[Mr. Speaker]
fully co-operate with him. The election is unanimous. There is no other proposal here.

Therefore, I wish him a safe tenure of office here, and I am sure the House agrees with me.

STATEMENT ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the past few months, as the House is aware, we have had the pleasure and privilege of welcoming to India many eminent visitors from abroad. These visitors came from many lands, as messengers of goodwill from nations with widely differing cultures and systems of thought and organisation. To all of them we extended a warm and cordial welcome in that spirit of friendliness towards all, which distinguishes our foreign policy, as indeed it does the traditions of our country and our people. I had long and detailed conversations with all of them, both on the major problems of the world, in their many aspects, and on matters of mutual interest to the particular country concerned and ourselves. I should like to take this opportunity of saying how valuable have been these talks and how much I have profited by them. It was, of course, not to be expected that, as a result of these talks, there would be sudden changes in the foreign policy of our country or of any of the other countries concerned. Foreign policies are not made and changed in that way. All the same, these talks at a personal level, held in a frank and informal atmosphere, have enabled us, and I hope our visitors too, to appreciate better each other's point of view. They have helped us to obtain a better understanding of the minds of those who in their respective countries, are directly concerned with the formulation and direction of policy. Where we have been unable to agree, we have agreed to differ.

It is not possible for me to cover all the ground of these talks or to refer, in this statement, to the many problems that afflict the world and are a matter of concern to us. Perhaps, at a later stage, I might refer in this House to some of these international problems. For the present, I should like to mention some important matters which were recently discussed by us with our distinguished visitors.

Of these visitors, the three recent ones have been Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State of the USA, and M. Pineau, Foreign Minister of France. We welcomed them as representatives of three leading countries in the world, and with each of them I discussed the international situation and also how best tension could be relaxed and peace, which is the objective of all countries, could best be promoted.

The occasion which brought these statesmen to this region of the world was the meeting of the SEATO Council in Karachi. To our great surprise, the Council at this meeting thought it fit, at the instance of one of its members, to discuss the question of Kashmir and include a declaration on this question in its final communique. In doing so, the Council confirmed our worst apprehensions about the organisation which it represent. The declared purpose of the South East Asia Treaty is to increase the defensive strength of the parties to the Treaty against aggression from outside and against internal subversion. How the question of Kashmir could come within the scope of the SEATO Council is not clear to us. Its reference to Kashmir could only mean that a military alliance is backing one country, namely, Pakistan, in its disputes with India. For any organisation to function in this way to the detriment of a country, which is friendly to the individual countries comprised in the organisation, would, at any time be considered an impropriety. In the present case, however, there is a further aspect. We have noted with regret that three other Commonwealth countries have associated themselves with the offending declaration. We have communicated our protest to all the countries concerned at the unusual procedure adopted by the Council.

I had talks with Mr. Dulles about the US military aid to Pakistan. I told him how this aid has been causing us serious concern. The atmosphere in Pakistan seems to be one of threats and menaces towards India. India continues to be the subject of bitter attack in sections of the Pakistan Press, and bellicose statements appear from time to time even from responsible leaders. More recently, there has been a recrudescence of border incidents which have, by their frequency and dispersion over a

wide area, assumed a special significance. Substance is thus lent to the growing belief in this country that whatever the object of the United States in giving military aid to Pakistan, in Pakistan itself the resulting acquisition of military strength has been generally welcomed not because it will increase Pakistan's defensive capacity against a potential aggressor, but because they hope thereby to be able to settle disputes with India from what is called a position of strength.

We in India wish Pakistan well. She has just declared herself a Republic, and we offer her our best wishes at the threshold of a new chapter in her history. We are sending one of our Ministers as a special envoy to Karachi to convey our felicitations in person. It is not our intention to enter upon any arms race with Pakistan or with any other country, even if we could afford such a competition. Our energies and our resources are completely absorbed and will continue to be absorbed for many years to come in our Five Year Plans, and none of us would wish to divert any part of our limited resources to further expenditure on arms, nevertheless, those responsible for the destiny of India have to take note of certain facts. I can only express our regret and disappointment that at a time when we in Asia should be bending our energies to the task of development, a new factor making for tension and instability should have been introduced by this arms aid. I have explained our views on this point clearly to Mr. Dulles and I hope he now has a better appreciation of our feelings.

Recent developments serve once again to focus attention on military pacts. These pacts, instead of dwindling in numbers, seems to be on the increase, and are being strengthened and enlarged, irrespective of previous commitments and declarations. This is the history of all pacts, more especially of the South East Asia Defence Treaty and the Baghdad Pact. The former came into existence at a time when, after many years of warfare, there was peace in South-East Asia. Tensions were relaxed and people looked forward to a return to normality. There was no possibility of aggression in the foreseeable future. Yet, at this moment of relief and the beginnings of hope, this Pact came into existence and resulted immediately in increasing tension. The more recent Baghdad Pact has already brought disruption, insecurity and discontent in Western Asia. Thus, the very objective for which these pacts were made is being defeated. It has been our firm conviction that these two treaties and similar military pacts and alliances do not add to the intrinsic defensive strength of the regions in the interest of which they are supposed to have been devised.

Talks on disarmament in the face of military pacts by either bloc and further preparations for war are inconsistent and a mockery of avowed purposes. There is always time to revise policies even if the Great Powers are involved in them, if the revision is in the common good and in the interests of peace. It is not by military alliances and the matching of strength with strength that tensions can be lowered and peace and stability re-established where conflict now prevails. We hold, and with each new experience are further confirmed in our conviction, that in the adherence to and the practice of the Five Principles, now widely known as the *Panch Shila* alone lies the promise of a new era of international peace and stability.

The coming of atomic energy and the dread weapons that it has let loose on the world, has made all previous thinking not only in regard to military matters but also other matters, out of date. Thinking people and the leaders of nations have, as a consequence, ruled out war. In this new situation, there is no logic in clinging to the idea of a cold war. We have stated repeatedly that nuclear weapons must be banned and that atomic energy must be used for the benefit of humanity and not be controlled by the Great Powers. If war is to be ruled out, then cold war becomes illogical and harmful. It can only keep up the atmosphere of hatred and fear, and the ever-present danger of being converted into a nuclear war.

I had discussions also on Goa with Mr. Secretary Dulles. As the House is aware, the joint statement issued by him and Mr. Cunha, the Foreign Minister of Portugal, some weeks ago, caused a deep feeling of resentment throughout India. We took this matter up immediately with the United States Government and explained to them how, in the context of the present situation in Goa, the association of the U.S. Secretary of State with a statement of that kind could only have one effect, that being to give encouragement to Portugal

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

in pursuing a policy which represents the worst type of colonialism. I told the House then that we would place our correspondence on this subject with the U.S. Government on the Table of the House. I am doing so today [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 26] and hon. Members will have an opportunity of seeing our notes and the reply of the United States.

12 NOON

Mr. Dulles, in his talks with me, assured me that, in subscribing to the joint statement, the U.S. was not supporting Portugal as against India. We do not, of course, doubt this statement, but the position nevertheless is that the joint communique is being interpreted, especially by Portuguese authorities, as if it supported their claims. We have made our position clear to the U.S. Government, and I want to repeat here that in no circumstance will we tolerate the continuance of the last remnants of Portuguese colonialism on Indian soil. We have been patient, and we shall continue to be patient, (*Shri V. G. Deshpande* : Why ?) but there will be no compromise on this issue. I still hope that friendly countries will impress on Portugal the unwisdom of following a policy of sixteenth century colonialism in the second half of the twentieth century.

With all the three Ministers I have had detailed discussions about the situation in Western Asia, All are agreed that this situation is an explosive one. I do not presume to give advice about any quick solution of this difficult problem. At the same time, I have no doubt in my mind that a solution can only emerge from a gradual relaxation of tension. Here again, the Baghdad Pact is partly responsible for a good deal of the present trouble which now plagues West Asia. It has rent asunder Arab unity and has thereby made the solution of a problem already difficult, still more difficult and complicated.

I discussed the situation in Indo-China with the three Foreign Ministers, particularly with the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, who is a co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference. When, in response to the invitation of the Geneva Powers, India accepted the Chairmanship of the three International Commissions in Indo-China, we did so in the hope that at long last peace would return permanently to this troubled region in South East Asia which is so close to us and with which we have so many old and historic ties. It appears now that the time schedule for elections as a preliminary to the unification of the two parts of Viet Nam, which was envisaged in the final declaration at Geneva, is unlikely to be fulfilled. We are compelled, therefore, to review the situation in so far as it concerns us. We have no intention of trying to escape from a position of responsibility, or to take a step which would hamper a peaceful settlement. We have, therefore, suggested to the two co-Chairmen that they should review the position and decide on the steps that should be taken to secure compliance with the Geneva Agreement. I have reason to hope that the two co-Chairmen will meet and discuss the present situation.

The discussions with the three Foreign Ministers also covered the present situation in East Asia, particularly in relation to the two coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu as well as Taiwan. I explained to them once more how in our view the basic cause of the trouble in East Asia is the non-recognition of a patent fact. That fact is the emergence of a new China, unified as never before in its history, strong powerful and conscious of its rights and dignity. I do not think that, so long as the Chinese People's Republic is not admitted to the United Nations, the situation in East Asia will return to normal. In particular, I expressed the view that China will never feel secure so long as Quemoy and Matsu remain in the occupation of hostile forces. The essential first step would be the withdrawal of those forces from these islands so that they can become part of the mainland. The Taiwan issue will still remain but I believe that if the coastal islands were to return to China, the problem of Taiwan could be handled a little more easily.

In this context we have been watching with interest the course of the talks at Geneva between the Ambassadors of the United States of America and China. Both sides are broadly agreed that they should settle disputes between them through peaceful negotiation. The main difficulty now is that of applying this principle to the particular case of Taiwan. We hope that a satisfactory formula in regard to this also will be found, thereby paving the way for a discussion of other outstanding matters, including a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the two countries.

I should like to refer in particular to the talk I had with M. Pineau about North Africa. We in India appreciate and welcome the steps taken by France to restore sovereignty to Morocco and Tunisia. The difficult problem of Algeria still remains. I was glad to find that M. Pineau takes a realistic view of the situation. The problem there is complicated by the existence of about one and a quarter million persons of European descent, who have been settled there for some generations. The House will not expect me to go into further details of these discussions. I hope that the problem of Algeria will also be solved to the mutual satisfaction of the French and the Algerian peoples.

Shortly before M. Pineau reached Delhi, we received from the French Government a draft of the treaty for the *de jure* transfer of sovereignty over the former French establishments in India. We do not foresee any difficulty about agreement on this draft and I hope that the *de jure* transfer of sovereignty will not be long delayed.

If peace is to be aimed at, disarmament is essential. As with every other difficult question, perhaps it is easier to proceed step by step. A sub-committee of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations has been meeting in London and there is already a large measure of agreement on this subject. Unfortunately, however, the growing tensions in the world do not create an atmosphere in favour of disarmament and yet the urgency of disarmament grows in proportion to the invention and accumulation of weapons of ever-increasing destructive potential. We believe in the unconditional prohibition of the production, use and experimentation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons and, as a step to that end, the suspension of experimental explosions and an armaments truce.

I should like to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to a very important event in recent weeks. I refer to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which met recently in Moscow. There can be no doubt that this Congress has adopted a new line and a new policy. This new line, both in political thinking and in practical policy, appears to be based upon a more realistic appreciation of the present world situation and represents a significant process of adaptation and adjustment. According to our principles, we do not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, just as we do not welcome any interference of others in our country. But any important development in any country which appears to be a step towards the creation of condition favourable to the pursuit of a policy of peaceful co-existence, is important for us as well as others. It is for this reason that we feel that the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Union are likely to have far-reaching effects. I hope that this development will lead to a further relaxation of tension in the world.

I should like to make some brief reference to a speech delivered by the Prime Minister of Pakistan yesterday in his Parliament. Normally, I would wait for a fuller and a more authoritative version before commenting on the speech. But, as I am speaking here today, I think I should say something about it.

I have read the brief report of this speech with sorrow and surprise. Chaudhuri Mohammad Ali has spoken in anger and has made some statements which are manifestly incorrect. He says that India was carrying on a campaign of fear and hatred and had created an atmosphere of hatred against Pakistan. It is easy to compare the press of India with the press of Pakistan and the statements made by responsible persons in India with those made in Pakistan.

There have been for long the most virulent attacks in Pakistan on India and frequent appeals for jehad. Has any responsible person or newspaper in India talked of war or indeed talked of hatred? We have even now an unceasing flow of migrants from East Pakistan to India. That is a great burden on us and a matter for serious concern. We have naturally drawn attention to this and to the reasons which compel people to leave their hearths and homes and lands and seek refuge in another country.

Mr. Mohammad Ali has referred to the recent border incidents and has said that they had been created by India and that in every single instance, aggression had come from the Indian side. It is a little difficult for me to deal with statements which have little connection with truth. I can give long lists of these incidents and I can give the facts behind them, in so far as we know, and any impartial authority can

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

judge. I shall only mention one well-known incident here because, in that case, an impartial authority did enquire and judge and give its decision. That was the Nekowal incident on the Jammu border. The United Nations Observers enquired into this and stated clearly where the fault lay. The then Prime Minister of Pakistan had assured as publicly that he would abide by the decision of the U. N. Observers and punish those who were guilty. We still await the carrying out of this assurance. We have written repeatedly with no effect.

Mr. Mohammad Ali has said that he wrote to me and made certain proposals and that he had received no reply from me. This is correct. But his message reached me night before last. We have had just one day to consider it. We hope to send an answer soon. In his message, Mr. Mohammad Ali has referred to a decision arrived at at a meeting of the Joint Steering Committee on the 11th and 12th March 1955 for the demarcation of the Indo-Pakistan border and apparently accuses India of delay in giving effect to this decision. This decision was further considered at a meeting of our Home Minister with the Pakistan Home Minister in May 1955 and they arrived at an agreement, referred to as the Pant-Mirza Agreement. The Pakistan Government took no action for the ratification of this agreement till the end of December 1955, and then suggested certain amendments to the agreement, which in effect, largely modified it. However, I welcome the Prime Minister's proposal for the demarcation of the Indo-Pakistan border and we are prepared to take this up immediately.

Mr. Mohammad Ali has suggested in his speech that India and Pakistan should declare that they would never go to war with each other. I welcome this proposal. Everyone knows that we have been suggesting a no-war declaration by both India and Pakistan for some years now. Our proposal, however, was not accepted by the Pakistan Government. I am glad that Mr. Mohammad Ali now looks with favour on this proposal and we shall gladly pursue this matter further.

There can be no greater folly than conflict between India and Pakistan. We have endeavoured to create friendly feelings between the two countries and I believe that, in spite of many unfortunate occurrences, there is today a large measure of friendship between the people of India and the people of Pakistan. It is not by military methods or threats ot war or of talking to each other from the so-called positions of strength that we shall come nearer. In this world of the atom bomb, both India and Pakistan are weak. But we can develop strength in other ways, strenth in friendship, in co-operation and in raising the standards of our people. I offer, in all goodwill and earnestness, the *Panch Shila* to the Prime Minister of Pakistan and I have every faith that if we base our dealings with one another on those Five Principles, the nightmare of fear and suspicion will fade away.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

CLASH BETWEEN INDIAN AND PAKISTANI ARMY UNITS AT HUSSAINIWALA HEADWORKS

Mr. Speaker: In view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister, I do not give my consent to the adjournment motion, to which I referred earlier.

LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION BILL

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion on the motion for reference of the Life Insurance Corporation Bill to a Select Committee. Out of 10 hours allotted for the pursions in the world do not create an atready been disposed of thus leaving 4 hours and 7 minutes.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav will continue his speech. But before Shri Vaishnav begins his speech, the hon. Prime Minister may lay on the Table the statement *re* : border incidents at Hussainiwala.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

BRIEF RECITAL OF FACTS RE: BORDER INCIDENTS AT HUSSAINIWALA

Shri Jawarharlal Nehru: As I stated just a little while ago, I beg to lay on the Table of the House a brief recital of the facts connected with the recent border incidents at Hussainiwala because the House is interested in having a correct recital of the facts. I need not take the time of the House in reading it.

[*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 27.]