy of greater assertion and bolder assertion against Pakistan is pursued without any falling back upon the progress that we are making. We have yielded always. In giving loans, we have yielded and in giving water. It is a shame that water is allowed to pass through our territory and our fertile areas, which could be made more fertile by the supply of water, are left barren, just to supply water to Pakistan. Lakhs and lakhs of sleepers are sabotaged. Our trains are running late. We cannot have railway work carried on in our country because sabotage is being carried out in the Sutlej. Lakhs and lakhs of sleepers are allowed to pass into Pakistan and not one farthing is charged. We sit in complacency and keep quiet. How long can we keep our eyes shut to this position. It is a thing over which we must all exercise our brains.

Coming from China and Pakistan, let us look the other way around us: Nepal, Our friend; our own flesh; our own blood. It has started think-

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

in terms as if it can achieve something more and better by being in the company of China than by being in our company. We have our soft corner for Nepal, be it governed by a Maharaja, be it governed by a Rana or be it governed by a junta of Congress. Yet, what do we find? Somehow or other, our relations with Nepal seem to be a bit strained.

The same position we find if we look at other countries with which we had friendly relations. No doubt our relations with the U.S.S.R. have improved. But, our relations, on the other hand, with the United Kingdom and the United States of America are not so pleasant as they ought to be. On the one hand, for a little affair, Goa, even our great Prime Minister was abused and abused in a very filthy manner by the American press and by the British press. They lost mental control over this. We never abused them for all the various things done by them. When it was merely a question of getting back our own property which was taken away by some one, who had the conceit of saying that it is their country, a part and parcel of Portugal,—a most inconceivable position—and when the people wanted to come back to us and they did come back to us without a drop of blood being shed, yet, crocodile tears were running down the eyes of the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom. What type of friends have we developed? Even if they do not help us in our adversity, they should at least pat us for the good things that we do. This is a very clear indication that our foreign policy has not been of very great help to us.

What are the reasons behind it? It is for those who are holding the helm of affairs to decide. But the patent facts are as I have laid before the House, that, unfortunately, we have not shown any progress whatsoever in achieving healthy relations with other nations. We have gone out of our way in trying to placate everybody. But I do not know what makes us so afraid that we are even today far

from recognising Israel. What prevents us from recognising Israel? What prevents us from having diplomatic relations with Israel? Israel is a country well established on the map of the world, and it has got its own representatives, and yet, we fear and we do not have relations with it. We can recognise San Marino, but not Israel. Where is that San Marino? Who knows San Marino? We shall have to look at the whole world map to find out where San Marino is.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): We have recognised Israel.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: When did we recognise Israel? From the report, I could not find it out. I would like to know when we recognised Israel. The hon. Minister can just give that information, and I would be very much obliged.

Where is that San Marino? San Marino is a small place having 52 square kilometres of area and a population of 13,500 people living somewhere in Italy, and we have got a Consul-General placed there. Why do we want to recognise this San Marino? Why are we not able to recognise Israel?

Shri Nath Pai: It is a delightful little place.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: This kind of thing indicates that we are incurring expenditure recklessly, carelessly and negligently, and just to aggrandise certain people, we have to make a big show. That cannot carry us very far in our foreign policy.

The foreign policy of our country must be the policy of a nation of 40 crores of people living in it, a virile nation which is growing day to day, which is now proclaiming to the world that industrially it is growing, politically it is growing, physically it is growing, and in wealth also, it is trying to grow. It is that country whose presence must be felt by the other nations. But, unfortunately, that presence is not being felt. We see

feeling like beggars, and everyone treats us as beggars. Nobody respects us. In South Africa, we are kicked, and we are not allowed to enter hotels. We are not allowed to talk on equal terms with the South Africans. We are sending out Missions, we are allowing other Missions to come in; we are holding treaties with Christian powers and with Christian Popes. What for? We are not here to recognise religions. We have tabooed religion, and yet we shall send out a mission here and there; we shall have an Archbishop from the Vatican in our country. Why should we do that? How do we explain this conduct on our part?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Vatican is an independent State.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The Vatican is a city-State. We have got a Sankaracharya State also, but nobody wants to have any Consul-General there.

Shri Nath Pai: But does Sankaracharya want it?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We shall have to find out whether he wants it or not.

We have got, if I remember right, about 90 Missions abroad; of course, not all are of the same type; some are with one type of name, and others are with different types of names. About 66 of them are the so-called Embassies. And who are the persons who are sent out to these Embassies to represent Indian culture? Have they any idea of Indian culture? I remember the son of an Ambassador talking with me once. Six or seven of us were talking about the great Sankaracharya whose name I mentioned just a little while ago. And the gentleman was there to enquire from me who that bloke was. That is the type of diplomatic personnel that we send abroad.

Shri Raghunath Singh: They know everything except India.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Yes, he will know everything except India. It is such people who are being sent abroad to represent our country.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): It is not the son who has been sent. It is the father who is responsible, and not the son.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is this type of father, wife and son who are all there to represent India, and it is such people whom we select for such posts, and they are selected because of their wives and also for their sons, and they go there just to show to what country they belong. It is this kind of thing which we have to check in our country.

If I am right, any number of female workers—I use the word 'female' and the word 'workers' because these are the words used in the report of the Ministry; I am sorry that this expression has been used—or, I would say, the ladies of India are kidnapped, taken across to the Persian Gulf ports of Kuwait, Oman, Muscat, and Bahrain, and they are sold as slaves. We have not been able to control this trade in our womenfolk.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: We have prohibited it.

Shri U. M. Trivedy: You have prohibited it. But have you succeeded? That is the point I like to know.

Shri Raghunath Singh: How are they going outside India?

Shri U. M. Trivedy: How are they going outside India? The main question is this. You have prohibited it. But how are they going?

Shri Raghunath Singh: How are they going outside, and how are they being sold as slaves? It is a very strange thing.

Shri Warior (Trichur): It is only those traders who can tell you.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is a very shameful thing that this thing is happening even today in our country.

There are many things which we would have liked to do in order to keep up our relations with those who

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

have been the original inhabitants of India, but we are yet failing to do those things. There are places like the Fiji Islands, Mauritius, the West Indies and so on, where Indian culture has spread, not by our efforts but on account of our having sent indentured labour in the olden days. In those places, the people are clamouring for Indian culture. They want Indian culture. They want to keep up the inheritance of their forefathers, but we have done nothing to send out Indian missions of the proper type and with the proper background of Indian culture to those countries which are hungry for Indian culture. We must take steps to do this.

When I was reading the report of the Ministry, I was surprised at one thing. One item struck me as very strange, namely that we are still enamoured of rock salt coming from Pakistan. Why is this business of rock salt being continued? Why should it enamour us? Rock salt is a salt which can be easily manufactured in our country. I remember that a merchant set up a small factory in Delhi, manufacturing rock salt. It is a very simple process. Any ordinary student of chemistry can tell you that rock salt is not difficult to manufacture, and yet we want rock salt to come from Pakistan and allow it to be transmitted also in our country. Why should we not encourage the manufacture of rock salt in our country itself? A little addition of manganese to ordinary sodium chloride will give the proper type of rock salt. Why are we not indulging in the manufacture of rock salt? I cannot understand it at all.

Shri K. C. Sharma: That relates to trade and commerce, not to foreign policy.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Keep it under trade and commerce. Do not disturb. Then, we talk about Pakistan's behaviour with us. The foremost example that comes to my mind, whenever I think of this that how weak we have

grown, is this. Col. Bhattacharya was said to have been arrested. Was he arrested or was he kidnapped? It was a clear case of kidnapping from our territory. The man was dragged from our territory, taken into the other territory and tried. What a farce it was! And we sit over that farce, tolerating it and not lifting our finger against it. Can we not kidnap thousands of these Pakistanis and send them to jail, and retaliate in the same manner; and thereby bring them to their senses and tell them that we are not going to tolerate this? This sort of thing cannot be tolerated by a big country like India, and should not be tolerated. How long can we have this complacency of allowing our men to be kidnapped in this manner? This has happened hundreds of times. Our Chancery was stoned, and our High Commissioner was insulted, and we have tolerated these things. Our men were shot at and were killed, our sepoys were killed, and we have tolerated these things. As I have said already, genocide has been consistently and continuously practised by Pakistan on Hindus, and we have done nothing about it. But kidnapping of a big officer is too much; they took him into their territory and then made a big show of a trial. And yet, we are keeping quiet. The children of this man, whosoever they may be, must be clamouring for his release; they must surely be feeling the weakness of our country. Surely, they must be feeling, 'What a type of a country we are in, where not even a little finger is lifted to strike at this kind of wrong thing?'

It was suggested by Shri Frank Anthony when he was speaking that saner counsels would prevail in Pakistan and the might do something very sane. Saner counsels have not prevailed for 14 years and I do not think we can go on hoping that they are going to prevail now. It is impossible. After all, you can keep a dog's tail buried under the earth for sometime, but the moment it comes out of the

earth, it will be still wagging and it would still be curved. It will remain curved for all time. It is not going to become straight unless and until there is pressure which can keep it straight. Therefore, my suggestion is that we must talk in the same language in which Pakistan has talked with us. We cannot go on behaving in a very decile manner with people who do not act like gentlemen. It is this difference which we must realise. When we are dealing with civilised people, we can act in a proper manner, in a polite manner and in a courteous manner. But we are talking with people who do not believe in anything except the *danda*. We must use the *danda*. What harm is there? We must teach them the lesson of their life that they should not treat India with scant courtesy.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, if there is any policy that has got the approval of almost all sections of this House, I maintain it is the foreign policy of the Government of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is not audible. He might come nearer.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: The House is not equipped for a small, little voice! The Prime Minister has introduced considerations, sometimes very touching, in dealing with other countries, especially when they are opposed to us. When the refugees were pouring into India and there was a cry for action against Pakistan—and there was a legitimate feeling of bitterness—the coolest head in the country was that of the Prime Minister. He raised his hand not to strike but to restrain. And his voice, as you heard only last Saturday when he was dealing with fictitious reports about the massacre of Muslims in India published in the Pakistan Press, had not anger but pain. He could have easily pursued the matter in the United Nations and got Pakistan named as an aggressor. But he did not want to embarrass a neighbour country. He did not want to put

to shame a country before the eyes of the world.

Some people see in this attitude weakness. I am not of that opinion. Recently there have been some reports in the Pakistan press. I have read some of them; they make your blood boil. They are trying to get arguments for putting the case of Kashmir in the United Nations. These are fictitious reports, coined and exaggerated.

The pretend to protect the Muslims of India. Here in this country, we have Members of Parliament who are Muslims. We have got Ministers in every State, we have Ministers in the Central Cabinet, we have Ambassadors and Governors who are Muslims. Recently we elected as Vice-President of India a Muslim. There was an offer to Maulana Azad for the Presidency of India. He declined because he wanted to remain in active politics. These are the conditions here. There, leave alone Ministers and Governors, no minority community is represented in any important office. There not even the head of any department is a member of the minority community. But they come round and say that there is injustice in India done to minorities. And there are people in the world who pretend to believe it to be correct. We must make it quite clear once for all that we have a Constitution in India which can protect us. We have got courts which are impartial where we can go for redress. If everything fails, we have ourselves the weapon of satyagraha with us. We do not want any foreign government or any foreign State to interfere in our affairs. We are happy here. I would ask the Pakistan Government: if they have any concern at all for the Muslim minority in India, let them better look after the minorities in their own country.

About killings and so on, apart from Hindus, what about the killing of Muslim pakhtoons in Pakhtoonistan? You read the Afghan Press and some

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

other Press. You will find what persecution is going on, how many arrests are made. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan has been imprisoned for a number of years now. These are the conditions there. I want to make it clear here and now as an Indian citizen that if there is some riot and some deaths take place, for me, whether it is between Santhals and Muslims or between Muslims and Hindus or Christians, it means that so many Indian citizens have died. It does not matter which community they come from. It is part of the functions of the Government of India, in the Home Ministry, to create conditions where this does not happen. We cannot keep on calculating in communities, numbers and so on. There should be an end to this chapter. We are trying to integrate emotionally all the communities of India. Of course, we have inherited a history which is a bar against this. Still we are trying. The efforts of everyone of us should be directed towards this end. We do not want the emotional balance that we have set up to be upset by some pedantic lawyer making a speech in the United Nations. There should be clear and complete understanding on this point.

I am happy that Shri Krishna Menon has made it quite clear that the frontiers and boundaries of India are well-defined and they are not open to discussion in any place, as any time and anywhere. That is our stand.

Now, I come to Goa. For the last 16 years, there has been agitation in this House and outside for action, strong action. That was justifiable. But the Prime Minister who learnt his lessons at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi waited. He argued and pleaded with the Portuguese Government. He went so far as to make an appeal to some other countries so that they might intervene and persuade the Portuguese Government to do the right thing. When every effort failed, when every method was tried and found wanting, it was then that he asked the Indian

Army to march in. What happened then? The Indian Army marched with practically reversed arms. Without a shot being fired, Goa was in our hands. Non-violently, we won our freedom, and practically through non-violence we have cleared the soil of India of all foreign pockets. I ask hon. Members opposite, specially Shri Nath Pai, who seem to be very much impressed by the strength and might of China: has China removed all the foreign pockets from its mainland, let alone the shore islands and Formosa? This is not strength. Show of strength is not real strength. Real strength is with us. Let us not be defeatists and say that China is strong. Whenever she was faced with something stronger, China has backed out, for example in Korea. In Formosa they tried firing across the channel, and then when the American fleet came, they became silent. America went so far as to say they were not interested in the off-shore islands; even then they kept silent. If they just advance here and there, we are agitated, naturally, but once we know that the Government of India means business and that it will see that all that land is cleared of foreign invaders, that should suffice. The timing and the method should be left to the Government of India. If in the minds of some hon. Members opposite there is some doubt, surely I will ask them then to start the fibre ablaze, go round the country and make the country so uncomfortable that the Government of India yields to their pressure. That, however, is not the case.

There is one thing more I would like to say very much. There has been some criticism about the way in which the message of Bertrand Russel regarding atomic tests was received. What can the Prime Minister do? Can he send a shipload and risk all the people dying, and dying in a very painful manner? Can he advertise in the columns of the press asking for volunteers to go to Christmas Island? If the hon. Member Shri Gupta had

volunteered or somebody in the country had volunteered and it was refused . . .

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): One Member did volunteer.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: I do not know what happened to that.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): Here, one of our Members, Shri Elias, said he would go provided the Prime Minister agreed to give him assistance.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: I am glad that there was one Member at least who was willing to go, and I think we should exercise pressure to see that he is allowed to go. That is sort of protest that we must make and people should be allowed to make.

One thing more, because I have no time to answer various criticisms. We find before us America and Russia, huge masses of humanity under centralised control with concentration of power, atomic power, and in between there is Europe which is trying to integrate. There is the Western European Council, there was the Coal and Steel community, then NATO and now the European Economic Community. All these are measures to bypass nationalism and pool their sovereignty, so that Europe becomes one economic and political unit, and a third force. But in Asia we have got two Koreas, two Chinas, two Viet Nams; India facing China, conflict between India and Pakistan, rupture of diplomatic relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan, Israel quarrelling with Arabas, and Arabas divided among themselves. What a picture facing us, what a number of frontiers to guard. What for? It is not against atomic weapons, it is against ourselves that all these frontiers are there. I think there is need for another Bandung, a serious conference, which will create conditions so that we can develop in our own countries. I am sure if nothing else can be done, at least we can freeze the frontiers for ten or twenty years, so that these countries may build themselves up. I am conscious

of the difficulties in the way, I am conscious of the stresses and strains that are existing today, but other countries have negotiated under more difficult conditions. We have a Prime Minister whose prestige is so high that people in Europe and Asia listen to his words. I would respectfully request him to make an attempt and give us all a period of peace, so that we can develop.

We had been agitating to keep out of the Commonwealth, but now it seems that England wants to get out of the Commonwealth, though not formally, but in point of fact through joining this European Common Market. The Finance Minister said the other day that delicate negotiations were going on, and so we could not discuss it. All the capitals of Europe and America, Canada and Australia are discussing this problem, and Ministers are making statements, but here we are told that we must keep quite and watch. I do not know why. Our exports are stagnant. Probably those in charge are not the right type of people. They are people from Oxford and Cambridge, very good sort of people. They have got a lot of social ease which is necessary for foreign service, but scratch them and you will find a snob underneath. They are allergic to business. We must inject at least people from other spheres—not politicians, they will make it worse—people from the business world, bankers and economists, so that they can handle these problems. Export is our main way of paying back the money we have borrowed. We are building on borrowed money. The private sector is getting money from foreign markets. What is it? Ultimately it is borrowed money. And how are we going to pay it back except through exports? The European Common Market might give you some concession for a number of years, even guarantee some increase in our exports, but that would not do. We have to double and treble our exports if we want to pay, and the Finance Minister will not take us into

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

confidence. The only thing I can do is to sit down and pray.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Although our minds are rather full of anxious worries about the horrible things that are happening in East Pakistan, even then it is a little surprising that not many speakers today have referred to another danger which has been looming large for the last few weeks not far away from our frontiers. I refer to the events that are happening in Laos. The press has it in today's news that the United States Government has expressed itself ready to commit its forces in Laos or in that region. Already President Kennedy has ordered the seventh fleet to move in Thai waters, and it is steaming to the South China Sea. I feel, that India, as one of the co-chairmen of the International Control Commission in Laos, should play a positive part in this crisis in seeing that things do not deteriorate beyond repair, that peace is restored immediately.

There is another matter to which I want to refer, and that is the resumption of nuclear tests by practically all the big nuclear Powers one by one. Several of them have started experimenting in new nuclear explosions in the South Pacific region. As the UN Disarmament Conference is still meeting in Geneva, I would suggest to the Government that it would be worth while to instruct our representative there to propose that Asia or at least East Asia be made a non-nuclear zone. I do not know what the fate of that proposal would be, but still it would be worth while making such a proposal, at least considering the interests of the people of this region.

Then, I would come to problems that are agitating our minds nearer home, particularly about the things that are happening in East Pakistan. After three weeks of suppression of news of riots and communal disturbances against the minorities in East

Pakistan, only yesterday the Pakistan Central Government has admitted that riots and violent disturbances have been raging in 7 districts of East Pakistan and not only in the Rajshahi district as it has been asserting hitherto. Whatever may be the causes of these riots and whosoever may have provoked them, I want to impress one point upon this House and upon the Government that, situated as the minorities in East Pakistan are today, they have become a pawn in the game of power politics which the present military administration of Pakistan is engaging in.

I find in the report of the Ministry of External Affairs that the Prime Ministers' Agreement of 1950, which is known as the Nehru-Liaquat Agreement, guaranteed certain basic rights to the minority community in East Pakistan. And, 12 years have passed since we signed that agreement. But this report itself says:

"The condition of the minority community in Pakistan however continues, as in the last year, to be unsatisfactory. There were serious communal riots, in Khulna, Jessore and Gopalganj, where the minority community suffered losses in both life and property. Besides these serious communal riots, reports of offences against the person and property of members of the minority community continued to be received throughout the year."

That was in 1961. Now, we have these reports, as admitted by the Pakistan Government itself. I am not referring to the reports that we have from the Indian Press or such reports as are available to us from our friends and relations still living in East Pakistan, but the admission made in the Central Pakistan Government communique. And, I would humbly suggest to the Government whether it will not worth while, in the context of the failure of the Prime Ministers'

Agreement to afford any protection whatsoever to the minority community, to at least consider whether we should not re-examine the 1950 Agreement anew and try to come to some fresh understanding with Pakistan in the light of our experience of the past 12 years. And, if that is not considered possible, whether, on humanitarian grounds at least, it will not be possible for the Government to consider that the restrictions that they have placed on the migration of minorities from East Pakistan should be lifted.

You will see from Press reports that although the riots have been raging in East Pakistan for the past 3 weeks, not many people have yet crossed the border. Some have come on foot, trekking across the border without proper permits. But people who live in the interior beyond Dacca, in Chittagong and Mymensingh, or Rajsahi or Rangpur they cannot come without proper permits, and these are not easily available to them.

I understand that already our Mission in Dacca, our Deputy High Commission's office in Dacca, is being besieged by members of the minority community for the issue of migration certificates but that, according to the present policy of the Government, these certificates are being very scantily issued. They are not easily given.

This is not only the question of the minorities. Even with regard to the protection of the rights of our own citizens, I mean Indian nationals who carry on business in Pakistan, who have investments in Pakistan, the position is in a worse condition

In his reply to the debate on the President's Address, the Prime Minister himself referred to a case and expressed his unhappiness over it. That was the Chittaranjan Mills case. The Chittaranjan Mill which was one of the most successful textile mills in Pakistan was taken over illegally. And, I am sure that the officials of the External Affairs Ministry who dealt

with this matter were also convinced that this taking over was wholly illegal. But what relief have been able to give to the Indian shareholders of the mill and to the company? There is no doubt that the nationality of that company was Indian. But, even then, the rights of the shareholders, several hundreds of them, have been wiped out without payment of a single farthing of compensation. Our Government has nothing to do, nothing to offer except expressing its own unhappiness over it. This is not a solitary case. There have been other cases like this. And, I have tried to find out the clue to the policy that is being followed in regard to Pakistan by our Government. I think that some indication of that can be found in the speech that the Prime Minister made in his reply to the debate on the President's Address. He said, so far as Pakistan is concerned:—

“We have almost learnt to live with it and the problem in the hope that some time or other it will solve itself because we have not seen at any time any effort to solve it on the part of Pakistan.”

Here you find the clue to the Government's mind, that somehow or other, in course of good time, the problem will solve itself spontaneously. We have nothing to do. And, this sort of attitude has created a sort of inertia in the minds of that particular department in the Ministry of External Affairs which deals with problems like this.

I do not have the time at my disposal to go into individual instances. But I have found that our own people—I am not referring to the minorities living in Pakistan but to our own people who have any kind of transaction in Pakistan, economically or otherwise—have their rights denied and their rights obliterated by a single stroke of the pen; and our Government has nothing to offer except to shake their heads and say that we cannot do anything.

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

I have myself had experience of meeting officials in the External Affairs Ministry, and some of them of course, not a very senior official but a person of the rank of Deputy Secretary—advised me to wait till the new Pakistan Constitution is framed, and indicated that, perhaps, that would give us some relief. That is the sort of attitude in which these things are being dealt with by the officials concerned in the External Affairs Ministry.

Here I will give you another choice specimen of the sort of attitude that is guiding their activities. In this House, time and again we have raised the question about Mangla Dam in the occupied Kashmir and have protested against it. I find that one of our worthy officials in the Karachi High Commission, First Secretary (Commercial) has written an article on India's trade prospects in Pakistan in the Government journal, Industry and Trade. He has suggested to the traders here, particularly those who deal with engineering goods and export such goods that as the contract for the Mangla dam had been offered to an American firm from San Francisco and as these contractors would appoint sub-contractors who would like to purchase engineering articles from India for the construction of that dam, Indian exporters should get busy and contact those sub-contractors. He has, in effect, asked Indian exporters to supply the engineering goods in order to help the construction of Mangla dam. If this was written by a non-official or by somebody not connected with Government, I would have nothing much to say. But it is written by an official. That is why I was trying to find out the clue to the Government mind in our dealings with Pakistan. We get the clue from the words of the Prime Minister: we have almost learnt to live with the problem of Pakistan; we have nothing to do; we cannot do anything to assert our rights. If we cannot carry on normal transactions if our invest-

ments are confiscated, we have nothing to do; we can only live in the hope that sometime the problem will solve by itself. We have even now some trade relations with Pakistan; we pay Rs. 83 crores to Pakistan in connection with canal water treaty. We have normal export and import trade; we supply them such essential commodities as coal, sugar and other things. We have Pakistan incorporated companies operating here. All these transactions go on. But we do not place any restrictions on these transactions, particularly on the rights of Pakistaners here. If Pakistan slaps us we turn our other cheek so that Pakistan can give us another slap....

(Interruptions.) Shri Kamath says that we do not believe in reciprocity in these things. I also do not believe in a policy of retaliation but in the sorry world in which we live today we have to stand up and fight for our rights and the rights of our nationals. If we do not do it if our own Government will not protect us, then God help us.

Shrimati Renuka Day: You want war?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: I do not want war. But there are things short of war that can be done to protect the rights of one's own nationals. That we have not done. Not even in a single case except in regard to the small affair of Goa have we done things properly and there too we did things belatedly, at the wrong moment and in a wrong way.

I would include by referring to another matter. Many other hon. Members have referred to the unsatisfactory state of affairs in our external publicity division. We are dealing extremely shabbily with the officials of the external publicity division who are charged with this highly responsible task of putting across our case with regard to various international issues and national issues in foreign countries. They have not been given

a square deal. Two years ago the Prime Minister in his reply to the debates on the demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, on March 17, stated that the Government had resolved to bring the publicity men into the foreign service so that they might not be considered a caste apart. He went on to say that they were functioning better than they used to do. That was in 1960. But even in 1962, nothing much has been done in this regard. It seems the hard core of the Indian Foreign Service men have prevented it, putting obstacles in the way of integration of the external publicity division officials in the foreign service. Uptil now out of 69 persons of the Information Service of India only two or three have been taken into the Foreign Service. If this is the specimen of integration, this is how our officials in the External Affairs Ministry—I mean not the Ministers or policy makers but the top officials in the Secretariat—works out the policy enunciated in the House by no less than a person than the Prime Minister himself, then I would again say: God help us.

✓ **Shrimati Lakshmi Menon:** There are two or three points raised by hon. Members of the Opposition which I would like to deal with. One is with regard to external publicity. Most of the hon. Members criticised our external publicity and mentioned that it had failed to give adequate publicity to our policies outside and consequently some of our very important actions were misinterpreted or misjudged and we were abused on account of that. In this connection, I would like to point out that external publicity is not just propaganda. Many think of it as a kind of propaganda, like the one that is indulged in by Pakistan both inside Pakistan as well as outside and when they find that people pay perhaps more attention to the propaganda material put out by Pakistan they naturally draw the conclusion that our publicity is at fault. That is not so. As I pointed out our publicity is not propaganda

publicity. Ours is a democracy with a free Press. It is not necessary for us to tell the people what is or what is not being done. At the same time we feel that publicity has its own value and we concentrate on what I might call long term publicity, that is, to familiarise the entire world with our policies and programmes and our day-to-day work. Our country is an openbook for anybody to come and see what is happening here. From time to time we have answered questions in this House in which we have stated the number of pamphlets put out, the number of press attaches maintained in the various missions and the kind of publicity that is being done almost daily such as the publication of Indograms, Indian news, etc. They bring out pamphlets on important issues in which the world shows some kind of interest as on Goa, Indo-Pakistan question, Kashmir, our disputes with China. All these have been the subject matter of many pamphlets and books published and distributed by our Missions and by the external publicity department. Besides, there are broadcasts every day which tell them what is happening here and our Missions are kept fairly well-informed about these things. Our officers also give talks when they are invited to do so. We have contacts with the press. Various conferences are held. It is quite possible that our publicity may not be so glamorous or so wonderful as perhaps the publicity material or other means of publicity put out by other more experienced countries like the United Kingdom, USSR or USA. We have no idea of competing with those countries. Our resources are limited and when you judge the kind of publicity that we give, I am sure the House will take into consideration the limited resources with which we are manning our external publicity. ✓

15 hrs.

✓ Much has been said about the personnel in the Publicity Division. Before I come to the question raised

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon]

by one of the hon. Members of the Opposition and also many others regarding the Information Services of India, I would like to point out that we do not have specially trained publicity personnel in the regular IFS cadre. For a long time, our publicity was conducted by the Press Information Bureau or just press attaches. We found that it was not satisfactory, and a Cabinet decision was taken. It was decided that people who are eminent in the journalistic world or who know something about publicity can be employed on a contract basis, some on long-term contracts extending up to 55 years and others for shorter periods, according to their experience and according to the contribution that they can make in order to enrich and enhance our publicity abroad. It is true that they are not in the permanent cadre. They are not entitled to pension. But except that, they have got all the privileges and all the allowances and all the perquisites that other officers of the same grade get when they are posted abroad. It is also considered that since these people do not get pension something should be done by way of granting some gratuity. The matter is under consideration.

I feel that Members of the Opposition tend to exaggerate the faults of the Ministry which perhaps they indulge in in order to drive their points home, but otherwise I do not think the ISI is as badly placed as it was shown to be.

Regarding the confirmation, I am not quite sure. I have not got the figures, but I am sure that the number of people confirmed must be more than two which was mentioned. As far as the ISI is concerned, the whole policy is to give the needed training to the IFS persons so that we can have an integrated information service as far as external publicity is concerned.

One hon. Member made rather a derogatory remark about our IFS personnel. I am sure he did not know, and I am sorry he did not know the position. I might point out that IFS officers are not selected off-hand or on an *ad hoc* basis as is done in some other countries. They have to go through the competitive examinations like the IAS and other officers. Those who opt for the IFS are given special training, first in the Administrative School, and later on they are posted to the districts for six months, so that they might have some grounding as to the problems at the district level, and then they are posted abroad.

If the son of an Ambassador or a high officer does not know who Shankaracharya is, that is no reason why the whole service should be condemned as not knowing anything about the cultural background of our country. I am sure there may be many hon. Members here in Parliament who also may not know who Shankaracharya is, but that is no reason why we should say Parliament is full of ignorant people!

Shri Nambiar: An hon Member is the choice of the people; the other is the choice of the Government. There is a difference.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: But it was not a Government officer or a representative who showed ignorance of Shankaracharya; it was his son. We cannot allow the sins of the sons to be visited on the father. It is never done.

Then, something was said about the printing of the *Foreign Affairs Record*. It is true it is a monthly journal, and we are sorry that we have not been able to bring the issues after November, 1961 according to the scheduled publication time. The reason is this. It is a record of things which have to be published with the greatest care in editing, etc. We are hampered by the fact that we do not have a press of our own. We were depending on a private press. Negotiations were going

on for shifting the press from a private firm to a Government one. Considerable delay has taken place because of these reasons. I would like to assure the House that the December issue is already in the press and the January issue is also ready.

An Hon. Member: Not yet got it.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: He will get it in time. We must allow for the shift of the press. People who have had to deal with private presses know how difficult it is to get the printers do anything in time.

One hon. Member accused us of not recognising Israel. I told him that Israel was recognised. He wanted to know the exact date. It was in September, 1960. I think the hon. Member was confusing between recognition and exchange of diplomatic relations.

The same hon. Member said he was very ashamed that we have got female slaves in the Persian Gulf. I would like to clarify the position. Recently, we received complaints about Indian women being sold in slavery in the Persian Gulf area. We found out why. This system has grown up because traders going from Bombay marry—most of them are Muslims—and they go there and then sell their women. The only thing that the Government could do is to prohibit any women being taken from India to those areas, and that is being done. We have taken up the matter with the U.K. High Commission and the moment it came to our notice we took action. I am quite sure this system will be ended very soon.

Shri Warrior: That means no family could be taken out there? It means wives also should not be taken to those places.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I said about traders taking women. I did

not say one should not take one's wife. Perhaps if it is so dangerous, we should not.

Then, I think the hon. Member who spoke just before me and some others also complained about the callous indifference to the conditions of Indians outside India. It is very sad that hon. Members should think that the Government are not interested in their own nationals living elsewhere. We have discussed this question in this House, I think, times without number, namely, the question about the position of Indians in Ceylon and Burma. Our task has been made most difficult in respect of Ceylon because of the illicit emigration of people from South India and in respect of Burma because of the very unconstitutional methods pursued by Indians there, who try to violate the local laws in order to get some advantage like sending money home, etc. One hon. Member said he was really very unhappy because the relations could not go and visit their people in Burma. As it is, a person of Indian origin or any foreigners living in Burma can only send Rs. 30 home. For that, there are so many restrictions. Under these circumstances, to imagine that large numbers of relations should go to Burma in order to meet their relations is really fantastic, because I assure the hon. Member did not mean what he said when he tried to express his sympathy for the relations living in India and the poor man earning his living in Burma.

With regard to the other points about land policy, about Burmanisation and Ceylonisation of services, etc., these things have hit our people very hard. But as I pointed out to the House the other day, the Indians in Burma were given the option to opt for Burmese citizenship or come away. But they would neither opt for Burmese citizenship nor register themselves as Indian nationals. From time to time, the period of registration has been extended, but our people simply would not take advantage of it.

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon]

because they think it is much better to stay in Burma under whatever hardships are there than come to India. Therefore, it is not correct to say that our Government is callous.

One hon. Member mentioned about Col. Bhattacharya. The House knows as much as I do in this matter, viz., that Government did everything possible to help Col. Bhattacharya, and because of the different legal system under which Pakistan functions, it is not possible to do more. We are giving his salary to his wife and children and they are allowed to stay in the Government quarters where Col. Bhattacharya was staying. More than that, I do not know what the hon. Member expects the Governments to do.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: From the very same spot from which Col. Bhattacharya was kidnapped, another border personnel was kidnapped. Is that spot in dispute between the two countries or the border is not demarcated properly?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That particular spot is not in dispute. But the particular spot from which Col. Bhattacharya was dragged away is in dispute, because we maintain that Col. Bhattacharya was taken from our territory and they maintain that he had crossed the border to Pakistan. That is in dispute. As far as the demarcation of the area is concerned, the boundary is very clear.

Shri M. K. Kumaran (Chirayinkil): The other day the Prime Minister said in reply to a question that the Malayalees expelled from Ceylon were moneylenders. May I know whether the Minister of State also shares the same view with the Prime Minister?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It was just an error: The Prime Minister meant to say that they were people who have gone there on business or profession and therefore they are not really in need of rehabilitation as the

Tamils coming from Ceylon, I do not think the Prime Minister really meant that they were moneylenders.

These are some of the points I wanted to mention. Other points like disarmament, etc. will be dealt with by the Prime Minister.

श्री विशनचन्द्र सेठ (एटा) : आदरणीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इस सदन में फौरन एफेयर्स पर जो डिबेट चल रहा है उसको मैं ने बड़े ध्यान से सुना है। मैं गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की पालिसी के सम्बन्ध में बड़े स्पष्ट शब्दों में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जितने भी हमारे फौरन के झगड़े हैं उन सब का मूल कारण हमारी कमजोर नीति है। अगर आज हमारे देश के माननीय नेता श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने या हमारे देश की सरकार ने इस तरह की पालिसी ऐडाप्ट की होती कि हम जैसे को तैसा जवाब देंगे तो कोई भी झगड़ा हमारे देश के समक्ष नहीं होता।

मैं बराबर देख रहा हूँ कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे देश को अपमानित करने की न मालूम दुनिया भर की इतनी चीजें की हैं जिनका कि कोई व्योरा जोड़ा नहीं जा सकता। आदरणीय श्री जवाहरलाल ने एक मर्तवा इसी सदन में बतलाया था कि जब से पाकिस्तान बना है लगभग ३००० छोटे बड़े हमले हिन्दुस्तान पर हुए हैं। प्रोटेस्ट लैटर्स भेजने से अगर हमारे सारे काम हल हो गये होते तो अब तक अनेकों जगहों पर जो हम ने प्रोटेस्ट ट्रेटर्स भेजे हैं, वह सब मामले हल हो जाने चाहिए थे। परन्तु हम ने देखा कि आज तक कोई भी उनका नतीजा नहीं निकला।

अभी किसी एक सज्जन ने यहां पर कहा कि क्या आप पाकिस्तान के साथ वार चाहते हैं? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वार कोई ऐसी चीज तो है नहीं जो कि दुनिया में अनोखी होगी? अगर आज पाकिस्तान इस तरह के मामलात हमारे सामने कर रहा है जिन से

हमारे देश के सम्मान को धक्का पहुंच रहा है तो कोई वजह इस बात की नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ उस तरह का व्यवहार क्यों न किया जाये जिस से उस को मालूम हो जाये कि हिन्दुस्तान अपनी बेइज्जती बर्दाश्त नहीं करेगा और हिन्दुस्तान भी उचित बदला लेने के लिए समर्थ है ।

मैं एक प्रश्न रखना चाहता हूँ जैसा कि अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने आप के सामने रखा है और वह यह कि अगर आप कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं, लड़ाई नहीं लड़ना चाहते, कोई बात नहीं है लेकिन क्या इतना भी आप नहीं कर सकते कि पाकिस्तान जिससे कि बराबर हमारी दुश्मनी बढ़ती जा रही है उसको आप कोयला और शक्कर आदि देना बंद कर दें ? एक तरफ तो पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ बराबर दुश्मनी का बर्ताव करता जा रहा है और दूसरी तरफ हम उनको कोयला और शक्कर आदि सप्लाई करके खुश करने की चेष्टा कर रहे हैं । सरकार को पाकिस्तान के प्रति अपनी इस एसी मेंट पालिसी को बन्द करने में क्या ऐतराज है. ?

आज से थोड़े हो दिन पहले हमारे देश की सैनिक टुकड़ियां यू० एन० ओ० के आदेश पर विदेशों को भेजी गयी हैं जहां कि वह यू० एन० ओ० की कमांड में अपने कर्तव्य का पालन कर रही हैं । इस के फलस्वरूप हमारे देश में अनेक प्रकार के नवीन कर बजट में लगाये गये हैं । परन्तु मुझे यह दैख कर आश्चर्य होता है कि एक ओर तो हम दूसरे कंट्रीज में जाकर अपनी शक्ति और धन खर्च करें और दूसरी ओर हम अपने देश में कर्नल भट्टाचार्य तक को बचाने में समर्थ नहीं ।

मैं थोड़े दिन पहले असम गया था । मैंने वहां पहुंच कर जब दौरा किया तो मैं यह देख कर हैरान हो गया कि हमारी जो प्रोटेक्शन करने की चौकियां थीं उन के लिए यह आर्डर्स थे कि जब पाकिस्तान की तरफ से फायरिंग हो तो उस के बाद मोटर साइकिल पर आदमी 538(Ai) LSD—7.

दौड़ाया जाये जोकि पूरा ब्योरा बता कर आर्डर्स ले । चूकि वहां पर कोई वायरलेस या टेलीफोन आदि की व्यवस्था नहीं थी इसलिए यह किया गया था कि फायरिंग होने के बाद आदमी मोटर साइकिल पर दौड़ाया जाये और ब्योरा बतला कर जरूरी अहकाम अफसरान से लिये जायें । आखिर यह क्या तमाशा है ? मैं तो सुन कर हैरान रह गया । जरूरत तो इस बात की थी जिस समय दुश्मन की तरफ से हमला हो रहा हो तो मौके पर तैनात मिलेटरी टुकड़ी को पूरी इस बात की पावर होनी चाहिए कि वह दुश्मन की तरफ से हमला होने पर जवाबी कार्यवाही कर सकें और तुरन्त उनको जवाब दे दिया जाये । यह क्या बात हुई कि व्यंज ४ घंटे लगाये जायें और तब तक वह अपना काम करके चले भी जायें ? आज बराबर इस तरह के किस्से होते चले जा रहे हैं, पाकिस्तान आय दिन कुछ न कुछ इस तरह की दुश्मनी भरी हरकतें करता रहता है और हमारी तरफ से अलावा विरोध पत्र भजने के और कोई बदले में जवाबी कार्यवाही नहीं की जाती है ।

मैं आप को उस समय की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय पाकिस्तान बना था । उस अवसर पर हमारे आदरणीय, पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने सारे देशवासियों के नाम एक सन्देश भेजा था और जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि जो भी हिन्दू पाकिस्तान में रह रहे हैं वे वहीं बने रहें हम उनकी जिदगी और इज्जत को पूरी जिम्मेदारी लेते हैं । पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू देश के एक महान् नेता हैं उनके मुंह से निकले हुए शब्दों के आधार पर पाकिस्तान में लगभग ८० लाख हिन्दू आज तक रह रहे हैं परन्तु कौन नहीं जानता कि वह किस तरह का जीवन वहां पर व्यतीत कर रहे हैं । वह जिन कठिनाइयों में वहां अपनी जिन्दगी बसर कर रहे हैं और उन पर जो जो अत्याचार होते रहते हैं वह रोष अखबारों में छपते भी नहीं हैं । माइनारिटी

[श्री विशनचन्द्र सेठ]

कम्युनिटी, वह एक नया तमाशा बन गया है। सोषो सादी बात नहीं छापी जाती कि मुसलमान ने मारा या हिन्दू ने मारा। थोड़ी देर तक तो वह समझ में नहीं आता कि किस ने किस को मारा। लेकिन हकीकत यह है कि रोज हमारे हिन्दू भाइयों का वहां पर ह्युमिलिएशन हो रहा है। उधर तो यह हालत है और इधर हमारे देश में मुसलमान जितनी अच्छी तरह रखे जा रहे हैं इस पर मैं ज्यादा बहस नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन जहां हिन्दुस्तान में मुसलमानों के साथ बहुत अच्छा व्यवहार हो रहा है वहां पाकिस्तान में हमारे हिन्दू भाई जयठवरो की तरह अपना जीवन व्यतीत कर रहे हैं।

मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय पाकिस्तान के बौर्डर पर मेरी स्पीच हुई थी, असम में जब मैं बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ तो वहां के हिन्दुओं ने आकर मुझ से कहा कि सेठ जी आप मुसलमानों के खिलाफ कुछ मत बोलियेगा। मैं पाकिस्तान में नहीं बोल रहा था हिन्दुस्तान की सरजमौन पर बोल रहा था। लेकिन मुझ से कहा गया कि मैं पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ न बोलूँ। मैं ने जब उठ से धीरे से कहा कि आप ऐसा क्यों कह रहे हैं तो उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि हमारी जिदगो यहां खतरे में है। हमारी फौजें कुछ करेंगी नहीं और अगर पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ आपने यहां पर बोला तो हम लोगों को वह आकर भून देंगे। आज हमारे देश के हिन्दू जोकि बौर्डर पर रह रहे हैं वह अपने को ऐसा असहाय अनुभव कर रहे हैं। उनको आशंका है कि हमारी सरकार उनकी किसी तरीके से भी रक्षा करने में समर्थ नहीं है। इतनी कमजोर बातें जिस देश में चल रही हों, जहां प्रोटेस्ट लैटर्स छपवा कर रख लिये गये हों जहां कोई घटना घटो बस उस के लिए एक प्रोटेस्ट लैटर रवाना कर दिया और चुप हो कर बैठ गये, वहां दुनिया का कौन सा काम होने वाला है? आज अगर हमारी सरकार जैसे को

तैसा जवाब देती तो मैं आप को विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान की यह जुरंत ही नहीं होती कि वह इस तरह की बेजा हरकतें करता रहता।

जिस समय पाकिस्तान बना था मुझे एक बहुत बड़ा मुजरिम समझ कर पाकिस्तान बनने से पहले गिरफ्तार कर लिया गया था। जब मैं जेल से निकला तो मेरी पहली स्पीच लखनऊ में हुई थी। मैं ने तब यह कहा था कि आज पाकिस्तान बनने की गलती के बाद भी पाकिस्तान बिना किसी हमारी कोशिश के ही खत्म हो सकता है बशर्तकि हमारी सरकार उस पर कुछ विचार करे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो बातें मैं ने उस वक्त कही थीं, उन का यहां पर उल्लेख कर दूँ। मैं ने कहा था कि कोई वजह नहीं कि हमारे देश में जो कोयला है, हम उसे पाकिस्तान की मिलें और उद्योग चलाने के लिए दें। कोई वजह नहीं कि हम उस को पानी और बिजली दें। मि० जिन्ना ने डिमांड की थी कि पाकिस्तान बनाने के साथ साथ दोनों देशों में आबादी की अदलाबदली भी की जाये। जब हम ने उन की चौदह आने बात मान ली, तो बाकी की दो आने बात मान कर आबादी एक्सचेंज की चेष्टा की जाती, ताकि यह रोज का झगड़ा खत्म हो जाता, परन्तु ऐसा नहीं किया गया। मैं उन कुछ मुसलमानों के बारे में नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ, जो कि वाकई राष्ट्रीय विचारों के हैं, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में रहने वाले अधिकतर मुसलमानों की मनोवृत्ति को देख कर यह बात हमारे सामने स्पष्ट हो जाती है कि इस देश में कई किस्म की गड़बड़ियां पैदा करने का उत्तरदायित्व किस पर है। लेकिन हमारी निगाहों के सामने सँकुलर भावना एक ऐसा डरावना चित्र बन गया है कि उस के कारण कोई भी व्यक्ति ईमानदारी की बात भी नहीं कहना चाहता, जिस को सब महसूस करते हैं।

जहां तक फ़ारेन कंट्रीज में हमारी एम्बसीज का प्रश्न है, मैं देखता हूँ कि एक और

तो हमारे बजट के घाटे का पूरा करने का सवाल पैदा होता है और दूसरी ओर ऐसे ऐसे कंजूस में हमारी एम्ब्रेंसों बनो हुई हैं, जिन में कोई काम नहीं है। अगर छोटे छोटे दो चार मुल्कों को मिला कर एक एम्ब्रेंसी बना दी जाये, तो हमारा काफी खर्च घट जाये।

मैं देखता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में बड़ी बड़ी पोस्ट्स नित्य क्रोएंट की जाती हैं, लेकिन अगर कहीं पर खर्च कम किया जाता है, तो वह लोअर स्तर पर। छोटे छोटे कर्मचारियों को हटाने पर जोर दिया जाता है, लेकिन जहाँ अनावश्यक रूप से बड़े बड़े खर्च हो रहे हैं, उस को तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है।

चन्द दिन पहले जब यू० पी० की मिनिस्ट्री में ४२, ४४ मंत्री रखे गये तो आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री ने उस में बहुत सारे आदमी लिये जाने पर टिप्पणी की थी, लेकिन मैं समझ नहीं सका हूँ—(मैं किसी माननीय मंत्री या उप-मंत्री को अपमान नहीं करना चाहता)—कि सेंट्रल कैबिनेट में कितने मंत्री रखे जायेंगे और कितनी पोस्ट्स क्रोएंट की जायगी। मैं अचछो तरह से याद है कि पार्टीशन से पहले जब हिन्दुओं और मुसलमानों को रीरिटी के आधार पर गवर्नमेंट बनाई गई थी, तो उस में केवल दस मिनिस्टर थे और उन दस मिनिस्टरों में सारे देश का काम चलता था। आज इतनी बड़ी मिनिस्ट्री बनाने का क्या औचित्य है ?

एक माननाय सदस्य : फ़ारेन एफ़ेयर्ज़ से इस का क्या सम्बन्ध है ?

श्री बिशतचंद्र सेठ : मैं यह गुजारिश करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे खर्च इस तरीके से बराबर बढ़ाये जा रहे हैं। (Interruptions)

उपस्थित महोदय : माननीय सदस्य जो कुछ कह रहे हैं, फ़ारेन एफ़ेयर्ज़ से उसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

श्री बिशतचंद्र सेठ : बिल्कुल है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ही तो ये सब मिनिस्टर बनाते हैं और यह उन्हीं का तो डिपार्टमेंट है। (Interruptions)

उपस्थित महोदय : माननीय सदस्य फ़ारेन एफ़ेयर्ज़ के बारे में कहें।

श्री बिशतचंद्र सेठ : बहुत अच्छा।

श्री दाजी (इन्दौर) : कई मेम्बरों का इस बारे में उम्मीद बंधी हुई है, लेकिन माननीय सदस्य अभी से रोक लगा रहे हैं।

श्री बिशतचंद्र सेठ : अब तक फ़ारेन सर्विस के लिए जो कैंडीडेट्स छूटे जाते थे, वे सारी मिनिस्ट्रीज़ को मिला कर छूटे जाते थे, परन्तु अब एक नई चीज़ यह की गई है कि फ़ारेन सर्विस के लिए फ़ारेन डिपार्टमेंट से ही आदमी लिए जाते हैं। दूसरे डिपार्टमेंट्स के कर्मचारियों के सामने एक बड़ा सेंट्रल हो गया है कि अब उन के लिए फ़ारेन सर्विस में जाने का कोई चांस नहीं है। यह बड़ी भारी इकावट बीच में डाल दी गई है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : यह ठीक है। दूसरे डिपार्टमेंट्स को फ़ारेन सर्विस में क्या काम है ?

श्री बिशतचंद्र सेठ : दूसरों को भी चांस देना चाहिए।

जहाँ तक चाइना के प्रश्न का सम्बन्ध है, मैं आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारे देश की नीति ठीक प्रकार से चलाई जाती, तो न तो पाकिस्तान का झगड़ा होता और न चाइना का। पहले पाकिस्तान ने हमारी कमजोरी का फ़ायदा उठाया और उस के बाद उसी रेफ़रेंस में, उसी मनोभावना के आधार पर, आज चाइना का मामला हमारे सामने है। अगर आज यह कहा जाय कि हम चाइना से लड़ नहीं सकते, तो यह ग़लत है। अभी चार दिन पहले हमारे आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री ने घोषणा की लिया है। वहाँ जो कुछ हुआ है, वह हमारे सामने है।

[श्री विशनचन्द्र सेठ]

हम बड़े आराम के साथ चाइना को षक्का दे सकते थे, लेकिन आज तक हम यही डेसाइड नहीं कर पाये कि हमारी पालिसी क्या है। रोज़ चाइना नये नक्शे बांटता है, जिन में हिन्दुस्तान के एरिया को अपना दिखाता है, लेकिन आज तक हम अपना एरिया तक डिसाइड नहीं कर सके हैं। इस समस्या के पैदा होने का कारण यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने जैसे को तैसा का बर्ताव नहीं किया है। उस ने इस तरह का बर्ताव किया है कि हम दूसरे देशों के सामने अपने को कमज़ोर महसूस करने लग हैं।

• इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, many hon. Members from all sides of the House have expressed their general satisfaction and approval of the basis of India's foreign policy, except the leader of the Jan Sangh group. I listened to his speech very attentively and from what I could follow from his speech—I am sorry he is not here right now; I think, he believes in the 'hit and run' principle. As leader of the Jan Sangh group, I believe, he was voicing the official views of the Jan Sangh party regarding India's foreign policy. I could not understand when he said that India's foreign policy should be based on 'danda' policy. Now, as far as my understanding goes, I think at the back of his mind he had the 'danda' policy of the R.S.S. I would like to convey this to the leader of the Jan Sangh group that India, more especially in her foreign policy, never wanted, never wants and will never base her policy on the 'danda' policy of the R.S.S. He also pleaded that the foreign policy should also be based on kidnapping. If a person is kidnapped by Pakistan from the Indian border, he says that the whole of India's foreign policy has failed because India has not kidnapped a citizen of Pakistan from their border.

An Hon. Member: He never said that.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: He did; the records are there. He also said that principle of kidnapping should be adopted.

Sir, he painted the whole picture so gloomy that I also started feeling for a minute whether there was something basically wrong with India's foreign policy. I come from a part of India which is very important. Only due to India's policy of neutrality and only due to India's prestige raised in the world due to her foreign policy, today we have Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of India.

Sir, recently, on the initiative of Pakistan the question of Kashmir came before the Security Council. Here, Sir, I would like to pay my tributes to the team of our permanent representatives at the United Nations and, more especially, to the leader of that team, our Defence Minister, who led the Indian team in the Security Council while the Kashmir question was being debated.

As in the past, Pakistan has again cried for the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I am really pained that time and again when this question comes up before the Security Council, the Big Powers, more especially United States of America and the United Kingdom somehow, either in low voices or in loud voices, indirectly or directly, try to support this cry of Pakistan. As I come from that part of the country, I say that the people of India, and more especially the people of Jammu and Kashmir, want the Security Council and the United Nations Organisation to restore and give the right of self-determination to the people of Pakistan-held Kashmir.

I would like to mention that right from the very beginning of 1947, in 1952, 1957 and 1962 there had been three general elections in Jammu and

Kashmir State. The political party there, the All Jammu National Conference, led by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, had always the main point in the election camps in that, as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned, it has always been and shall always be an integral part of India. In other wards, the people of Jammu and Kashmir have always expressed their opinion or view in favour of this. I do not know what other evidence is required, either for Pakistan, or for the United States of America, or for the United Kingdom, or even the Security Council to know what the people of Jammu and Kashmir desire.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, I only want to say that no matter how many times Sir Zafrulla Khan may try in the Security Council to raise a discussion on the Kashmir issue, the people of India, especially the people of Jammu and Kashmir State, are not going to feel that any kind of insecurity is going to be created in that State. Because we in India, under the leadership of our great Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, know it definitely well that no power on this earth can separate even an inch of the territory of Jammu and Kashmir State from the rest of India.

15.33 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now a very funny situation has developed in this region, and that is the friendship between China and Pakistan. I fail to understand how the United States of America can reconcile herself to the recent friendship between China and Pakistan. On the one hand, the United States is always opposed to the Chinese entry into the United Nations, because basically it is opposed to the communist doctrines. Since India has always refused to fall into the military alliances sponsored by the United States of America and Pakistan did surrender to the United States, as far as joining the military alliances were concerned, all of a sudden the United States has developed a sort of indirect

toleration for Communist China, when it allowed Pakistan to flirt with China and try to blackmail India.

I only appeal to the United States that they should realise that the border conflict or dispute between India and China is not a small matter, as far as the Indian nation is concerned. So, it would be befitting a democratic country like the United States to tell Pakistan in very plain words that it cannot have two things at the same time—military aid from USA and political flirtation with Red China.

Here I would like to point out that the representative of Pakistan at the Security Council has again started making attempts for a further resumption of the debate on the Kashmir question. So, I would submit for the consideration of the hon. Prime Minister that, as very rightly a stern attitude has been taken by the Government in the case of China, on this question also we should take a very stern attitude. If at all the debate is resumed and when we go before the Security Council, we should plainly tell the United Nations that India is no longer prepared to participate in these academic debates and give a chance to Pakistan to create a sort of hysteria or psychological insecurity in the minds of the people. The Security Council or the United Nations must be told very frankly that unless and until the right of self-determination is given to the people of Azad Kashmir, the people of 'occupied Kashmir', the area which is illegally occupied by Pakistan, India will not be prepared to participate in any further debates in the United Nations or the Security Council.

We have had enough of debates in the Security Council on this question for the last 14 to 15 years. As in the past, this time also our Defence Minister raised the basic question involved in the Kashmir issue, and the big powers like the USA and UK, as they have been doing in the past, again followed the policy of evasion,

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

failing to commit themselves either to Kashmir's accession completely with India or to oppose it.

Here I would like to congratulate the USSR and convey the congratulations of the people of Jammu and Kashmir in particular, and the people of India in general, to the Soviet Union. As in the past, this time also the USSR has acted very wisely and stuck to the policy declared by her earlier that, as far as Kashmir is concerned, it is for ever an integral part of India.

In the end, I would like to say that the foreign policy adopted by the Government of India has raised India's prestige in the international world.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत के स्वाधीनता संग्राम में भाग लेने वाले उच्च कोटि के नेताओं में, जिन्हें आजाद हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का संचालन करने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ, उनमें एक स्वर्गीय सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल और दूसरे प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू आते हैं। स्वर्गीय सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल को समस्याओं को हल करने का जहाँ श्रेय मिला वहाँ साथ साथ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को समस्याओं को खड़ा करने और उस-झाने का भी श्रेय मिला।

एक बात बड़ी विचित्र है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के व्यक्तित्व में दोनों एक साथ मिल गए हैं। समस्याओं की असफलता और उनका भाग्य यह दोनों एक साथ जुड़ गए हैं।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : असफलता और भाग्य यह जब आप कहते हैं तो यह शास्त्र विरोधी बात कहते हैं।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : यही तो विचित्र बात है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान की जो विदेश नीति रही है और पिछले चौदह पन्द्रह वर्षों का जो उसका इतिहास रहा है, उसको देखते हुए यह कहना पड़ेगा कि वह नीति असफल रही है। उसका कारण यह है कि हमारी विदेश नीति भावुक, व्यक्तिवादी और सिद्धान्त विहीन रही है। भावुक जब मैं कहता हूँ, तो श्रीमन्, उसके लिए मैं दो मिसालें रखना चाहता हूँ। काश्मीर के प्रश्न को ले लें। उसमें भावुकता से काम लिया गया और उसकी सारी जिम्मेवारी शेख अब्दुल्ला और अब फिर से उसी तरह से सारी जिम्मेवारी बल्खी जी पर है। काश्मीर के साथ एक विशेष तरह का बरताव किया जा रहा है। भारतवर्ष के दूसरे राज्यों की तरह से हम उसको अपने देश के साथ एकरूपता में नहीं ढाल सके हैं, उसको अलग स्टेटस दिए हुए हैं। काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में जो साधारण बुद्धिमत्ता और दूर-अन्देशी की आवश्यकता थी, उसको भी हम भावुकता में भूल गए।

इसी तरह से चीन के प्रश्न को ले लें। जब हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के बीच संधि हुई, पंचशील का नारा लगा और उस पर हस्ताक्षर हो गए और हिन्दी-चीनी भाई भाई का नारा लगा तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री इस हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई के नारे तथा पंचशील की सन्धि से इतने आत्मविभोर हो उठे कि साधारण सी आत्म-रक्षा की बात भी उनको याद न रही, उसे भी वह भूल गए। और उसका कुपरिणाम हम ने देखा कि आज हम चीन के साथ इस कदर उलझे हुए हैं कि हमारे लिये यह एक सिर दर्द बन गया है।

जहाँ तक व्यक्तिवाद का सवाल है, गोआ, काश्मीर, पांडिचेरी इत्यादि जो हमारे राष्ट्र के अलग अलग अंग हो सकते हैं, उनको हम विदेश नीति के अन्दर नहीं ला सकते, विदेश मन्त्रालय के अन्तर्गत नहीं ला सकते हैं, लेकिन उनको प्रधान मंत्री जी एक अलग

अलग अस्तित्व दिये हुए हैं और यह उन के व्यक्तिवाद का ही परिचायक है।

जब मैं सिद्धान्त विहीनता की बात करता हूँ तो उस सिलसिले में मैं यह निवेदन करूँगा कि भारत की वैदेशिक नीति अब तक यह रही कि हम कभी रूस के चक्कर में और कभी अमरीका के चक्कर में इधर से उधर नाचते रहे। कोई सिद्धान्त नहीं अपनाया और एक तरह की दलाल वाली नीति हम चलाते रहे, जैसे कि घाना, अल्जीरिया इत्यादि के प्रश्न।

श्री रघनाथ सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह "दलाल वाली नीति" शब्द पालियामेंटरी नहीं है। यह शब्द अच्छे नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मेरी नोटिस में ले आये हैं तो मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि यह शब्द बहुत अच्छे तो नहीं हैं, लेकिन इतने बुरे भी नहीं हैं कि मैं उनको निकाल सकूँ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : शायद माननीय सदस्य अंग्रेजी शब्दों की ज्यादा कद्र करने वाले हैं। अगर "ब्रोकर" कह दिया जाता तो उन्हें आपत्ति नहीं होती।

जो अल्जीरिया का प्रश्न था या कांगो का प्रश्न था, स में भी इस देश ने यह कोशिश की कि कोई समझौता इत्यादि करावे और बिचवई ही करें। उनकी आजादी और उनके ऊपर पूंजीवाद का और साम्राज्यवाद का कोड़ा चल रहा था उस को हटाने के लिये ही कोई कदम नहीं उठाया। अल्जीरिया के प्रश्न में तो यहाँ तक हुआ कि जब ३४ देशों ने उसको मान्यता दे दी तब भी भारत सरकार ने आज तक उसे मान्यता प्रदान नहीं की, जबकि हम को सबसे पहले ऐसा करना चाहिये था, क्योंकि भारतवर्ष ने गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ और पूंजीवाद के खिलाफ आवाज उठाई और उसके परिणामस्वरूप हिन्दुस्तान स्वतन्त्र हुआ। भारत को तो यह चाहिये था कि

संसार में जहाँ भी साम्राज्यवाद, पूंजीवाद और गरीबी के खिलाफ युद्ध हो वह उस देश का निश्चित रूप से पक्ष लेता। भारत के प्रधान मंत्री शायद पक्ष लेने से घबराते हैं कि कहीं हमारी निष्पक्षता में कलंक न लग जाये। मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि जहाँ पर भी गरीबी और आजादी का सवाल हो, उस सवाल में प्रधान मंत्री को और भारत को एक आवाज मिला कर उस देश की आजादी का समर्थक हो जाना चाहिये, और यहाँ मैं कह सकता हूँ कि अगर हम उन देशों में किसी का भी पक्ष ले लेते तो इसमें कोई बुरी बात न होती, जहाँ तक न्याय की बात है। लेकिन शायद हम घबराते हैं कि कहीं इस तरह से हमारी नई आई हुई आजादी खो न जाये। इस में मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि जो देश किसी ऊँचे आदर्श के लिये अपनी स्वतन्त्रता को भी जोखिम में डाल सकता है वही देश अपनी आजादी की रक्षा कर सकता है। मिसाल के तौर पर मिस्र के कर्नल नासिर ने स्वेज जैसे प्रश्न को हल किया। स्वेज कैनल का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया। हालांकि उन्होंने एक जबर्दस्त खतरा मोल लिया, लेकिन हमने देखा कि वह आज दुनिया में अपना सिर ऊंचा उठाये हुए हैं। स्वेज कैनल में उन ही का और उनके देश का कब्जा है और उन के देश की आजादी भी खतरे में नहीं पड़ी। लेकिन ऐसा करते शायद हम घबराते रहते हैं।

इसी तरह से भारत पर एक नई नीति के निर्माण की जो जिम्मेदारी आई थी उस को भी भारत सरकार ने नहीं उठाया। वह नीति क्या थी? रूस और अमरीका दोनों एक गोरी दुनिया के प्रतीक हैं। एक तरफ रंगीन दुनिया है और दूसरी ओर गोरी। रंगीन दुनिया में लोग पूंजीवाद, साम्राज्यवाद और गरीबी के शिकार हैं, भूखे मरते हैं और दूसरी तरफ गोरी दुनिया में लोग आराम से रहते हैं और इस धरती पर हर मुमकिन आराम की चीजों का उपभोग करते हैं और अब तो उद्‌जन बम आदि के निर्माण और

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

अन्तरिक्ष यात्रा के प्रयत्नों में लगे हैं। रंगीन दुनिया की गरीबी और उनकी हालत के बारे में उनको चिन्ता नहीं है। भारत सरकार को चाहिये कि तटस्थ देशों के लोगों को इकट्ठा करके एक शक्ति का निर्माण करे, और उनका उद्देश्य यह हो कि किस तरह से रंगीन देशों की गरीबी दूर की जाय। उन को आजाद कराने का प्रयत्न किया जाय। इस तरह से छूट पुट और आधे मन से कार्य करने से काम नहीं चलेगा, जैसे कि बेलफ्रेड में एक सम्मेलन हुआ। चूंकि उद्देश्य में कमी थी इस लिये वांछित फल नहीं मिल सका।

इसी तरह से हम अगर अपने पड़ोसी देशों से सम्बन्ध की तरफ नजर डालें तो हम देखेंगे कि वह अच्छे नहीं हैं और बिगड़ते ही जा रहे हैं। नेपाल से हमारे सम्बन्ध बहुत अच्छे थे। नेपाल से हमारा व्यापारिक, सांस्कृतिक और राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध था लेकिन हमने देखा कि इन १४, १५ सालों में वह सम्बन्ध और बिगड़ता गया, अच्छा नहीं हुआ, और आज नेपाल और हिन्दुस्तान के सम्बन्ध उतने अच्छे नहीं रह गये हैं जितने नेपाल और चीन के हैं। अभी हाल ही में नेपाल के महाराज हिन्दुस्तान आये थे और प्रधान मन्त्री जी से उन की बातचीत चली थी। लेकिन जो भी उन्होंने भाषण दिये उससे हमें यह अन्दाजा लगता है कि कोई ताल्लूकात हमारे अच्छे नहीं हैं। उन्होंने बराबर आजादी, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ, पंचशील आदि चीजों का नारा दिया और हिन्दुस्तान के जो पहले के सांस्कृतिक और धार्मिक सम्बन्ध थे, साथ ही साथ जो व्यापारिक सम्बन्ध थे, इन सब चीजों पर उन्होंने विशेष जोर नहीं दिया।

इसी तरह से पाकिस्तान चीन का सम्बन्ध है। नेपाल और चीन का सम्बन्ध है, वह ऐसी कठिनाइयां हैं जो कि हमारी स्थिति को और ज्यादा बिगाड़ती हैं। इस तरफ विशेष ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है।

चीन से सम्बन्धों की हालत और बिगड़ी। अगस्त और सितम्बर महीने में हिन्दुस्तान की भूमि लद्दाख में चीन की और चौकियां बन गईं। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा प्रधान मन्त्री महोदय से कि जब हमेशा यह सवाल उठता है कि आखिर हम क्या करें, क्या लड़ाई छेड़ दें तो आखिर हमारी फौज वहां क्यों रहती है? हमारी चौकियां वहां क्यों हैं? हमारी पुलिस वहां क्यों रहती है? जब हमारी रक्षा का प्रश्न है तो मैं इतना अवश्य कहना चाहूंगा कि वहां के लोगों को हमें अस्त्रधार देना चाहिये। इस डर से कि कहीं लड़ाई न छिड़ जाये या कोई बड़ा खतरा न पैदा हो जाय, हम उसे बर्दाश्त करते रहें और एक विदेशी आक्रमणकारी हमारे अन्दर घुसता चला आये और चौकियां बना ले, तथा हम उस को बर्दाश्त करते रहें, इस डर से कि कहीं जंग न छिड़ जाये? मैं समझता हूं कि इससे हमारी इज्जत और आजादी को खतरा पैदा होगा और हम इस देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकेंगे।

सिक्किम और भूटान दो हमारे और पड़ोसी हैं जिनके साथ हमारी विशेष सन्धियां हैं। लेकिन वह बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं सामरिक दृष्टिकोण से। उनके हथियार आधुनिक नहीं हैं। चाहे आम उनकी आर्थिक स्थिति को देख लें या जो उनकी सरहदें चीन और नेपाल से मिलती हैं उन्हें दृष्टिकोण में रखें, हमारे लोग बहुत चिन्तित हैं कि हमारी सीमाओं को और हमारे देश को उस की और से बहुत खतरा है। उस खतरे का एक और कारण हो जाता है कि आज सिक्किम और भूटान में एक प्रतिनिधि सरकार नहीं है, वहां राजाओं के हाथ में सारी शक्ति है। प्रधान मन्त्री से पहले भी कहा गया और आज कहूंगा कि ऐसी कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि वहां पर प्रतिनिधि सरकार बने और भूटान और सिक्किम की जनता अपने पैरों पर खड़ी हो

सके ताकि वक्त जरूरत चीन के और दूसरे
आक्रमणों का वे लोग मुकाबला कर सकें
और अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो सकें ।

श्री श० ना० चतुर्वेदी (फिरोजाबाद) :
नेपाल में जनतन्त्र का हम न समर्थन किया तो
आप न आलोचना की कि उससे सम्बन्ध
बिगाड़ लिये ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : निःशस्त्रीकरण
का प्रश्न आज संसार के सामने है । एक तरफ
जितनी तेजी से आवाज उठाई जाती है कि
हथियार चलाना बन्द हो, उन का निर्माण
बन्द किया जाये उतनी तेजी से रूस और
अमरीका उद्जन बमों के निर्माण की होड़
में लगे हुए हैं । हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार भी
चाहती है कि उन का निर्माण बन्द हो जाये
लेकिन मैं आज आप के द्वारा प्रधान मंत्री जी
से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह अब इस के बजाय
कोई दूसरा रास्ता निकालें जिस से उन हथि-
यारों का निर्माण रुके । मेरा तो यह निश्चित
मत है कि हथियार बुरे हैं और बुरे रहेंगे,
लेकिन जब से उद्जन बम बन गये हैं तब से
उन हथियारों का इस्तेमाल बेकार हो गया है
और उद्जन बम का भी प्रयोग नहीं होगा
अगर युद्ध हुआ । इसी लिये कि उद्जन बमों
से विजय प्राप्त नहीं हो सकती । विनाश
जरूर हो सकता है और यह बहुत बड़ी चीज
है जिस से हम आसानी से समझ सकते हैं कि
अगर कोई आकस्मिक घटना हो जाये तो शायद
उन का प्रयोग हो जाये नहीं तो आम तौर से
न रूस चाहेगा न अमरीका चाहेगा कि उन का
इस्तेमाल हो । कोशिश होनी चाहिए विदेश
मंत्री के द्वारा कि रूस के प्रधान मंत्री श्री
ब्रुश्चेव और अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति श्री कनेडी
इन दोनों को शिखर वार्ता के लिए तैयार
किया जाये और उनके सामने यह रखा जाये
कि किस तरह से दुनिया के और खास तौर से
रंगीन दुनिया के गरीबी और गुलामी के
सवाल को हम हल करें । अगर इसके लिए
कोशिश हो तो ज्यादा कारगर होगी ।

मैं नागा लैंड के बारे में भी कुछ कहना
चाहूंगा । नागा लैंड में जो अब तक किया गया
उससे वहां के लोगों को संतोष नहीं है ।
आज ही सवेरे वहां के बारे में काल एटेंशन
मोशन पेश हुआ और प्रधान मंत्री ने उसका
जवाब भी दिया । यह साफ है कि वह लोग
अब भी सक्रिय हैं और जो कुछ भी सुधार
वहां हो रहा है या वहां जो भी जिम्मेदार
लोगों की कमेटी आदि का निर्माण हुआ है
उससे वह संतुष्ट नहीं हैं । इसका हल यही हो
सकता है कि वहां पर दूसरे राज्यों की तरह से
उत्तरदायी सरकार कायम हो जाये । इसमें
कोई झगड़े की बात नहीं है और इसमें कोई
बुरा भी होगा वाला नहीं है । जैसे दूसरे राज्यों
को स्थान प्राप्त है वैसे ही उस इलाके को भी
स्थान प्राप्त हो जाये । इन सब चीजों को
चलाने के लिए सरकार को पर्वतीय इलाकों
के लिए एक हिमालय नीति अपनानी चाहिए
और उनके साथ जो हमारे रिश्ते हैं उनको
सुधारने की कोशिश होनी चाहिए ।

एक निवेदन मैं और करना चाहता हूं ।
नागा लैंड, ईस्टन फ्रांटियर, गोआ, पांडिचेरी,
काश्मीर ये हमारे देश के अंग हैं और इसी देश
के अन्तर्गत इन का राज काज चलता है ।
फिर भी न मालूम क्यों देश के अन्दर विदेश
की स्थापना की हुई है और इन क्षेत्रों को जो
कि गृह मंत्रालय के अधीन होने चाहिए ये
विदेश मंत्रालय के अधीन रखा गया है ।
और उसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि जब
देश के एक हिस्से का कोई नागरिक दूसरे
हिस्से में जाना चाहता है तो उसको विशेष
परमिट लेना पड़ता है । उसे आज्ञा लेनी
पड़ती है तब वह जा सकता है । अब गोआ
आजाद हो गया है और भारत का अंग बन
गया है । लेकिन अगर किसी भारतीय नागरिक
को गोआ जान के लिए परमिट लेना हो तो
उसको कैसे पता चलेगा कि गोआ हिन्दुस्तान
का अंग बन गया है या उसी तरह से पुर्तगाल
का अंग है । यह व्यवस्था खत्म होनी चाहिए
और ये इलाके जो विदेश मंत्रालय के अन्तर्गत

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

हैं उन को गृह मंत्रालय के अन्तर्गत लाना चाहिए ।

गोआ के सम्बन्ध में एक निवेदन करूंगा । गोआ की मुक्ति हुई । इससे बड़ी खुशी हमको, इस सदन को और सारे देश को हुई । यह कार्य बहुत पहले हो जाना चाहिए था । लेकिन इसका जवाब दे दिया जायेगा कि अब हो गया । लेकिन इस सिलसिले में मेरा निवेदन है कि या तो पुर्तगाल की शक्ति का हम को अन्दाजा नहीं था और अगर अन्दाजा था तो १४ बरस तक जो हम बैठे रहे यह हमारा निकम्मापन था । अगर हम को पुर्तगाल की शक्ति का अन्दाजा नहीं था तो यह हमारी जानकारी की कमी है और हमारा इंटेलीजेंस विभाग हम को यह जानकारी न दे सका ।

इसके अलावा गोआ का प्रश्न ऐसे समय हल किया गया कि जब उसके फौरन बाद चुनाव होने थे और ऐसा लगा कि उसका फायदा चुनाव में उठाना है । गोआ आजाद हुआ उसकी हमें खुशी है लेकिन वह एक ऐसे मौके से किया गया जिसका फायदा चुनाव में उठाया जा सकता था । और उत्तर बम्बई के चुनाव में जहां रक्षा मंत्री श्री कृष्ण मेनन चुनाव लड़ रहे थे उसका प्रचार करके फायदा उठाया गया ।

श्री अन्सार हरवानी : आपके ऊपर तो उसका असर नहीं पड़ा ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : आप जैसे लोग थे भरे निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में भी ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्रालय के खर्च के बारे में भी एक निवेदन करूंगा । मंत्रालय का खर्चा दिन प्रतिदिन बढ़ रहा है और इतना बढ़ रहा है कि सन् १९६१-६२ में ३५-४९ करोड़ का व्यय था जब कि सन् १९६२-६३ में ४५-४६ करोड़ हो गया । जैसा कि दूसरे मंत्रालयों में है वैसा ही

इस मंत्रालय में भी जो अधिकारी हैं और जो दूसरे स्टाफ के सदस्य हैं उनके वेतनों में और सुविधाओं में बहुत बड़ा फर्क है । अधिकारियों के वेतन भत्तों में १-६६ करोड़ खर्चा होता है जब कि दूसरे स्टाफ पर १-६९ करोड़ खर्च होता है । दोनों आंकड़े देखे जाएं तो दोनों समान हैं जब कि स्टाफ की संख्या ज्यादा है और अधिकारियों की संख्या कम है । यह तो वैसा ही हो गया जैसा कि देहात में कहते हैं—आघे में अधघर आघे में कुलघर । मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी विदेश मंत्री भी हैं इसलिए उनको शायद मौका ज्यादा मिलता है अपने मंत्रालय पर अधिक खर्च करने का । एक सेक्रेटरी जनरल उनके मंत्रालय में हैं और भी ज्यादा अधिकारी लोग हैं । तो इसमें भी मितव्ययता का ध्यान होना चाहिए ।

अन्त में मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि अल्जोरिया को जनता कराह रही है, वह गरीबी और गुलामी का शिकार है । अनेक देशों ने उसको मान्यता दे दी है और भारत जैसा देश अगर अल्जोरिया को मान्यता न दे इससे ज्यादा गांधीवाद, समाजवाद और मानवता के लिए दूसरी क्या कलंक की बात हो सकती है । तो मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि अल्जोरिया को शीघ्राति-शीघ्र कानूनी मान्यता प्रदान की जाए ।

Shri Tekur Subramanyam (Bellary): Mr. Speaker, the basic principles of our external affairs policy which has been practised, or which has been sought to be practised, in the last fourteen years have been mainly the same principles that underline the United Nations charter: that is, to maintain international peace, to develop friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights of peoples, to achieve international co-operation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental

freedoms for all without distinction of caste, race, sex language or religion. These are virtually the principles which have been followed by us for the last fourteen years. I remember quite well a decade back when our representatives and delegations at the U.N. sought to interpret these principles, they were roundly condemned, abused and misunderstood by both groups, by the eastern and western blocs. Each side thought that we were the stooges of the other group. That is how our policy was misunderstood in those days. Now there is a wholesome respect and understanding of our policy of non-alignment and they have begun to respect us, and at the time of every crisis arising there they turn to India and ask, "What does the Prime Minister of India say?"

Now the most important problem which every country is facing in international affairs is the problem of survival or destruction of the human race on this planet, and hence total disarmament becomes a necessity. In this context we are seeing now the atomic test explosions which have been carried out by America. And, naturally, the representatives of Russia and the other bloc say, "These are hypocrites, they are aggressors, these atomic blasts are taking us to the brink of atomic warfare." On the other side the reply given is that last year in September when there was a moratorium of three years to avoid atomic blasts, Russia came forward and carried out the most powerful atomic explosion. And between these two we are caught.

So far as we are concerned, it matters little whether it is Russia that carries out these tests or it is the United States of America. The whole atmosphere of this planet is fouled and the future generations also are put to serious danger of being disfigured. And now everybody comes and says that India must do something. Bertrand Russell said the same thing the other day. Some friends on the opposite side have also said so.

They have now respect for the policy of the present Government of India. They say, "India has established a good reputation for being friendly and useful and therefore India must interfere in this matter." In this context, I must say that every step that was taken by the present Government contributed to the reputation and strength of this Government.

16 hrs.

In regard to Goa, an hon. Member said that Goa could have been occupied some time ago. It was the phenomenal patience shown by the present Government that was a significant factor in creating an impression, in the world that we are a peaceful people. We wanted to be friendly with all people. We hesitated, we hesitated for a long time to take Goa. It would have been a day's march or a week's march. Militarily it was not a difficult achievement. But, for the sake of our principles, to be consistent with our own principles, to have consideration for our own reputation, we did not take it at a particularly early stage.

Now, as I said, the most immediate problem is the problem of disarmament. It is a difficult problem. I saw, the other day, a cartoon in which both the atomic powers were compared to two scorpions which were bottled up in one bottle, each raising its tail and about to sting, both gazing at each other, both afraid to strike, because they knew it was mutual destruction. It was a caricature. We should not take it seriously. It was there. Both the atomic powers are trying to destroy each other. Therefore, in this context, we can only appeal. The Prime Minister has been appealing. We hope the conscience of the community in both these countries, whether Russia or the U.S.A., will be roused and the people will come into their own and assert themselves and prevent further tests and also bring about a movement of general and total disarmament.

Now, I wish to say a word about the regional military pacts, these defence

[Shri Jehur Subramanyam]

pacts. I will refer to the Central Treaty Organisation. America believes that there can be containment of communism by having a sort of an encirclement, having some basis in the countries immediately surrounding the U.S.S.R. or China. In that context, Pakistan is near by. Pakistan is also one of the countries attached to the Central Treaty Organisation. America goes on supplying them the latest types of military weapons, supersonic jet fighters, all these things. On the one side, they believe in the basic principles of human dignity, dignity of the individual, freedom, democracy and all those things which are basic principles of their own existence and of their Independence movement, the American War of Independence and declaration of Independence and declarations of Thomas Jefferson and others. Here, we in India, are straining every nerve to see that democracy is successful. It is not a pretension or a pose. We are doing our best. Only yesterday, we saw the ex-President going away, giving his place to the new President, who took the oath of office. That was symptomatic, a symbol, of the democracy that we are trying to bring in. It is in strange contrast to the experiences of other countries where Presidents come and go; not in this climate of friendliness, peace, democracy and freedom, but in a climate of terrorism or fear of being liquidated or military dictatorship or totalitarianism. It is a strange contrast worthy of note. What is U.S.A. doing? We are compelled to go in for military weapons to Soviet Russia. I read in the papers. We have not been informed officially whether our Government have taken a decision with regard to getting these M.I.G. supersonic jet fighters from Russia. I request the Government in this connection, that Parliament may be taken into confidence not with regard to all the details in such matters, but still, when we hear that Pakistan is supplied with the latest weapons of warfare and these supersonic jets, we should also like to be informed that

our Government is also taking steps to secure these weapons, these jet fighters, from whom and all that. Not the details; but still to give a sort of assurance, it is necessary that we should be informed of all these things.

It is obvious that this policy of containment followed by the U.S.A. is bound to fail. In the context of Inter-continental ballistic missiles and space satellites which can be used as platforms to send rockets with atomic warheads, these military bases and this policy of containment is an obvious failure. Therefore, both from the point of view of principle, that is, democracy, freedom, human dignity, and from the point of view of military strategy, this policy of containment is bound to fail. It adds to our difficulties. We are straining every nerve to mobilise all our human and material resources to implement our plans and to bring about the prosperity and happiness of 44 crores of people in our country. We have to devote every ounce of our energy and every material to make the people prosper. We are compelled to divert a part of this for our defence, for military equipment. America, strangely enough, is following an inconsistent attitude. They should not try to criticise us or condemn us if we go to Russia to have these M.I.G. supersonic jets.

One word about China. We took the greatest initiative to bring China into world politics. At Bandung we tried to do it. We wanted to create a climate of friendliness for China to come in and function in international politics. We did the same in the U.N.O. also. On every conceivable occasion, we wanted to bring in China and make it a member of the U.N.O. What does China do? Stabs us in the back; betrays all our friendliness. It is heartening on this occasion. I should say, that the Prime Minister said the other day that we are not going to withdraw our forces from the border, our forces will be there, we

will resist by force any attempt by China to oust our officers and men there. This is heartening. I am sure this will be followed all along the borders.

Finally, we wish well for Pakistan; we wish well for the people of Pakistan. We want America to give them more economic aid. But, the military equipment which America supplies to Pakistan is something self-defeating and obnoxious.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to make my maiden speech in this House. While supporting the foreign policy of the Government especially in the matter of Kashmir, I would like to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister a few matters concerning the External Affairs Demands.

First of all, I will refer to the problem of Indians in Ceylon. A large number of Indians in Ceylon are sent out and they are jobless. The other day, the Prime Minister in this House, in answer to a question, stated that the people of Kerala who are sent out from Ceylon are well off, and they are often moneylenders. I wonder how such an impression was created in the mind of the Prime Minister. As a matter of fact, they are poor people, toddy tappers, poor plantation labourers and hotel workers. More are coming out from Ceylon to Kerala and their families are suffering. I hope that our friendly relations with Ceylon, about which it has been stated in the report sent to us, will be made use of and the Prime Minister will use his personal influence to see that the Indians are not sent out of Ceylon in large numbers. At the same time, for those who have already been sent out, something should be done for their repatriation.

There is the question of Indians in Burma. As one hon. Member pointed out, they are being sent out of that country. Every day many people are coming from Burma to the State of

Kerala. About those who are there in Burma, they are put to many difficulties due to restriction of remittances, and their families are starving. A sum of Rs. 30 or Rs. 35 alone is allowed and that too is denied sometimes. Those who are paying income-tax in Burma are allowed to send some money here. For that they must produce a certificate from the revenue authorities in India. Somehow, the authorities here are not liberal in issuing those certificates. So, many families are really suffering.

As regards those who are coming to India, they are allowed to bring some money. But here also, the people of the South are suffering, because they have to travel all the way from Calcutta as no steamer service is allowed from Madras.

Another problem that I wanted to talk about was in regard to the *de jure* transfer of the Pondicherry State. We have got a tiny pimple on the face of Kerala, known as Mahe, and I hope that the Prime Minister and the Government will take early steps in regard to the *de jure* transfer of the French possessions and the integration of Mahe with Kerala. At present, there is a toll system there. Even though Mahe is a very small place inside the State of Kerala, if anybody wants to travel from the Malabar side to Mahe, by a vehicle, he will have to pay a toll. I think that if the *de jure* transfer may take some time, Government should move the Government of Pondicherry to see that this toll system is abolished.

In the report that has been supplied to us, mention has been made about the necessary arrangements to facilitate the Haj pilgrimage to Saudi Arabia by Indian Muslims. The report says that:

“Next to Yemen and Egypt, the largest number of pilgrims—21,357—went for the Haj from India in 1961.”

The Government of India are doing everything possible to help the pilgrims there. The report further says:

"A special contingent of 4 doctors (including a lady doctor), and four compounders, equipped with the necessary supply of medicines was also sent to Saudi Arabia."

It is being sent every year. This is in addition to the arrangements that are already there in Mecca and at Jeddah, at our Embassy. As far as the Haj pilgrimage is concerned, from personal experience I can say that the pilgrims there have got various other difficulties which can be redressed, if our Government take up the matter with the Government of Saudi Arabia. The pilgrims are in charge of the Muallims or Mutawwifs there. A large section of the pilgrims are from Kerala, but they can choose between only two Muallims. These Muallims are creating a lot of trouble, and they are extracting a lot of money from the people. For North India, the number of Muallims comes to about 20 to 30. But so far as the people from Kerala are concerned, they have to choose between one or the other of the Muallims allotted for the Kerala State. If they were given the option to select from a larger circle of Muallims, this sort of exploitation by the Muallims will be stopped.

On the question of the Indo-Pakistan relations, I would like to say that Pakistan is doing a disservice to the Muslims of India by unnecessarily interfering in our affairs. We can very well stand on our legs. The incident in Malda, whether it was between the Hindus and the Muslims or whether it was between the Santhals and the Muslims, was really an unfortunate thing, but when such things happen and when such grievances are there we ourselves take up the matter with the Government of India in

a democratic way, and, therefore; Pakistan need not interfere in these matters. The interference of Pakistan has not at all helped us but it is having the contrary effects. So, I request the Government of Pakistan to leave us alone in this matter.

With these few words, I support the Demands of the External Affairs Ministry.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry. This Ministry is none of those Ministries of our Government which has succeeded in securing practically unanimous support from this House. Even the Members of the Opposition who spoke criticising certain aspects of what was done or what was not done, were more eloquent in their parentheses and their punctuations rather than in the argumentation that they used against the Government's policies. There was only one discordant voice that the House had listened to, as far as the fundamentals of the policy are concerned or as far as the effectiveness with which this policy is being implemented, is concerned.

The days that we are going to face now are very difficult and delicate days, and the External Affairs Ministry will need the wholehearted support of this House and this country, especially in facing the forces of disruption and aggression that threaten us from outside.

Mention has been made here about our support to the demand for disarmament. It is a strange irony of fate that today when the world is progressing, when science has progressed, when humanity is reaching out its hands to other planets and other worlds the forces that divide us are being strengthened in the world. This House has always supported our Government in their policy of seeking disarmament, total and general disarma-

ment, on the basis of rational and reasonable opportunities for inspection. As far as the question of nuclear test is concerned, we have been consistent in our opposition to the resumption of these tests. We have bemoaned the resumption of these tests whoever has been responsible for the resumption of these tests. Two wrongs do not make one right. When Russia resumed these tests we were aware that the future of humanity was being put in jeopardy by that country. When America followed suit, we were equally distressed that America too had followed in the wake of Russia, and created conditions in which humanity had to fear for its survival. The latest series of tests are of great concern to our country, especially because the belt of the radio-active fall-out touches countries in the tropics, including our own country. I am sure that this House will back our Government to the hilt, in whatever steps the Government want to take, to see that such nuclear tests are prevented, that their resumption is given up and that humanity is ensured peace and continuity for posterity.

On the liberation of Goa, from all sides of the House, you have been told how thrilled and gratified this nation is that the last vestige of colonialism has been erased from the face of our country.

The action that our Government has taken on the question of the Congo, the policy that our Government have adopted as far as Angola is concerned and the immediate need for liquidation of colonialism on the continent of Africa is concerned, the attitude that our delegation has taken on the question of the proposals for franchise and political reform in Rhodesia and in other parts of the Federation of Central Africa—all these have met with the approval and appreciation of this House, and I join the hon. Members who have spoken in support of these policies.

Sir, it was said by one hon. Member, one of the leader of the Communist Group, that if at all any fault could be found with our policy, as far as disarmament was concerned, it was that we had not had the courage to say who was delaying the process of disarmament, who was delaying agreement in the conference on disarmament. He seems to think that the finger of accusation can be the magic wand of conciliation.

As far as China is concerned, and the strange alliance that we witness today between China and Pakistan is concerned, many hon. Members have voiced their concern. It has been said that adversity makes strange bed-fellows; even so, aggression makes strange comrades in arms. As far as China is concerned, the policy that China is adopting, today, has affected us not only on this continent, but on every continent of the world. We were hoodwinked by China, we were duped by China, China mistook our patience to mean cowardice. China thought that we would believe in their pious professions, that our good faith was tantamount to gullibility. Our Government has today shown that what we offered China was good faith and friendship and not gullibility and cowardice. Our Government has stated again and again that as long as a single inch of our territory is occupied by China, we reserve to ourselves the right to use every means that sovereign nations can use to see that such aggression is liquidated.

But, Sir, today one of the hon. Members of this House, Shri Frank Anthony, painted a picture which almost seemed sombre. In the ordinary course of things, this House hears rather realistic speeches from him. But I am afraid there was an element of alarmism in what he told us this morning. It is true that China is on the diplomatic war path against India not only on this Continent but on other Continents as well, in Africa and Latin America. China is attacking us today not only on our frontiers but in the whole underdeveloped

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

world, the so-called uncommitted world. Even as immediately after independence, Pakistan launched a terrific attack against India on the diplomatic front everywhere. We see today the spectacle of China concentrating on the under-developed world, the uncommitted world, attacking the policies of India surreptitiously, undermining our reputation, challenging the postulates on which our foreign policy is based and attempting to create an impression that we are the 'running dogs of imperialism'.

Sir, to come back to the measures we should take, it is essential that we concentrate on putting our case strongly especially to the so-called under-developed countries of the world. Our Embassies and Legations should protect the rights of Indians; they should protect and expand our trade interests. They should explain our views, our stand, our achievements and our aspirations to the peoples of these countries, and should, above all, keep us informed of the ideas that are simmering in these continents, the new forces that are emerging and the new personages who are guiding the peoples of these countries in their march towards the realisation of their aspirations.

If you look at it from this point of view, you will see the need for many more new embassies. One hon. member who spoke before me said that the Ministry was taking too much of the money of the exchequer. If it were at all possible, Sir, I would have liked to move that the Demands for grants of the External Affairs Ministry be increased because of the tremendous responsibility they have to face today in the world (*Interruptions*). In Africa, many countries have become independent. What is the representation we have in Africa, or in Latin America and in other parts of the under-developed world, with the sole exception of Asia? Is it possible for us to say today that the only contact, the only forum of con-

tact that we need have with these countries should be through and at the United Nations? It is true that governments are represented at the U.N. But do embassies have contacts only with governments? Is it not necessary for us to keep in touch with other forces, vital forces in society like trade unions, youth organisations, student organisations and political organisations so that we may be understood by all sections of the peoples of these countries?

If this is necessary,—especially when governments change, coups take place, other forces are at work for changes in the composition and attitudes of governments, it is very necessary for us to have embassies and legations in these newly-independent countries. If you take, for example, the case of Africa, sometimes there is a feeling—a mistaken feeling—that politics in Africa is the politics of freedom versus colonialism. No, Sir. Colonialism will be liquidated on the continent of Africa. We are working for the liquidation of colonialism on the continent of Africa. But in Africa too there other conflicts and competitions, there are differences in the attitudes to federation, in the ideas that people have of confederation. There is conflict of interests, national interests, and conflict of ambitions. It is necessary that our country understands, and is understood by these different forces on the continent.

If you take the diplomatic representation that we have on the continent of Africa, I am tempted to say that it is very meagre. In Mauritania, Dahomey, Chad, the Central African Republic, (onbangichari) Gabon, Togo, Nigeria and the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville Congo), we have no representation at all. It is very easy to say that representation costs money. I agree when you say that a poor country like ours cannot have so many new embassies and legations opened so soon. Take, again, Central and South America. There are

many countries in this region. It is no good to write off these countries, to say that some of these countries are inclined to vote with one bloc or another in the United Nations. We have three embassies in South America and none at all in Central America—one in Rio De Janeiro, one in Buenos Aires and one in Santiago (Chile).

Then there is this practice of concurrent accreditation. It is very difficult to understand whether it is geographical proximity or contiguity that determines concurrent accreditation or whether it is political affinity or diplomatic compatibility. From Santiago (Chile) our Ambassador is accredited to Colombia, which is near Panama. You know Chile is near the South Pole. Then you have at Rio De Janeiro, our Ambassador accredited to Venezuela. Even the air lines advertise this distance as the longest non-stop flying distance on an over land route, the distance from Rio De Janeiro in Brazil to Caracas in Venezuela. In the entire Central American region, there is no Indian representation.

I can go on in this way. But I do not want to take up more time of the House. Thinking about this some times one wonders whether there is some similarity between this state of affairs and the way an old Pope is stated to have resolved the conflict between Spain and Portugal, by taking up the map of South America and drawing an artificial line bescribing the continent and saying 'From this side Spain will have authority in South America and on the other side of the line Portugal will have authority'. Some kind of a division of that nature seems to exist.

The opportunities and arrangements for external publicity are very very meagre indeed. Going through the Report that has been given to us, we find that of the External Publicity Information Units abroad, 14 units are situated in East Asia, Australia and

the Pacific, 2 in Pakistan, 5 in West Asia, 12 in Europe, 5 in North America, 9 in Africa (including 6 in the Commonwealth countries, only 3 outside the Commonwealth countries, a meagre 2 in Central and South America, one in West Indies thus making a total of 50.

As far as publicity is concerned, the Report says that the Government is making efforts to put out special pamphlets, designed to meet the special requirements of different areas. I wonder what has been done for French-speaking Africa. I wonder what has been done for the Spanish-speaking countries of the world. The amount that is set apart for this seems to be incredibly inadequate, to put it very charitably.

To conclude, I would also like to refer to another aspect. As far as the new responsibilities of the External Affairs Ministry and the expectations of the world from this Ministry are concerned, it is very necessary to realise that we are today in quest of a new kind of diplomacy. The old world diplomacy of war no longer holds good. Today when we struggle for disarmament, for the realisation of the UN Declaration of Human Rights, we also work for a new United Nations, and look a new kind of diplomacy that does not have as its ultimate guarantee war or violence but non-violence. If any country can give a lead in this regard, it is India and if any individual can do so, it is our Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

It is very necessary, therefore, to remember this aspect, especially when the question of the revision of the UN Charter comes up,—the need for greater representation to certain areas of the world, greater authority for the United Nations and greater effectiveness in its working.

With these words, Sir, I support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry.

श्री भक्त दर्शन (गढ़वाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सुबह से बड़े धीरज और सन्न के साथ विरोधी दलों में माननीय सदस्यों के भाषणों को सुनता रहा हूँ। हमारे समाजवादी दल के श्री राम सेवक यादव जी ने भाषण दिया, हिन्दू महा सभा के श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ जी ने भाषण दिया और हमारे जनसंघ दल के नेता श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी जी ने भाषण दिया। लेकिन उनके भाषणों के बावजूद भी मैं यह नहीं समझ पाया कि जैसी स्थिति में से हमारा देश इस समय गुजर रहा है और जैसी हमें विरासत अंग्रेजी साम्राज्य से मिली थी उस हालत में हम इससे अधिक क्या कर सकते थे, जो हमारे वैदेशिक मंत्रालय ने इस बीच में सफलता प्राप्त की है। मेरे पास इतना समय नहीं है कि मैं विस्तार के साथ उसकी व्याख्या कर सकूँ। यह तो सूर्य के प्रकाश को दीपक दिखाने के समान होगा। इसलिए केवल एक ही शब्द कह कर मैं इस विषय को समाप्त करता हूँ कि संसार में तीसरे विश्व महा युद्ध को रोकने में भारत ने जो भूमिका अदा की है, उसके लिए युग युगों तक हमारे देश के नेताओं का और हमारे देश की वैदेशिक नीति का नाम लिया जायेगा।

श्रीमन् मेरे पास चूँकि समय कम है इस लिये केवल उत्तरी सीमा के कुछ देशों के सम्बन्ध में ही अपने विचार रख कर मैं अपना वक्तव्य समाप्त कर दूँगा।

चीन के सम्बन्ध में यहाँ पर हमारी सरकार की नीति की भी बड़ी आलोचना हुई है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि आये दिन चीनी वायुयान भारतीय वायु सीमा का उल्लंघन करते रहे हैं; साथ ही बहुत सी भूमि पर अतिक्रमण किया जाता रहा है और दूसरी तरह की परेशानियाँ हमारे सामने हैं। लेकिन मैं अपने विरोधी दल के

मित्रों को यह विश्वास दिखाना चाहता हूँ और उनसे यह अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि हमें कुछ दिन और धीरज से काम लेना है। गोआ के सम्बन्ध में भी हमारे अन्दर और सारे देश में एक बेसन्नी सी छा गई थी। लेकिन जब गवर्नमेंट ने ठोस कारवाई की तो सारे देश ने उसे देख लिया कि क्या हुआ। मैं तो इस सम्बन्ध में अन्तरात्मा से विश्वास करता हूँ कि हमारी नीति कुछ कुछ महादेव जी के तीसरे नेत्र की तरह पर है। कामदेव ने चारों ओर से जब शिव जी को परेशान करने का प्रयत्न किया तो शायद लोग समझने लगे कि शिव जी हार गये हैं। लेकिन जब अन्त में तीसरा नेत्र खुला तो कामदेव महाराज। बिल्कुल भस्म होते दिखाई दिये। वही हालत चीन की हो सकती है हमें सन्न से अपने नेताओं पर विश्वास रखना चाहिये। जब अनुकूल परिस्थितियाँ होंगी तब जो आवश्यक कदम होगा उसे वे अवश्य उठावेंगे।

नवम्बर, १९६१ में चीन और भारत सरकार के बीच जो पत्र व्यवहार हुआ था उस के सम्बन्ध में एक श्वेत पत्र, व्हाइट पेपर, प्रकाशित किया गया था। उस के बाद दोनों सरकारों के बीच में काफी पत्र व्यवहार हुआ है, और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने समय समय पर कुछ पत्रों की प्रतिलिपियों को सदन के पटल पर भी रक्खा है, लेकिन मेरा अपना निवेदन है कि हो सकता है कि उन पत्रों के सिवा और भी पत्र व्यवहार हुआ हो, साथ ही अलग अलग होने के कारण उन्हें समझने में कठिनाई होती है। इस लिये क्यों न एक छठवाँ श्वेत पत्र इस बारे में प्रकाशित कर दिया जाय ताकि पूरा नक्शा देश के सामने आ सके?

दूसरी बात इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहूँगा कि सन् १९५४ में, सात वर्ष पहले तिब्बत से

व्यापार और तीर्थ यात्रियों के बारे में जो मुआहदा हुआ था वह २ जून को समाप्त हो रहा है। इस सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार ने जो रुख अख्तियार किया है, उस का हमें दृढ़ता के साथ समर्थन करना चाहिये क्योंकि वह उचित कदम है। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ कठिनाइयों को भी मैं रखना चाहता हूँ। कुछ समय पहले मेरे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बतलाया था कि हमारे जो व्यापारी तिब्बत जाना चाहते हैं उन्हें हम कोई निश्चित सलाह नहीं दे सकते कि आया वे वहां जायें या न जायें। वहां की परिस्थि प्रत्येक भारतीय को मालूम है, और इस सदन को मालूम है। वहां लाखों रुपये हमारे व्यापारियों के फंसे पड़े हैं। अगर हम वहां नहीं जाते, अगर हमारे व्यापारी वहां नहीं जाते तो उन की वसूली कठिन है और बिना किसी सुरक्षा की गारन्टी के अगर जाते हैं तो फिर उन के वापस आने के सम्बन्ध में आशंका हो सकती है। पिछले दिनों चीन की सरकार ने हमें चेतावनी दी थी कि हमारे तीर्थ यात्री कैलाश मानसरोवर नहीं जाने चाहियें। फिर भी हमारे कुछ यात्री जान पर खेल कर वहां गये। लेकिन तीर्थ यात्रियों और व्यापारियों में बहुत अन्तर है। व्यापारी लाखों रुपयों का सामान ले कर जाते हैं, वहां लाखों, करोड़ों रुपयों का सामान पहले से रुका पड़ा है। फिर इस समझौते की समाप्ति के बाद, २ जून के बाद वहां पर कोई हमारा वाणिज्य दूत, या ट्रेड एजेंट भी नहीं रहेगा। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि ऐसी परिस्थिति में किस तरह से भारतीय व्यापारियों और अन्य लोगों को वहां जाना चाहिये। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से अनुरोध करूंगा कि जो भारतीय व्यापारी वहां जाना चाहें, उन के लिये स्पष्ट आदेश होने चाहियें कि वे वहां जायें या न जायें। कल ही रात रेडियो के अनुसार चीन की सरकार ने तिब्बत से आयात निर्यात के सम्बन्ध में नये प्रतिबन्ध लगाये हैं। उन से तो वहां की स्थिति और भी बिगड़ गई है और इस सम्बन्ध में निश्चित आदेश मिलने चाहियें।

सरकार ने तिब्बती शरणाथियों के बसाने के सम्बन्ध में काफी अच्छा कार्य किया है, लेकिन, जैसा कि रिपोर्ट से मालम होता है, अभी तक करीब ५,००० तिब्बती शरणाथी ऐसे हैं जो कि ट्रांजिट कैंप में पड़े हुए हैं। मेरे निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में पौड़ी के पास एक तिब्बतियों का कैंप है जिन्होंने नीति और माना घाटियों से हमारे भारत में प्रवेश किया था। इन सगभग २०० तिब्बतियों की जब दशा मैं ने देखी तो बड़ा दुख हुआ। उन के रहने की व्यवस्था अच्छी नहीं है, उन के भोजन की व्यवस्था अच्छी नहीं है; उन के लिये रोजगार की व्यवस्था नहीं है। पास पड़ोस के जो गांव वाले हैं वे भी इस कारण से बहुत परेशान हैं। अतः मैं यह अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि जल्दी से जल्दी उन को वहां से हटा कर किसी और जगह स्थायी रूप से बसाया जाये।

प्रधान मंत्री जी की प्रेरणा में सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिये पिछले कुछ वर्षों से जो कार्य हो रहा है उस से देश की और वहां की जनता बहुत अनुभूति है, लेकिन मैं विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उस विकास कार्यक्रम से हमें जितनी आशाये थीं वे पूरी नहीं हुई हैं। उदाहरण के लिये अभी कुछ दिन पहले रक्षा मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री श्री रघुरामैया जी ने एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में बतलाया था कि बद्दीनाथ के लिये जो सड़क बन रही है वह एक साल आगे चल कर शायद चलने के काबिल हो सके। जहां तक मैं समझता हूँ, जिस चाल से काम हो रहा है, वह गति सन्तोषजनक नहीं है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस तरह से नेफा के इलाके में और लद्दाख के इलाके में मिलिटरी इंजीनियर्स के द्वारा काम कराया जाता है उसी तरीके से अगर सेंट्रल सेक्टर में भी काम कराया जाये व बद्दीनाथ के क्षेत्र में और नीती तथा माना के क्षेत्र में तो शायद ज्यादा सफलता मिल सकती है।

सिक्किम और भूटान, जो दोनों उत्तरी सीमा के राज्य हैं, उन के सम्बन्ध में श्री यादव

[श्री भक्त दर्शन]

जी ने अभी फरमाया था। मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता है कि अभी हाल में भूटान के प्रधान मंत्री भारत तशरीफ लाये थे और सिक्किम के महाराज कुमार ने भी भारत की यात्रा की। मुझे विश्वास है कि वहाँ पर जो विकास का कार्यक्रम सन्तोषजनक ढंग से नहीं चल रहा है, उस में कुछ तेजी आयेगी और अगले पांच वर्षों के लिये जो विकास योजनयें बनी हैं उन में अधिक सफलता मिलेगी।

नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में मैं विशेष रूप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। यह बड़े दुःख और आश्चर्य की बात है कि नेपाल हमारी भाषा बोलने वाला है, हमारे धर्म को मानने वाला है, हमारी संस्कृति एक रहते हुए भी और लाखों आदमियों का दिन प्रति दिन यातायात होते हुए भी, हमारे सम्बन्धों में इस बीच कोई अधिक सुधार नहीं हुआ है। अतः इस बारे में बहुत गम्भीरता से सोचने की जरूरत है।

अभी उत्तर प्रदेश असेम्बली में जब सिंचाई विभाग के ऊपर बहस हो रही थी तो सिंचाई मंत्री जी ने एक रहस्य का उद्घाटन करते हुए कहा था कि गंडक नदी की विकास योजना के बारे में एक समझौता नेपाल सरकार, उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार और बिहार सरकार के बीच में हुआ था, लेकिन जब हमारे इंजीनियर नेपाल में जांच पड़ताल करने के लिये गये तो उन्हें गिरफ्तार कर लिया गया। जब वहाँ के महाराजाधिराज यहाँ आये थे तब शायद प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उन से बात चीत की थी। मैं ने यह उदाहरण इस लिये दिये कि हमारे सम्बन्ध आपस में बिगड़ते ही चले जा रहे हैं इस सम्बन्ध में मैं दो तीन छोटे छोटे मुझाव देना चाहता हूँ।

मेरा ख्याल है कि हम नेपाल में काफी काम जरूर कर रहे हैं। अभी हाल में पांच मुझाहदों पर काठमांडू में हस्ताक्षर हुए हैं काम काफी हो रहा है, लेकिन इस का प्रचार

और प्रकाशन नहीं होता। वहाँ इस की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये।

दूसरी बात मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जो कर्मचारी वहाँ जा रहे हैं, या और किसी भी जगह जाते हैं, उन के बारे में हमें विशेष ध्यान रखना चाहिये। मेरे अन्दर एक भ्रम है और बहुत से नेपाल के मित्रों ने भी यह बात बतलाई कि हमारे कर्मचारियों के अन्दर एक अहम्मन्यता सी है, एक सुपीरि-आरिटी काम्प्लेक्स सा है कि हम गांधी जी के देश के हैं, हम नेहरू जी के देश के हैं, वे एक बड़े देश के रहने वाले हैं। इस से वहाँ की जनता जो है उस को ठेस सी लगती है, उन के आत्म सम्मान को ठेस लगती है, और इस लिये उन के अन्दर गुस्सा आता है कि यह लोग हमारे ऊपर रोब जमाने के लिये आते हैं। इस लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ जो कर्मचारी भेजे जायें, या कहीं भी भेजे जायें उन्हें अच्छी तरह से छाँट कर भेजा जाय। वे विनम्रता के साथ और वास्तविक भारतीय संस्कृति का सन्देश ले कर जायें, और उनकी आचार विचार ठीक हों, ताकि वे वहाँ के जनता के हृदय जीत सकें।

एक बात जिस से मैं ने समझा कि नेपाल की जनता में हमारे प्रति कुछ रोष है वह यह है कि वे समझते हैं कि हम उन के आन्तरिक मामलों में मदाखलत करना चाहते हैं। वे लोग उदाहरण देते हैं कि बर्मा में सरकार परिवर्तित हो गई, वहाँ पर डिक्टेटरशिप हो गई, लेकिन वहाँ की जनता के अधिकारों के बारे में हम ने कुछ नहीं कहा। पाकिस्तान में तो डिक्टेटरशिप चल ही रही है, सिक्किम और भटान जो कि हमारे संरक्षित राज्य हैं, जिन के साथ हमारी विशेष सन्धियाँ हैं, उन के बारे में, जनता को अधिकार देने के बारे में, हम ने कोई आवाज नहीं उठाई, तो नेपाल के सम्बन्ध में हम क्यों कहें? क्यों उस के बारे में मदाखलत करे कि वहाँ पर महाराज का शासन

तन्त्र चल रहा है? मैं जानता हूँ कि हम संसदीय लोकतन्त्र का इस देश के अन्दर बड़ा अच्छा परीक्षण कर रहे हैं और हम को बड़ी सफलता मिल रही है, लेकिन उस देश की जनता इस के लिये तैयार नहीं है, और वहाँ पर अनुकूल परिस्थितियाँ नहीं हैं, इस लिये हमारे कर्मचारियों को, हमारे नेताओं को, और दलों के नेताओं को, या जो सरकारी प्रवक्ता अथवा गवर्नमेंट स्पोक्समेन हों, उन को इस बारे में बड़ी सतर्कता से चलना चाहिये ताकि इस समय दोनों देशों में कोई कटुता पैदा न हो।

अन्त में मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। नेपाल और भारत के बीच जो बार्डर है, वह बिल्कुल उपेक्षित रहा है। अभी हाल में, आप को मालूम होगा कि हमारे एक सम्मानित सदस्य श्री विजय आनन्द शिकार खेलते हुए हाथी से गिर पड़े और उन को चोट आ गई। मतलब यह कि वह सारा इलाका, जो कि तराई का इलाका है, जो नेपाल से मिलता हुआ इलाका है, वह बिल्कुल उपेक्षित है, जंगलों से भरा हुआ है और वहाँ पर यातायात के साधन भी नहीं हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि नेपाल और चीन का जो बार्डर है, उस के लिये तो हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन हमारी और नेपाल की जो सीमा है, उस के विकास की ओर हमें ध्यान देना चाहिये। जिस तरह से तिब्बत के सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों के बारे में भारत सरकार के सहयोग से उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार या और सरकारें वहाँ के विकास के लिये तेजी से कार्यक्रम चला रही हैं, हालाँकि उससे पूरा सन्तोष हमें नहीं है, और हम समय-समय पर उस के लिये सुझाव देते रहे हैं, उसी तरीके से नेपाल की जो सीमा हम से मिलती हुई है, उस के विकास की योजना भी बननी चाहिये।

श्रीमान् इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are at

the end of the day's debate and I am sure the House is waiting eagerly for the Prime Minister's reply. But I wish to stress in the beginning that our debate is important not only because grave events have cast their shadow on the world horizon but also because the role of India, already well-established in the world affairs, can, if creatively and dynamically exercised, produce the kind of result which mankind is eagerly waiting for. I think the first matter which occupies our minds is the question of disarmament and the question of putting an end after all to the fear that is gripping humanity today, fear of nuclear annihilation. In this matter I am afraid that the conference at Geneva and the attitude of nuclear power like the United States in particular is something which bodes very ill for the future of humanity. The United States in particular has been displaying a sort of an intransigence which it is the job of the world's peoples to bring to bay. Non aligned countries with India in the lead and with a country like Sweden in the lumber have offered suggestions and solutions to this nuclear problem. They have tried to bring about a *via media* so that international control on nuclear explosions can take place and at the same time inspection of a sort which suggests something like espionage in certain national territories can be avoided. But in spite of this suggestion which has been welcomed by a country like the Soviet Union, we do not find things are progressing and that is because we know that the question of disarmament, nuclear and non nuclear, is linked in the minds of the people who ache for this disarmament with such other things which would bring about an amplification of freedom as the elimination of foreign military bases in different parts of the world. That is not to the liking of certain people and that is why mankind is living under the shadow of fear and agony.

That reminds me of a suggestion which was made by Bertrand Russell

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

which has been mentioned several times in this House and I do wish to ask the Prime Minister why exactly it was not possible to make at least some gesture of acceptance of the method which he had suggested. He is not a person who is given to sentimental exercises. He is not only a philosopher but a scientist; precision has been his passion. And he gave his mind to this suggestion which was offered to him by journalists in London and then after a great deal of cogitation put it forward especially to a country like India hoping that India with her tradition of satyagraha and her tradition of suffering in order to bring about a cleansing of the spirit in ourselves and in others could perhaps welcome this. It was not a mere sentimental gesture by any means; it was an attempt in howsoever modest manner might be possible to do, it was an attempt to add something like a physical sanction to a moral sanction which already exists today against the nuclear explosions which are taking place and which threaten to multiply in the near future. I know the Prime Minister has said in answer to a communication from a Member on this side of the House that he does not mind non-official agencies trying to go to somewhere near the Christmas Island. If that is so why was it not possible officially to make a pronouncement that perhaps on account of certain technical factors it was not possible to send an expedition of that sort which would have represented the moral challenge of man to the kind of wildness which is being practised by the nuclear powers but that this country was in favour of making whatever gesture it can in order to bring about a cessation of the fear and the agony which grips the mind of man today. I wish the Prime Minister tells us a little more about the reasons why he considered that he could not make any kind of positive response to the suggestions made by Bertrand Russell.

This morning and yesterday we read in the papers how in South east Asia, the waters are being muddied by the intervention which is reported to be attempted by the United States. Press has ordered the Seventh Fleet to South east Asia so that the people of Laos might have peace and freedom. The people of Laos will decide for themselves and we know what has been going on. India knows a great deal more than the other countries. We know how Souvanna Phouma has been bogged all the time. We know how under the aegis of the United States and its satellites a situation has been created there on account of which the people of Laos are not in a position to satisfy their aspirations. They are resenting the Seventh Fleet. But the Jeddarts of international reaction is trying to make sure that capitalism is safe in that part of the world for as long as they care to foresee into the future. This is linked to my mind at any rate with meetings of the NATO council which was held lately in Athens and with meetings of so-called CENTO in London. These confabulations take place and the peoples of the world are subject to agony and torture and of their hopes for freedom and fulfilment.

It is quite in keeping with this kind of talk that again we say in the papers reports about a committee of the United States Senate recommending that the US aid to India should be cut to the extent of 25 per cent. This cut was, according to the Press report, on account of the punishment which we have deserved on the score of Goa and Kashmir. There are reports of course that some other friends of India in the United States are trying to see that the cut is restored and generous magnanimity will perhaps be displayed after a few days. But surely it is not by this kind of threat that they are going to deflect India from the policy

of non alignment which is upheld by all sections of our people. This kind of threat will not do. The persuasiveness of my friend Shri Anthony in order to wean the Indian Government away from the policy of non-alignment is destined to defeat as he knows very well. This kind of thing which goes on, this horse trading on the scale of international affairs will have to stop. India as a country has its own honour and self-respect: it is not going to be told in so far as its international policies are concerned.

In regard to our neighbour Pakistan about which we are so concerned, very rightly so, things are happening in Pakistan about which we have got to be extremely anxious. Pakistan surely, as some Congress Members have pointed out, is a pawn in the hands of the United States which cannot lift a little finger without the sanction of the United States: there is no doubt about it. And perhaps there is some coincidence in the fact that a worthy journalist who has enjoyed the hospitality of our country and perhaps will enjoy it again because we have a free Press and a free atmosphere and all that kind of thing, has written from somewhere in Pakistan a report of the Malda incidents in West Bengal which the Prime Minister had to describe as deeply shocking and absolutely mendacious inventions, whose only intention was to see that in Pakistan there was trouble and all over the world there was a feeling against India. This kind of thing goes on. We know the club which has been formed against India; we know how India is refused support and sympathy because of this kind of thing going on on the international scene.

We know of course the United States Government sends us farm surpluses from time to time and as a result of that we get certain amount of money and they have a say in our projects. Our Embassy in the United States gets cold feet even on a question like Goa. I shall refer to this

matter in some detail, particularly to a special article which was written in the 13th Annual Number of the *Economic Weekly* of Bombay, a very reputable journal, one of the best journals that we have in this country. There is a special letter from America, a long letter with the heading—Indian Embassy against cold feet. Here a reputable correspondent of a very reputable paper says how after Goa our Embassy almost liquidated itself and shut up its shop for a while and did not know what to say, and how some of our subordinate officials went about talking in the most irresponsible fashion about Shri Krishna Menon's repartees and how, soon after, everything will be lovely in the garden.

✓ A great deal has been said about the IFS. I have heard my hon. friend the Minister of State, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon defending the external publicity. She did it and it is her duty to do so. We do not condemn everybody in the Foreign Service. They are our kith and kin, but surely there are glaring abuses which have got to be tackled and here are special, specific accusations made against the conduct of these people. The Prime Minister has today a sizeable family of aides in the House as well as outside, and I wish they make a very special study of this article where instances are given of how in cocktail parties certain talks are indulged in by Indian officials which go against the grain. That is why we say—not that we dislike the people who are in the Foreign Service; many of them are very good friends; it is not because of that—we want our Foreign Service to be not only Indianised but also nationalised. They should know how to be in tune with the real basis of the foreign policy of our country. They go to the English language medium schools and perhaps to some fashionable places somewhere and then, after learning one or two foreign languages—I wonder if they do it very well—they are shunted into the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Foreign Service, and they do not know how to present the culture of our country, the feelings of our country. Here is something about which the Ministry has got to take very serious note. They have to be given very special tuition.

My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai and also my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta have raised this question earlier—how we have to look after these people very carefully and how otherwise they go wrong. We say this not out of any animosity. We know how the Indian Civil Service personnel had let down India over the question of Kashmir before the Security Council, and Shri Krishna Menon had to come later on to rehabilitate the position, to repair the damage, the damage caused by years of negligence as far as the presentation of the Indian case was concerned. All that happened only because we do not have any real understanding of the realities of Indian life, of Indian aspirations, of India's desire to live in tune with the modern age as well as in conformity with the ideals of our civilisation. This sort of thing goes on all the time and we cannot do very much about it. ✓

In regard to Pakistan, as I said, the hidden—not very invisible—hand behind it has to be noted. I need not amplify it because so many hon. Members have referred to it. But since the Prime Minister's agreement of 1950 has become almost a dead letter, and since unlike the leader of the Jan Sangh party, Shri U. M. Trivedi, who spoke sometime ago, we cannot speak in the language of the ruling personnel in Pakistan—it goes against the grain; we cannot do just that;—and my hon. friend Shri Inder J. Malhotra said the same thing, and I was very happy to hear him, but we cannot do that—what are we going to do? Things are happening in Pakistan today, and it is not enough for our Government merely to say, "We are very sorry; it is very unfortunate; there is nothing that we can do about it." There has to be

a Government-to-Government approach. There has to be at least an effort, to begin with, at a Government-to-Government approach. There has to be an isolation, morally speaking, of the Pakistan Government before the bar of the world. And for that purpose, our case, the facts about the Indian situation, the position of the minority community in this country and all that have to be presented before the world.

In regard to Kashmir also,—I think Shri Inder J. Malhotra suggested it—I should recommend that procedure. Over and over again, this Kashmir question is made to dangle over our heads. It is repeatedly discussed in the Security Council. We have been threatened all the time that we shall be pilloried and we shall be asked to go there and explain our conduct. Perhaps it is time that we let the Security Council know that we are not going to answer this kind of accusations any further.

I feel that in view of certain things like the United Kingdom's allergy towards Indian interests and the United States' particular proclivities in the international sphere, it is necessary for India to try and amplify her links not with African countries but with countries of South-East Asia, and for that purpose, in so many ways, we can develop our economic relations with countries like Burma or Indonesia or Thailand or Ceylon.

The Prime Minister has taken a lead in starting what was called the Bandung programme of talks where politically he has been the principal spokesman, the principal upholder, I think, of Asian consciousness and unity. Now that Europe is going to combine under American pressure and American direction, it is very necessary that we should do something in that direction.

In regard to the United Kingdom, our very old friend, it is perfectly clear by this time, even though my

non-friend, the Finance Minister, is very, very unwilling to divulge what is happening in Brussels where we are very able represented—in spite of that—that the British Government has made up its mind to sell the commonwealth economic interests down the drain, if in return it can have a finger in the West European pie. And this has happened in the context of so many things. The Immigration Act has been passed in Britain. The British Government has specialised in mollycoddling a man like Phizo. They try to queer the pitch for a settlement between India and Pakistan and for a settlement of the Nagaland question. The mollycoddling of Phizo has gone on, and is deliberately done by the British Government.

An instance was brought up here in Parliament very recently about the pestering of an Indian national from Goa, who got Indian travel documents but who was sent about, back again from London to Paris and from Paris to London, so that he should bring his Portuguese papers! This kind of thing has gone on as far as the British Government is concerned. I feel it is certainly time that the non-white members of the commonwealth like India who can do independent thinking should begin seriously to give thought to the problem of alternative arrangements both among themselves and with others with whom they have a community of interests. The commonwealth can no longer be regarded as a unit which is moving towards a non-racial outlook. Its membership is not only devoid of any economic advantage but it is a hindrance to normal and business like relations with the rest of the world. Our membership of the sterling area, for instance, is a distinct disadvantage in developing trade relations with other countries, whether in the capitalist or the socialist world. Our political association with a complex so heavily committed to the cold war may not remain cold for any length of time and it gravely handicaps our initiative in promoting international peace.

Our experience of the past years has repeatedly shown that the central axis of the policies of Great Britain and most other white members of the commonwealth is orientated in a direction which is against our national interests. And therefore the divergencies between ourselves could become even more patent in the near future. That is all the more reason why we should consider this matter. It might be said that we have been connected with this association for so long and that we cannot sever it just like that. I do not say, "Make an immediate decision." I only ask for a serious thinking in regard to this problem. I say this association has not done us as much good as it is something talked about, and there is no reason to suppose that if we go outside the commonwealth, the British or the Australians or the Canadians would not discuss matters of commonwealth interest with us. Therefore, we must start an effort in disinvolvement in regard to our relationship with the commonwealth if we really are honest and serious in pursuing a policy of non-alignment, since the dominant interest in the commonwealth was fully committed to policies which are opposed to the whole notion of non-alignment. This is a matter to which I do feel the Prime Minister ought to give his attention as early as it is possible.

On account of certain lacunae in the prosecution of our policy, we have not succeeded in successfully implementing the policies well begun in regard to integration of Goa, for instance. Its impact on the third Plan has not been properly worked out, and Goa is being kept in quarantine for a little longer than was perhaps necessary.

In regard to Algeria, the Algerian representative in India has said that he wants a more concrete demonstration of India's support for Algeria and we do hope that the Prime Minister does something about it.

In regard to Pondicherry, I have got here the paper called *Republican*

[Shri M. N. Mukerjee]

Francaise, printed in two languages—French and Tamil—in Pondicherry, and it says *Vive L'nde Francaise—Long Live French India*. All sorts of things are said, which are absolutely intolerable under Indian conditions. Because Pondicherry is not a legal part of our country, this sort of thing is permitted to take place. I have raised this matter over and over again. I hate to have to say that it is difficult for us to go on waiting for the good pleasure of France, if that good pleasure dawns in some future, when France would condescend to leagally part with the possession of Pondicherry in our favour.

17 hrs.

These are some of the matters which I wanted to mention before the grants are taken up. As everybody knows, the basic position of our foreign policy, of non-alignment has the complete confidence of the country. It is only in regard to implementation that we do have certain serious objections and it is only in regard to certain perspectives, certain angles of view, that we do want to put forward our ideas, which we feel are more in conformity with the interests of our country, than the Government is prepared to concede. With these words, I wish the Prime Minister gives us some satisfaction in regard to the variety of criticisms which have been made in the course of the debate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the House for what the hon. Members have said, including their criticisms of the working of the External Affairs Ministry. Just before me, Shri H. N. Mukerjee said that so far as the policy was concerned, they are greatly in agreement and it is only in the implementation of it that criticisms arise. In the course of the debate today, some hon. Members new to the House have challenged what I thought not only the basic policies we indulge

in, but the basic approaches even. All I can say is that they are new to this House and do not know how we function and possibly do not know much about the subject they were talking about.

But I was surprised to hear the speech of Shri Anthony. He challenged the very basis of what we are doing and I think the argument he raised was quite so extraordinary that I was simply taken aback that anything so ridiculous could come from an hon. Member of this House. The one thing in regard to our policy today is that it is recognised by those who were critics of it for a very long time as the only policy that India could pursue. It is recognised and appreciated and to imagine that by pursuing any other policy, we would have done better is, I submit, to be ignorant of what is happening in the world.

He made a long string of things of what is happening in Laos, Vietnam and other places. I wonder if he knows anything about what is happening in Laos and Vietnam, because in Laos and Vietnam much is happening which is not very creditable. The whole of Laos and Vietnam depends, it is recognised now more than before, on the policy of what is called—I do not like the word—"neutrality". Every person, even members of the rival blocs agree that Laos and Vietnam must be neutral and must not attach themselves to this or that military bloc. The whole policy depends upon what was laid down in Geneva six or seven years ago—the Geneva Agreements. It is in so far as these agreements have not been acted upon that trouble has arisen. I would commend to Shri Anthony the fact that how force of circumstances have led people in other countries to come to the conclusion that the only possible policy for Laos and Vietnam is that of what is called "neutrality" or non-alignment. They are right in the middle of an area which is dangerous and if it is so there, how exactly does he come to the conclusion that in

India, we should leave our policy of non-alignment? I am sorry to say that my mind does not function in that peculiar way. I do not see the logic of it. I had used a strong word; I called it rather absurd or ridiculous. I do not wish to hurt Shri Anthony by strong language. But what he said hurt me as being quite beyond the thinking of reasonable human beings.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): It is a little too much.

An Hon. Member: Too unkind.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The whole concept is wrong. It is not what he said, but the whole concept that leads to this is wrong. The whole concept is that India should seek refuge and shelter itself under the wings of some great power bloc.

What is happening in the world today is that those who take shelter get into trouble. That is what is happening whatever bloc they may belong to, because they invite trouble from the other bloc. I am talking of the practical way; I am not talking about the much more important reason, which is that we have an individuality in India.

Apart from our bigness, there is something which I value in India. I would not be so proud of India if India had no particular individuality except bigness and followed that country's or this country's decisions in regard to foreign affairs or internal affairs. I think it would be a horrible position for India to occupy. India has not only a very strong individuality; it has a long history and is a cultural entity. We have gone wrong in many places, which is different. Much there that is wrong, I think, in India today is superstition and all that. Nevertheless, it is a tremendous cultural unit. It has a certain mission, I do believe, for the rest of the world in politics as in other things. I am not saying this in any spirit of vain glory or thinking that we are better than the rest.

Every country has a mission, but it so happens that I think in the present day world of war and violence, what India has stood for has some greater importance than perhaps other things. Another very big thing in which the various western countries are leaders is what might be called science and technology. It is a tremendous mission to change the world through science and technology. That is happening. Therefore, we bow down to them in regard to science and technology. But bowing down to them in regard to science and technology does not mean our bowing down to them in regard to morality and ethics. I do not see, I fail to understand, how a country which becomes a great power necessarily becomes greater in wisdom. I do not see that at all.

I do not say that the bigness of India makes India great. It is not the bigness of India; it is something else which I cannot perhaps easily describe, but which I feel, which has made India great through 5,000 years—a certain continuity and tradition. Much evil has come India's way and we have suffered because of it and become weak and all that. But nevertheless, there is good in India which is an essential basic thing. We attach ourselves to these power blocs—why? To protect us from somebody? We are damned then; we are doomed; whether we are protected or not is immaterial, but by the mere act of doing so, we give up our individuality, what we stand for and what we stood for through the ages. Am I going to give all this up for a mess of pottage? I am afraid I react rather strongly to any such suggestion. I cannot conceive it; I shall fight any such idea of leaving this principle of non-alignment so far as we are concerned. And leaving it when? When the world recognises its importance, when the world thinks more and more of it as a solution of its ills, when in fact on the purely practical and limited ground it is considered more useful—leave out morals and ethics apart.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Why is it, I should like hon. Members to consider, that after these 14 years or so of our independence when many people, our critics prophesied doom for us and going to pieces—and we did have plenty of trouble, India is thought of rather highly in the councils of the world, and why is it that India is searched for when somebody is required to hold the balance? When people cannot agree about others they go to India. There is something in that.

Yesterday, we had the ceremony, a rather moving ceremony I thought, of the presidential change-over to which all of us were invited and, presumably, were present. It seemed to symbolise, the simplicity of it with its quiet dignity, what India stands for. Here was a man, our retiring President, who is a high intellectual, very able, whose life had been one of service, but a man of the people—that is the essence—who rose to this very high position in India because of his services and sacrifices, and beloved of the people. Quietly, without fuss, he handed over the presidency at the will of the people to the new choice of the people who sat next to him. They shook hands and exchanged chairs. That act of exchanging chairs quietly and peacefully in accordance with the will of the people seemed to be very significant; how quiet we had done this thing which almost in every part of Asia has given rise to trouble and upheaval and all that kind of thing. There was a certain nobility about it. It can only be done by a nation with a background, with a long history, a nation which has learnt how to behave. There was nothing very showy about it, but there was hundreds of generations of breeding about it. Take the two persons most concerned, the retiring President and the one who came in—both great men, somewhat different from each other though both noble men, and each distinguished above others in many ways.

I mentioned this because it moved me, as it must have moved others —

But I mention this as typical of India in the present age, because that represented to me not only a certain continuity, a certain way of doing things, but also an outlook which is not wedded to the past; it accepts the past, it honours the past, it wants to remember the past, but it looks to the future. So it brings about a certain synthesis between the past and the future. That is how it struck me. May be, I attach more importance to this than was perhaps necessary, but I do mention this because.

India's past, present and future revolts against this idea of our becoming a camp followers by a military group.

What does that mean? What does non-alignment mean? What does alignment mean? Alignment means joining up with other military powers for military purposes, where, whatever people may say, decisions are made, military decisions are made by those who have big military forces. May be, one can affect them slightly here and there by bringing pressure, but essentially those decisions are made by the big military forces. It means adopting a military outlook, adopting the method of deciding things by military methods, and then follows the arms race and all that. We also keep an arm. We increase the army and air force when the need arises. We are pacifists, as I have said many times. But I hope we have not got the military mind which interprets events only through military ways, of joining a group. Because, when we talk of non-alignment, we do not say that we will not be aligned with countries for friendly purposes. In hundred and one things we get aligned with other countries. But we are not going to be aligned for military purposes. That is the main thing. Now, military purpose means our giving up our whole soul, all that we have stood for, all that we think of, and handing over our future to others because they have promised to defend us and because they have got bigger armies and, may be, atom

bombs etc. The whole idea is horrible to me. It is intolerable to think of. I would rather India sink and die than it should continue in that fashion as a camp follower of some other nation. India is too great a country to become that.

But we are not inimical or hostile to any country. We want to be friendly to all of them, and we have succeeded remarkably in that. We are often criticised. Because we do not fall into line people think that other countries are hostile to us. They are very wrong. Except, unfortunately, for two of our neighbouring countries, namely, Pakistan and China which, for the moment, are hostile to us—I hope, not for ever, not for very long; for the moment they are hostile to us—we are friendly with all the other countries.

Then we are criticised for our publicity. It is asked why our publicity organisation does not present our case adequately. Of course, they are not always very successful. But I would submit to this House that it is not so much the fault of our publicity apparatus or our issuing facts and other things which leads to criticism of India. There are many factors, one of the factors being that people have developed—we also, I suppose—closed minds in regard to certain subjects. On certain subjects which affect us, if I may say so with all respect—I do not know with what hostility or objectivity Pakistan views things—I am prepared to say that our minds are closed, to some extent, about Pakistan, because we are angered with Pakistan. So, those countries have got closed minds, because of their military alliances and the like. They do not like any person not following in their wake and, therefore, they criticise it; their newspapers criticise it. But I can say with some confidence that in spite of the criticism sometimes, not always, of the political leaders, it is remarkable how in all these countries the common man expresses appreciation for India and affection for India. It is quite remarkable. Go to any

bloc; whether you go to the United States of America and meet anybody in the street, a taxman or anybody else or you go to the Soviet Union or ask anybody who has been there, it is quite extraordinary the idea of India they have got; may be wrong, possibly. I myself get frightened at this idea of India's standing for peace and goodwill which they have got, because they are fed up with talks of war all the time and they think India stands for peace. So, India is not in a bad way, so far as public opinion in other countries is concerned, and even where the opinion of Government is concerned.

Hon. Members have criticised somewhat the Foreign Service, specially what they did in regard to Goa. I have not seen the number of the Economic Weekly to which the hon. Member has referred, but I do know what was done in America and I think that quite a creditable amount of work was done in regard to Goa itself. So, the best statements in regard to Goa and our policy in taking action in Goa were made in the United States by our Ambassador in the United States very clear, very definite and very forceful. Immediately the Goan action took place something was not said. That is perfectly true. The reason for it was that they did not quite know. The reason for their not knowing was that we did not want to allow people to know before the action itself, even our own people, because the whole thing depended on swift action. If that was known by others that element of swiftness is gone. Because we were swift we managed to save a great part of Goa which the Portuguese had decided to blow up. Actually even when they had dynamite and everything they could not use it. I feared if they had got to know that we were coming, even a day or two's difference would have made them possibly blow up things and do other things to impede our progress. As the House knows, we got there in a day. Naturally, we could not even take the risk of telling our own men even in India. I did not

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

tell the House except that vaguely and generally I talked about it. Although we had fixed the date many days before and we knew the exact date, I did not dare say it. As I said, I talked in vague language because we did not want to take that risk. So, none of our missions abroad knew about it and they were taken aback—they did not know—

When a fierce onslaught came. They asked us, "What are we to say? Tell us the facts." They waited till we sent the facts and they started saying that. So there was a slight gap right at the beginning.

I should like to say this about our Foreign Service generally—I forget now how many hundreds of people we have got in our Foreign Service—I do not say all of them are paragons of virtue or of anything else, but by and large, I think, our Foreign Service compares advantageously with any Foreign Service in the world. That is not my opinion. I was reading a book the other day—I forget the name of it—by a retired very eminent diplomat of England. He said that one of the remarkable features of the age, since the last war, has been the growth of Indian diplomacy which he has praised in very high terms. He praises another country too in this connection. I am not mentioning that country here. There is nothing secret about it. It is a European country and not an Asian country. He said that the diplomacy of these two countries has surprised people by its ability and so on and so forth. That is a general opinion. In every big world centre of diplomacy the Indian diplomats are thought of highly. They are consulted, of course, partly because they represent a great big country which—I do not like the word—in effect, not in terms of money and power, is a great power and is becoming a great power daily more and more. It is recognised a great power

since the influence that it exercises is not military or monetary. The influence is something else. That is something deeper which Shri Anthony would have me lose, give up and become like many others, camp-followers of other powers. So I would say—because I know most of our people in our Foreign Service—naturally, they are of all grades; some are brilliant, some are less brilliant, some are able, some are less able. That is so, of course. I cannot speak for every one, but, by and large,—and I know large numbers of other diplomats too, of other countries—I think our diplomats compare very favourably with the diplomats of every other country ✓

Someone criticised a classification, in our report, of our Missions into 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D',—I am sorry, there is no 'D' there are only 'A', 'B', and 'C'.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is coming perhaps, in the near future.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The classification, rightly or wrongly, was made, about climate factors, about the cost of living there and other factors. For instance, I think Moscow is put in 'B'. That does not mean that those in 'A'—Beirut is in 'A'—are superior or more important than those in 'B'.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Moscow is in 'A', I believe.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is due to other reasons, the difficulty of living there. Originally Moscow was in 'C'; it has been promoted to 'B'. But every one should know that our ablest diplomat, the most experienced one, is our Ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Dutt. There it is. You don't judge by 'A', 'B', 'C', as to where we send our men.

It is true to some extent, though not wholly, that in Africa, where we are spreading out now, sometimes

young people, young diplomats have been sent. Even there, senior diplomats have been sent, because we attach great importance to Africa. Unfortunately, we have, nearly all of us, been trained in the English language. The new persons in the Foreign Service have to learn other languages. But we are not so conversant with the French language as we are with English. And Africa, most of it, requires the French language. These are local difficulties which we get over by training them. But I wish to assure the House that we attach the greatest importance to Africa, and it is completely wrong to say that we attach greater importance to places in Europe than to Asia and Africa.

It is true that some places in Europe are of high importance. Our four most important posts, as we consider them, were Washington, London, Moscow and Peking. At Peking we have no Ambassador now; we have a Mission of course, we have a Counsellor; but no Ambassador has been sent there yet since the last one was withdrawn. But these are four most important ones from the point of view of world affairs, from the point of view of our own interests.

It is perfectly true that Peking in the old days was a very important post, but the persons there had not much to do not only in the sense of normal life, but even in business, in his own work. Sometimes things come with a rush. For instance, all our Embassies have to do a great deal of work in regard to business matters, trade, etc. There was none there. There is no educational matter there, very small ones here and there. Life itself was at a low ebb, in regard to diplomatic life, I mean—otherwise it may be at a high ebb. So these are differences which count, and the climate of Peking did not suit many people unless they were terribly healthy. So it was put in a low grade; because, normally speaking,

people could not remain there for long without their health suffering. Take, for instance, Addis Ababa. Three of our Ambassadors there just could not stand the height, the altitude of Addis Ababa. It is over nine thousand feet. These are the considerations that led to this division in this way. It has nothing to do with importance.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee talked about the European Common Market and this business that is going on and said that the dominant interests in the Commonwealth are doing this. I do not know what he considers dominant interests except, of course, United Kingdom, because all the other members—Canada, Australia, etc.—are very much against the European Common Market, against the United Kingdom coming into it. The fact to be remembered is that the European common market may be good for those who are in it, any may be good—I do not know; it is not for me to judge—for United Kingdom. It is not good for us. It will do us some harm. More important than that, this is a first step in a particular direction, the direction being a certain measure of growing political solidarity between those countries. I do not know what this will lead to. But, I fear it will not lead to anything good. I am talking about political solidarity. That, of course, is for England to decide. It will have certain consequences on the Commonwealth. I do not mean to say that the Commonwealth will break up. I do not like things breaking up. Anything which might do some good should continue. But, its influence will become less ultimately.

I did not quite understand when somebody said that we should have Government to Government approach to Pakistan. What does that mean unless he means Prime Minister—President approach? Government to Government approach we are always having. One Government deals with the other Government daily.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Shri Frank Anthony, in the course of his eloquent address, also referred to the grave mistake we made about Tibet. We thought about Tibet and discussed it many a time. I entirely fail to understand what else by an iota we could have done than what we did. I do not just understand that: as if Tibet was something in our pocket which we handed over to China. I cannot understand it. There was nothing else that we could do. Practically or otherwise, even if we had fore-knowledge of events and knew what China did subsequently in our border areas, what else could we have done?

Shri Nath Pai: Was it not pointed out during the debate when it took place that it was according to you or a publication published by your Ministry that there was a cipher mistake between the words sovereignty and suzerainty whereas your instructions to your Ambassador Shri Panikkar were that he concede suzerainty and because of cipher mistake, sovereignty was conceded? It has been said. I produced this document in the House on the 7th of December. You did not say anything.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Maybe there was no mistake unless it was a deliberate mistake of the Chinese Government. We certainly used the word "suzerainty". I do not know if it is possible to translate suzerainty and sovereignty in the Chinese language separately: I do not know. They do not use the English language; they do not understand it. Anyhow, if we used it, how could we force that down them? They proceeded by sending armies to Tibet. Either conquest or fear of military action led the then Government of Tibet yielding to them and signing a treaty. Where do was come in? We went on saying, let us say suzerainty and they did not accept it.

Shri Nath Pai: Must we support what we cannot stop? Is that what you have always taught us? Must

we support in the world what we cannot stop? Why did we keep quiet when the armies were coming. You just now said that you acceded to the Chinese only the right of suzerainty which does not incorporate the conception of posting their armies. Not a word was raised by us against this misinterpretation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not a question of our conceding this or that. We, in our correspondence with them, talked about our acknowledging the fact that they had suzerainty over Tibet historically in the various periods. They did not accept that. Leave out what they said—in fact, they did not accept—what do we do about it? We go about in the world, carrying on agitation that they say sovereignty and we say suzerainty?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I submit, when China refuses to recognise India's sovereignty over Kashmir, why should we recognise China's sovereignty over Tibet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Here is a novel point which the hon. Member has raised. I should have thought it has nothing to do with it.

Shri Frank Anthony: I think the Prime Minister referred to what I said. I merely said, owing to weakness we had accepted or recognised the conquest of Tibet. What I did ask was, what is preventing the Government now from allowing the Dalai Lama to function freely in this country.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Dalai Lama is perfectly free here, except that we have said that we will not permit any kind of so-called emigre Government to function here. Otherwise, he is perfectly free. He does what he likes; he says what he likes. It is not a question of Tibet; we do not want any kind of an emigre Government to function here. About Pondicherry, the latest information is that the French Government have introduced a measure in their—I do not know about their complicated

Constitution—Foreign Affairs Committee or some such committee about the *de jure* transfer of sovereignty. A kind of Bill has been introduced, but I cannot say, having long experience of these matters in regard to Pondicherry, how long it will take to pass.

Shri Hem Barua: Pending the adoption of the Bill there, can we not extend our Constitution to Pondicherry, We can.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We should extend our Constitution?

Shri Hem Barua: I say that the Bill is pending there on the legislative anvil in France, with regard to the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry. And this matter has been hanging fire for a long time. So, we can take steps to extend our Constitution, since the Bill has been introduced in the French Parliament already.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What steps can we take? It is completely in our possession. It is functioning under us. The only steps we can take are to bring forward a Bill here or in Parliament to make it a part of the Union of India and allow them representation here. That is the only thing that they do not have; otherwise, they are completely with us.

Shri Hem Barua: Certain laws of ours also can be extended and the Constitutional provisions can be extended.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): Such as in regard to the Supreme Court etc.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: The appeal has to go to the court in France in certain cases.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as the right of appeal is concerned, I think we have done that, or we are in the process of doing that. The only thing remaining almost is this representation in Parliament. And we would prefer to do it naturally with the good-will of France. If we cannot do it that way, it is a different matter, but we prefer to do that.

538(A1) LSD—9.

France, as hon. Members will know, has passed through a very extraordinary period during the last seven or eight or ten years, with Governments changing so often. Now, the present regime of President De Gaulle is a firmer Government, presumably, but it has had a great deal of trouble. And whenever we have approached them, as we have approached them often enough, they have said, 'Yes, of course, we agree with you, but please wait a little; we have got our own troubles.' Take, Algeria, for instance. The question is we have to decide whether it is worth-while ignoring them altogether and taking some steps. It was not worth-while. When we have Pondicherry, and we can do what we like, except for some constitutional measures, it is not worth-while to irritate a great country like France for that purpose, especially when a short while ago we were told that they are going to. . .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I ask a question? Some time ago, the French Government had given us very specific indications which were reported to Parliament that in the very near future—at that particular point of time—they were going to bring in legislation for the legal transfer of the territory to India. Have the French Government forgotten that promise or gone back on it? Is there any information on that in the Prime Minister's possession.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: 'Some time ago' refers, I think, to probably September or October last. It is in furtherance of that promise that they have put in this Bill now. That is what they say. This is a little later.

Algeria has been referred to, and Algeria has been a very difficult problem from the French point of view, and it was difficult for us to press very hard that ignoring all other difficulties they must go ahead, but we have been pressing it forward, and I hope that this will now be done.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Now about Algeria, it was a possibility sometime ago before the recent agreement between France and the Provisional Government of Algeria, that there was some value in recognising the Provisional Government of Algeria. It was purely a gesture; it meant nothing else. It was a gesture, bringing some pressure on the French Government to recognise that Government, to deal with that Government and to come to an agreement. That was the whole point. Now to say that we must do it has no value at all; it has a great deal of the reverse of value.

Now certain processes have started. There is no question of bringing pressure on France. The present problem is to put an end to the violence, to the terrorism of the OAS. That is common ground between the French Government and the Algerian Nationalists Government. The only thing that can come in the way of the fulfilment of the processes that have started is this extreme violence. For instance, there has already been a referendum in France. That is over. A referendum is to take place in Algeria early in July—in two or three months. But it is a possibility that the violence grows so much that it is difficult to hold a referendum. That will come in the way.

Today it is to the interest of both France and Algeria to put an end to this violence; otherwise, not only will the Algerian agreement not be implemented, but the French Government itself may fall. This is as much against the French Government. It cannot possibly face the future; if it cannot do it, it will have no prestige left. In fact, the whole violence is aimed at making the French Government fall.

Therefore, that is the first objective of both these Governments. At the present moment, there is a Joint Executive in Algeria, partly Alge-

rian, partly French, for this interval of two months or so.

Now, there is no particular value in recognising this Algerian Government. We are as a matter of fact, for practical purposes, dealing with it. We deal with it directly, in so far as we have to deal with it.

Shri Nath Pai: If it has no value, why are they pleading with you that you extend this recognition to give a psychological boost that they want to have.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It has a psychological disadvantage because it creates a certain temper in France which is against France.

Shri Nath Pai: 34 other governments, including the USSR, have recognised it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The USSR has got into great trouble because it tried to recognise it. Having said so, it has done nothing. It has stopped at that, because the French Ambassador was withdrawn. You may say that the French are acting in a very infantile manner, if you like, in this matter. But there it is. If there was something of value to be gained, one might do it. There is no value to be gained, because we recognise for practical purposes the Algerian Government.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: When the Algerian Government want it, how do we feel so positive that there is no value in it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the Algerian Government wants something which may not be quite right from our point of view, I do not know whether we should do it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Could you explain?

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): It is not as though we have

no sympathy for the freedom movement of Algeria. Any number of times, the Prime Minister has declared at Congress meetings our sympathy for that freedom movement.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We all agree about the tremendous sacrifices of Algeria. We are all with it, of course. But the point here is a technical point, of acknowledging a Government. Normally one does not acknowledge a Government which does not exist in the soil of the country that it is governing. It is only acknowledged in war, when there is an *emigre* Government functioning to harass the enemy. De Gaulle's Government was an *emigre* Government and the British Government recognised it when the Germans were occupying France. But one recognises governments which are functioning in the soil of the countries which they are presumed to govern. That is the basic thing. You may recognise it as a gesture, and if it is in the balance good, you may do so. At the present moment, what is functioning there is a joint executive government of the French and the Algerians. The Algerian representatives have been appointed by the provisional government. The provisional government has been acknowledged by the French Government. They deal with it; they came to an agreement with it and they are trying to implement that agreement. Now, to do something which may—it would not upset the agreement by itself—come in the way we deal with the French people, which may come in the way of that agreement will not be desirable.

Shri Nath Pai: Sorry, we fail to be convinced by that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should like, very briefly, to touch on two or three matters. **Shri Indrajit Gupta** referred to the speech of **Shrimati Indira Gandhi** in Canada, which was reported. It is a manifestly incorrect report because one particular aspect

of it was something about the massacre of the Portuguese. It is the other way about. She said that if people went there unarmed, the Portuguese would massacre them, as they had done previously in small numbers. There is no question of massacre of the Portuguese. Who is going to massacre the Portuguese, if unarmed people go there. So, you have to face the contingency of our own people going there unarmed in large numbers—several thousands being massacred by the Portuguese. That would have created a situation which our Government could not tolerate.

I won't say anything about Kashmir. It has recently been discussed in the Security Council. I would say that the Defence Minister's speech was very....

Shri Nambiar: On the point of alleged Communists encouraging trouble in Goa, which was also quoted by Mrs. Indira Gandhi no reply has been given. **Shrimati Indira Gandhi** made a reference to Communists in her speech.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what she said. I have not been able to confirm that. This I know. It is obvious. But I do not know what other things she might have said. She might as well have said that the communists might have incited people to march inside. I cannot confirm that.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): On a point of order, Sir. What has **Shrimati Indira Gandhi** to do with the Government of India and why is the Prime Minister explaining?

Mr. Speaker: Because some criticism was made. The hon. Member was probably not here then.

Shri P. K. Deo: Still what has she to do with the Government of India?

Mr. Speaker: Because it was brought in by the other speakers, therefore, it is denied.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are two matters which I should like to say something about. One is the Chinese border and then there is disarmament.

About disarmament it is difficult for me to go into details, now, because the matter is being discussed. So far as the nuclear tests are concerned, the 8 neutral countries presented a proposal which both the major parties said they would consider. They are considering that; they have not come to any decision. I think they will agree to something which stops these nuclear tests.

As for disarmament also, it is a complicated subject and I cannot discuss it in 5 minutes. But the presence of the so-called neutral countries in this disarmament committee has been undoubtedly of value. The value, first of all, is that the whole tone of the discussions in this committee has been different from the one on previous occasions. Now merely because of the presence of neutral countries, there has been very little strong language used by anybody. They have all spoken, more or less, gently to each other and there is a general spirit of accommodation, trying to find something. But there is a definite barrier, a gap which they cannot cross, which they might cross any day. Till they cross it, they will always take a strong line about crossing it.

Secondly, the neutral countries' presence there—they have made various suggestions—has opened out various avenues of thought which has helped the committee. But it has not helped it sufficiently to cross that barrier which divides the two sides, the barrier ultimately being one of fear and dislike and distrust of each other. In fact, I may say that I believe they will some time or the other come to an agreement because there is no other way but to come to an agreement. The other way is going gradually towards something like annihilation of each other.

Another important question which lies behind disarmament is the Berlin

issue. In regard to the Berlin issue it is said that much progress has been made in talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two principal parties. Another important development is that the German Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer does not like this progress to be made and there has been some difference of opinion between him and the American Government. However it may be, if the Berlin issue is solved there is no doubt that a very big step will have been taken.

Now coming to the border question it is very easy for some hon. Members to talk some new Members, I would say, lest the old Members might suspect I am referring to them—bravely of our border and say that we should do this and that. As every one realises now, any war between India and China is going to be a tremendously disastrous affair. What is more, it may well become interminable because I do not see any easy possibility of either party defeating the other. Warring what for? Well, for certain pieces of territory, important though they may be, but some pieces of mountain territory. Therefore, one tries to avoid war because war would be disastrous both for India and China. It is our policy to avoid war unless it is thrust upon us but whether we avoid war or not, we have to be prepared for it and we prepare for it to defend these areas and to recover them. How to recover them short of war? If one is prepared to recover them and one is strong enough, other things also help in the process and it is possible that those things plus our preparation for any action may result in some kind of agreement for these areas to be liberated. Therefore, to say that we will not talk to the Chinese Government is not right. But to talk to them we must talk to them on some basis and not just talk to them on the air. What basis can there be? We had suggested at one time that they should withdraw according to our maps and we should withdraw according to

their maps leaving the area in between which is administered. It does not very much matter because it is mountain area where very few people dwell. These are important and strategic areas but no administration existed there and none is necessary for the time being. I had suggested and I had further added something a little later that, in regard to the northern Tibet-Aksai Chin where they built a road and which was used as a caravan route, they might use that road for civilian purposes for a temporary period till we discussed this matter and presumably came to an agreement or not or whatever it might be. All this was for a temporary period. This was to enable us to talk to each other and discuss the matter. So, I had said they should withdraw according to our maps, which meant withdrawal from the vast area which they have taken, and our withdrawal according to their maps. This applies, may I say, entirely to the Ladakh area and not the eastern area at all, because we are not going to withdraw in the east. In the Ladakh area, it meant a very small withdrawal for us—a few villages—and it meant a large withdrawal for them.

I had said that for civilian use, as they used to before, they could continue to use the Aksai Chin road for a temporary period. I think that was a very fair offer which they did not accept. I still think that is a fair offer. That would immediately give us a base for talks, because without a base, one cannot talk merely repeating our respective claims. The only other basis was the basis of the officials' report. On that basis I was discussing it.

I do not know if it is worth-while my putting before the House some general considerations. We live in a turbulent, dynamic and fast changing world, and one hesitates to take a step which might make it much more turbulent. We live in a world which is fast changing economically also.

Our country is fast changing, and we would not like to do something which will stop that change or reduce the pace of that change. Much has happened in our country during the last few years. Much has happened in China. We have heard how a great leap forward was there in China. We have also heard of a considerable going back in China. There is no doubt that, because, not only of bad harvests but for other internal reasons—economic and otherwise—there has been a great setback in China.

What is very interesting is that the great attack that took place in the early days of this new regime there, on what might be called the ancient Chinese civilisation, the traditional Chinese culture, has largely ceased or anyhow there is a reappearance of the traditional culture. Even Confucious is talked about now. He was banned; and there is a certain feeling of disillusionment of youth. There has been no political reaction or political relaxation there at all. The tension is still there, but, nevertheless, there is a certain relaxation in life generally. It is a period of retreat from the extreme step taken previously and a certain craving among the youth for some of their older culture. This may change again, of course.

But I am merely pointing out that whatever happens in China—China being a very great country, very great not only in size but in background and in culture—is bound to have a powerful effect on the world, and these changes are being watched very closely. Our merely ignoring these facts and thinking of a quick military solution of this very difficult problem before us is perhaps not wise. But it is wise and essential that we should think of military steps lest others fail. That is why we have been engaged in road-building, building up our military apparatus, etc. Till that is done, our indulging in some adventure would not be wise.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

18 hrs.

There are one or two others things I would like to mention before I take leave of the House. For the first time, I think, the Estimates Committee of this House had a look at the External Affairs Ministry last year. The look was, as far as I can make out, satisfactory to both parties. They spent some time over it, as they do. They made certain suggestions. Most of their suggestions have been accepted by the Ministry and in regard to some of them they pointed out their difficulties. And so, they parted with mutual expressions of satisfaction. They went deeply into the working of the Ministry and they had a greater chance of judging what was being done, the expenditure, etc.

In regard to the expenditure, may I remind the House that out of the big figures that are put in these demands for grants in the name of the External Affairs Ministry, very large sums have practically nothing to do with External Affairs. There are the Naga Hills; there are the very expensive Assam Rifles, for whom the External Affairs Ministry pays. It is part of the army, a private army; perhaps not a private army, but it is apart from the regular army and a very good army too. Then, there is the North-East Frontier Agency. There is Goa, Daman, Diu, Nagar Haveli and a number, of other things, which have nothing to do with External Affairs, but which due to historical chance are there. They may later be taken out. Again, there are large sums which we pay as our contribution to the United Nations and various other organisations such as that, which come into External Affairs, so that the actual sum spent on the External Affairs Ministry is considerably less than the demands made.

Shri Nath Pai: I would like to put one question to the Prime Minister,

because if that statement is allowed to remain, perhaps we would be misunderstood colossally. The Prime Minister said that the date for the liberation of Goa was fixed long in advance. That will bring the charge that we were only inventing excuses, having already decided upon it. He said in defending the action of our Embassy in Washington that we wanted to keep it a secret, but we had fixed the date much in advance. That brings once again the charge that we were playing a double game. Would he kindly explain what "much in advance" means? Otherwise, it means that we were cooking up excuses, having fixed the date.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: "Much in advance" means a week or ten days.

Mr. Speaker: May I put all the cut motions together?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I put all the cut motions to the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"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, 1963, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 116, relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

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

DEMAND NO. 16—TRIBAL AREAS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8, 16,49,000 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, 1963, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND NO. 17—NAGA HILLS—
TUENSANG AREA

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,16,81,000 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, 1963 in respect of Naga Hills—Tuensang Area."

DEMAND NO. 18—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,99,16,000 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, 1963, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 19—STATE OF PONDICHERRY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,33,88,000 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, 1963, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'."

DEMAND NO.—20—DADRA AND NAGAR
HAVELI AREA

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,75,000 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, 1963, in respect of 'Dadra and Nagar Haveli Area'."

DEMAND NO. 21—GOA, DAMAN AND
DIU

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,95,78,000 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, 1963, in respect of 'Goa, Daman and Diu'."

DEMAND NO. 22—OTHER REVENUE
EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,60,18,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges, which will come in course or payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, in respect of 'Other revenue expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 116—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF
THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 67,65,000 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, 1963, in respect of 'Capital outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'."