

[Shri Kamath]

to the Committee for his absence which, in my humble judgment, cannot be condoned without reasons being assigned for the absence.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly read the first line of the next paragraph. It says:

"The member has also requested leave of absence for the entire period of the Fifteenth Session as he is suffering from enteric fever. The total period of his absence from the 18th March to 28th March, 1957 amounts to 11 days. The Committee recommends that the member be granted leave of absence for this period."

Shri Kamath: You will be pleased to see that the second part refers to the Fifteenth Session whereas the first part refers to the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Sessions.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): Sir, with your permission, I will explain the position. During the last session this hon. Member had applied for leave for 60 days. He was also absent for 60 days as he was ill and due to which he had applied for leave. But the rule is that leave can be granted only for 59 days, and if leave has to be granted for 60 days the permission of the House is necessary. Therefore, we asked the hon. Member to apply again for purposes of condonation. He had already applied for leave, but as the leave was for 60 days which could not be granted under the rules he was asked to apply for condonation. Therefore, he has applied for condonation which has been granted. The reason of his suffering from enteric fever is already stated there.

Mr. Speaker: I may suggest to all hon. Members that, after the reports are submitted to the House, regarding granting of leave of absence to Members, if any hon. Member has got any doubt and wants to look into the details further I will make the particular application available to the hon. Member and he may kindly take it from the Secretary to avoid taking up the time of the House on that account.

So, I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Members will be informed accordingly.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that Shri M. D. Ramasami has resigned his seat in the Lok Sabha with effect from 25th March, 1957 afternoon.

*CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION ON STARRED QUESTION NO. 1257

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on the 25th March, 1957, namely:—

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration".

The Minister Without Portfolio (Shri Krishna Menon): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the consideration of the motion moved yesterday by the Prime Minister before this House, there were, during the course of the debate, certain general criticisms of foreign policy in the background of the almost unanimous support of the House of that policy and its execution. In speaking at the end of this debate, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would first of all like to deal with these general criticisms of principles and execution of foreign policy, and then deal with the specific matters on which clarification has been sought or criticism made.

But, before doing so, I ask your indulgence to join in the general expressions of happiness that have been uttered in this House in connection with the emergence of the Gold Coast as an independent State. As we did at the United Nations, I think it is useful to read the records of this House, that this is not a country that for the first time emerges into civilization but, like ourselves, whose civilization has been overlaid by the hand of imperial rule has now come back into its own. Speaking before the Legislative Assembly on the 18th of May, the Prime Minister of Gold Coast said:

"The Government proposes that when the Gold Coast attains independence, the name of the country should be changed from 'Gold Coast' to the new name of 'Ghana'. The name Ghana is rooted deeply in ancient African history, especially in the history of the western portion of Africa known as the Western Sudan. It kindles in the imagination of modern West African youth the grandeur and the achievements of a great mediaeval civilization which our ancestors developed many centuries before the European penetration and subsequent domination of Africa began. According to tradition the various peoples or tribal groups in the Gold Coast were originally members of the Great Ghana Empire that developed in the Western Sudan during the mediaeval period.

For the one thousand years that the Ghana Empire existed, it spread over a wide expanse of territory in the Western Sudan. Its influence stretched across the Sudan from Lake Chad in the East to the Fouta Djallon mountains in the west, and from the southern fringes of the Sahara Desert in the north to the Bights of Benin and Biafra in the south. Thus the Ghana Empire was known to have covered what is

now the greater part of West Africa, namely, from Nigeria in the east to Senegambia in the west. While it existed, the Ghana Empire carried on extensive commercial relations with the outside world, extending as far as Spain and Portugal. Gold, animal skins, ivory, kola, nuts, gums, honey, corn and cotton were among the articles that writers had most frequently named. It is reported that Egyptian, European and African students attended the great and famous universities and other institutions of higher learning that flourished in Ghana during the mediaeval period to learn philosophy, mathematics, medicine and law. A famous Arabic writer has stated that there was during this period exchange of professors between the University of Santore in Ghana and the University of Cordova in Spain."

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would read this because it brings memories to our minds and also a feeling that the whole world which has been overlaid by certain aspects of modern civilization much to its detriment is now coming back to its own. It is also appropriate that, while congratulating Ghana and expressing our good wishes to her, we should also recall that her independence in many ways has been reached in the same way as ours, that is, in the last stages by co-operation with the metropolitan power in conditions of peace, and I believe a tribute is due to that metropolitan power also in bringing an end to the imperial rule in this part of West Africa. I may make, Mr. Speaker, a humble suggestion. Perhaps, in view of the unanimity of expression, you, in your wisdom, would consider in what way it is possible to convey to the Parliament of Ghana the wishes of this House.

The hon. Member from Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea, in speaking on this debate, referred to the failure of our foreign policy. Normally, one would

[Shri Krishna Menon]

leave a general statement of this character unanswered. But, coming as it does from the elder statesman of this country, one who has served it in the struggle for independence and today occupies a place of affection in our hearts and minds irrespective of the party labels he may wish to carry, it would be impolite to ignore his observations. I have read his statement very carefully, and I confess—I say it with great respect—I find it difficult to reconcile one part of it with another. The general failure of foreign policy on the one hand, we are told, arises from our addiction to slogans and that we have taken on too much. But the burden of the charge is that the foreign policy is not based upon what is fundamental.

Acharya Kripalani tells us that "every nation has to safeguard primarily its own interests and also to save itself from any possible danger;" that "there is no other objective in international diplomacy." If I may say so, would every one in the House subscribe to his statement? I dare to ask whether the endeavours for peace in this world, the establishment of friendship and international co-operation, the participation in the fight against racialism and standing by the side of those who still have to labour against colonial rule, the participation in the efforts to bring about economic amelioration and development of under-developed countries, in extending the advantages of modern health services through the World Health Organisation and various other things that we know today, and what is more, keeping ourselves free from entanglements or war politics—whether these are not in the interests of our country. Our primary interest in this world is peace and co-operation. It so happens that in a condition like ours at present, there is no interest which is incompatible with international interests. Therefore, our policy—it may be called idealistic—is

probably the most common sense and practical policy that we could have followed.

We are told that in regard to various other matters, the pursuit of this policy has landed us in a situation where we have no friends. With great respect, Mr. Speaker, one has to take this statement very seriously, because as it happens, this House, on the debates on foreign affairs, has a vast audience, and coming from such an hon. Member, to say that this country stands unfriended in the world is a very serious statement. The facts are to the contrary. It would be a bad day if we counted amongst our friends only those who would support us. Friendship does not mean that another sovereign State, when it takes its own decision and has, if you like its own prejudices, should take our side. It so happens that our country is among the few nations of the world that is still able to speak at all levels,—governmental, ambassadorial, parliamentary,—to peoples and Governments of States which have very divergent forms of political and economic systems. It would be untrue to say, looking at the large number of representatives of Governments and heads of States that come to this capital of ours week after week, month after month, that we are a friendless country. No one suggests that they are coming here for the purpose of espionage. They come here on a friendly visit. Therefore, if any evidence were required for the man-in-the street and even Members of Parliament who are of the same species,—here is incontrovertible evidence. I venture to say that the hon. Member's statement is much to be regretted, because, while all speeches in Parliament are happily reported in our Press, only certain speeches will be reported in certain countries and in certain sections of the Press and they tend to attain an importance out of proportion to the general context of the observations made in the House.

The hon. Member from Mysore has made criticisms about the conduct of foreign policy. He goes into considerable detail. I have not had the opportunity to consult the Prime Minister on the text of the speech, but I do not think that this matter requires much consultation, because the thesis that has been put forward is that we should scrap parliamentary Government. Ours is a parliamentary Government with a responsible executive where the Government are responsible for the conduct of administration. Parliament has, at all times, the opportunity to turn out the Government. Therefore, when Parliament is advised to follow the practice that does not obtain in parliamentary countries but in countries where there is no responsible executive as in the Congressional system where the ambassadors must come before the parliamentary committees and be subject to inquisition, then we depart from this practice of the Foreign Minister taking responsibility for the ambassador or whoever represents the case. Similarly, in our system, treaties are not subject to the same procedures as in a Congressional system of Government.

This criticism may have arisen from objection to certain choices, certain procedures, but since it has been raised as a general principle, it goes far deeper than that. We have, for good or evil,—I believe for good—established in this country the system of Government where the executive sits inside the legislature. We were sitting here this morning for one and a quarter hours listening to questions and answers on matters which no doubt every person who puts the question considers to be of importance. We are here, as a Government, subject to criticisms on every detail of our policy.

Even in regard to foreign affairs, while it is said that there is no consultation, the number of debates that take place in the House is evidence of this consultation. The parliamentary executive alone must

assume the responsibility if things go wrong. This form of open consultation is followed, except when the Minister responsible—the Prime Minister in this case—considers that those things or any particular matter must be subject to a special form of consultation.

On the one hand, there has been a criticism that too many debates on foreign affairs are held. In the same breath, we are told that there is no consultation. Government believes that frequent debates in this House not only permit the Government to assess the views and to react to the sentiments of various sections of the House, but they also proclaim to the world that the policy in general or any particular action has the support of the people as in this country. Therefore, to respond to any of the suggestions made, that either the ambassador should be appointed by Parliament or the conduct of foreign policy should be given to the parliamentary committee and the Government should, therefore, take instructions from an all-party committee of Parliament, while it itself has a parliamentary executive which is responsible under the Constitution, is something which cannot be reconciled.

The rest of the criticisms, coming from the hon. Members, is directed to specific matters and to personal issues. The hon. Member from Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea said that diplomacy does not consist in certain things but consists in something else. He said that representatives are badly chosen and in this particular case, the representation in the United Nations in the field of foreign discussion is rather unhappy because the representative is not able to persuade. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister and the Government could make better choices than they make at present, but Government is not always the choice of the best but the choice of what is possible and some of us happen to be among the possibles.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

But this matter has been taken a little farther than that, because our policies are not exalted by the personalities of individuals or representatives. The representatives of the Government in this country abroad are quite unlike Members of Parliament, because Members of Parliament are representatives, while those who go out are delegates. They get their instructions; they keep to those instructions and if they do not keep to those instructions, they will hear about it or some correction will be made afterwards. They are not in the position of Members of Parliament formulating policies on their own. This country does not run two foreign offices, but only one. Therefore, when we speak about our delegates not having the capacity to persuade, I think we are entitled to ask this House to look back to the last six or seven years, look to the history of the independence of Indonesia or the termination of war in Korea, the termination of hostilities in Indo-China, to the position in regard to the troubles which had recently arisen in the Middle East, the responsibility we have undertaken and the contributions we have made in this matter, however modest they may be—all these have arisen only by the result of persuasion. What other weapon have we got?

Several Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Shri Krishna Menon: In fact, the greater part of the time of our delegates is spent outside in debating chambers, in the task of taking counsel and in what the hon. Member has called 'persuasion'. He asked me whether I resented his observations. I did not resent his observations in the least. On the other hand it might do me a lot of good, because it is very bad for any representative to be simply the recipient of praise or of approval. What is more, the foreign Press and our own people should know that no one in this country, including the Prime Minister, is above criticism, as there is no inhibition here on the expression of opinion.

I now come to the more specific issues which have been raised during the debate. The first of these is the Middle East. It is necessary to refer to this, because during the course of the debate, after the Prime Minister had spoken, references were made to statements by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the Dominion of Canada. Yesterday he has sent me an extract of his speech through his High Commissioner. This is a matter in which Canada and we are commonly involved. Incidentally, while the Prime Minister has spoken fully about the Commonwealth relations, I may as well draw the attention of the House to this fact that there were two Commonwealth States—Canada and India—that stood against Britain and Australia and others in regard to the situation in the Middle East in the United Nations. So, there is no question of inhibition in regard to judgments or policies. The greater part of the Secretary of State's statement appeared in the Press and with much of it our Government is in agreement. The best way to answer this would be to consider the position with regard to the United Nations Emergency Force and the situation in the Gaza strip and the Middle East generally. Contrary to what may appear from newspaper reports to the best of one's judgment the situation is much easier than it was some 10 or 15 days ago. The invading armies are withdrawing from Egypt and Egyptian controlled territory and the last of these elements that remain in the Gaza strip and what is called the Sharm-el-Shaikh area. The legal position with regard to these territories is that both the Gaza strip on the one hand and that part of Israel which is not awarded to it under the 1947 resolution in the United Nations are legally equal in status. When India agreed to participate in the United Nations Emergency Force, it made it very clear and categorical and the assurance was given, which was endorsed by the United Nations, that the forces would not at any place be asked to violate the sovereignty of Egyptian territory; they would not

take up the functions of invading forces; they would not be armies of occupation. We and the Canadian Government, according to the speech made in the House there, have slight differences in this matter in that the Canadian Government apprehends that when the United Nations Emergency Forces are placed on the armistice line, they must feel assured that there would be no attacks from the Egyptian side. So far as we are informed and so far as our knowledge goes, there is no need for this apprehension. There are no disturbances in this area and until now the United Nations troops had not been fired upon either by Israel or by the Arabs at any time. There have been some slight incidents in Israel five or six months ago, for which the Government apologised. Therefore, the statement in the Canadian Parliament which arises from the apprehension that the United Nations forces on the demarcation line may meet with difficulties when separating the two sides by raids from one side—only one side was mentioned—is not in our judgment in correspondence with the facts of the case. We have no reason to think that Egypt, which accepted the United Nations forces on the basis or the understanding of the Secretary-General to carry out the resolutions of the United Nations in good faith, would not do so. To the best of our knowledge, there are no Egyptian armies moving in the Gaza territory and the Governor of Gaza is co-operating fully with the United Nations forces. Our Government has not agreed, and cannot agree, indeed, to be *ultra vires* of the United Nations resolutions to put these forces in the position of occupation of the Gaza strip. That would be a violation of the armistice agreement. Mr. Lester Pearson has said that the armistice agreement is the basis on which these territories rest and that is our position also. But to put in foreign forces in this strip, which is *de facto* Egyptian territory but whose status *de jure* is unsettled, would be a violation of the armistice agreement of 1949. Our country has always said that we would not take over the powers of occupa-

tion. Over and above that, what we are all looking for is a peaceful settlement of this matter and if it were possible, the establishment of at least as much of non-conflict on this border which may lead gradually step by step towards a wider settlement of the question that involves the two countries and the other Arab States. Therefore, the functions of the United Nations forces are of a neutral character. Any police functions, except as requested by the Egyptian Government, would involve them in trouble and probably lead to incidents same as occurred in Port Said before the withdrawal. Therefore, I would like to say that the apprehension in this matter is unfounded, that the United Nations forces are functioning according to rule and according to the resolutions of the Assembly, and so far as our Government is concerned, such influence, as it may possess, would be exercised on the side of moderation. As I said, on the whole the situation has improved and it is a matter for congratulation that for the first time in eight or nine years, instead of raids taking place from one side on the other and the other way about, where after the raids the United Nations observers report and allocate responsibility, now they have placed a cordon in between, where there are no weapons except weapons of self-defence, which would separate the parties; and, there are those who believe that this may be the beginning of finding a way towards a settlement. Our forces in this connection, it is not too well-known, have performed a task which does take credit for this country. It is not known that the Indian army, whether in Korea or in Indo-China or now in Egypt, under conditions of great difficulty, where it does not perform the task of killing its enemy or getting killed in return, but is there for helping the cause of peace, is popular with the local population and does not get involved in politics of the place and exercises the strictest control and discipline among its own ranks.

The other problem in the Middle East that is confronting us again in

[Shri Krishna Menon]

relation to our foreign policy is one of our self-interest. We did not involve ourselves in the discussions in regard to the Suez Canal and the difficulties arising in connection with it after nationalisation not because we could not keep out of the colourful picture, but because the Suez Canal to a certain extent is much more our life-line than it may be the life-line of the western countries. In the autumn last year, 70 per cent. of our exports and 69 per cent. of our imports passed through the canal. This country carried somewhere about 550,000 tonnage through the canal in that twelve-month period. Therefore, its re-opening which is vital to the progress of our Five Year Plans, to our economic life and to our food prices, is a matter of great concern to us. I think we can have a restrained optimism that when the canal is opened in the next few days for international traffic, the conditions will be such that at least for the time being, there will be a restoration to normality and the various apprehensions that were held with regard to discrimination with regard to those who were using the canal before or with regard to its maintenance and conditions of navigations, etc., will disappear. We are not the Government concerned. It lies in the sovereign authority of the Egyptian Government to make a statement. They have said only last week, that just before the canal is opened, they will make known to the world their plans of operation and the general arrangement for its functioning, etc. and there is every reason to think that this will be a practical approach which would meet the apprehensions of the world community.

The Prime Minister, in opening the debate referred to Pacts. Acharya Kripalani went further on and said that we must just talk of the pacts and say no more about it, after having told us that we should not place reliance on slogans. These pacts, again, to us are not matters of moral rectitude. It is not a matter of difference of opinion. They are vital to our

country. Today, the position is not what it was in 1947. Our neighbour is linked up in military alliances stretching from Istanbul to our frontiers, and supported by some of the very powerful countries of the world including the former metropolitan country, the U.K. Therefore, when these pact systems, apart from the general world context, protrude, project the instrument of war and threats of aggression to our own land and menace our security, it becomes absolutely necessary for us to say so.

Secondly, this country, both by its constitutional procedures and by its affirmations both before and after Independence, is wedded to principles of international behaviour and international law. Since the founding of the United Nations, we have been a loyal member of the United Nations. It has been our view which we held at the Bandung Conference that these pacts are—I am not now referring to the N.A.T.O. and other older organisations—a violation of the Charter of the United Nations. They do not come under article 51 which provides for collective defence. For example, under the S.E.A.T.O. Agreement, the powers concerned have taken under protection all territories below a certain latitude. So, without asking us, we are under protection. It is not a situation which we can easily accept. Over and above that, it is a curious combination of former imperial countries and former colonial countries. It is, more or less, a return in a pact form to colonial rule. It is our own view that these helpless countries, militarily weak countries, by joining these military alliances, simply bring back all the attributes of colonial rule in a different form. What can they provide? They can provide the terrain and the man power. They could only become the instruments of bringing the cold war into our own areas. So, while we have only the method of persuasion, we have only the method of protest, we have only the method of dissociation from the pacts, as a Government, in the pursuit of our pacific foreign

policy, it is necessary for us to use all constitutional procedures to international systems and to express our views in this way.

Furthermore, it has come to light in the last two or three years that these military alliances are also enlisted in support and in pursuit of the domestic policies of the countries as against others. The most outstanding instance is the adventures of the French Empire in their colonial territories. There has been no disguising the fact,—it has been repeatedly stated from the platforms where the discussion has come,—that the equipment supplied by the N.A.T.O. organisation is used in very large and considerable quantities in the suppression of liberation movements in North Africa. The same applies to us you may remember with regard to the debates on Portugal although the Governments concerned rather fight shy of the Portuguese insistence upon what they regard as a right in this matter. More recently, last year both at Teheran and Karachi, at the meetings of the Baghdad powers and the S.E.A.T.O. conference, the issue of Kashmir was dragged in as if it was a matter within the competence of these pact systems. They can be called by whatever names you like. They are just offensive and defensive alliances. The offensiveness is not decided by the collective group of these powers but by each individual member. If you have any doubt, you have only to read the statements of Pakistan Ministers and military leaders in this connection.

Furthermore, in these liberated areas, for example, in Indo-China, the path of development lies in those countries being able to exercise sovereignty without outside interference, free from entanglements, even as the United States was for 100 years or 150 years after liberty. The introduction of these pacts has divided the countries which were formerly united. We who have lived under empires have somewhat sinister and unhappy memories of the process of division, whether it be division in

order to maintain authority or as is the more modern fashion. In the olden days they used to say, divide and rule. The fashion now is to divide and leave, to cut up a country and go away. In the Arab countries, for example, the Baghdad Pact, instead of bringing about a sense of unity, has divided those people and set up one Arab nation against another and created fears, and what is more,—I do not want to traverse on this to a great extent—brought into existence the so-called vacuum and attracted into this region the elements of conflict, which it is in the interests of those countries to avoid. Therefore, if our Government were to escape responsibility for expression of its opinion, both in its own interests and in the interests of peace in this region, and peace in the world, it would be guilty of dereliction of its responsibility. It is unhappy to feel that these pact systems not only appear to have come to stay, but they seem to be growing from time to time. Those of you who can think back far enough may remember the days of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, long before it was known by that name when the world was definitely told of cultural alliances, economic alliances, and finally now, military alliances are going to have an economic aspect. Similarly, in the case of the S.E.A.T.O. also. There are new nations coming into existence in our part of the world. We are apprehensive of their being drawn into the system of war activity.

The Government, that is to say, the representatives of the Government in the United Nations were criticised for certain other matters. Since it is a matter of some importance, one should refer to them. I would like to say that much of this criticism arises from the fact that speeches on these subjects are made before the reports come into this country. It is nobody's fault. That is how our news services and our present system works. We were criticised for our soft handling of Britain in the issue of Cyprus. I wonder how many hon. Members have read the debate on this

[Shri Krishna Menon]

question. We initiated in the United Nations the conception that the people mainly concerned are the Cypriot people, and that Cyprus was not to be bargained off between Turkey, Greece and Britain. A few others are now looking in. The Syrians said, while Turkey is only 45 miles from Cyprus, Syria is only 37 miles. What is more, they said, we can see the Cyprus coast from our coast. Next year, there may be other people. We did not consider that the issue of Cyprus is a matter of the country being sliced up between various people. The view of our Government was expressly stated. If Iceland with a population 167,000 people can be a sovereign State and a member of the United Nations, there was a reason why Cyprus with nearly half a million people, with its industry and agriculture, with its general capacity, and trade and its position in the world, should not also be an independent country. So, right along, not only this year or previous year, the policy presented on behalf of our Government has been two-fold—that the Cypriot people are a nation, that nationalism is territorial. It may be that they may be of Greek origin. No one suggests that because the bulk of the population of the United States is of Anglo-Saxon origin, they should go back to England. Similarly, because the people in Cyprus are of Turkish or Greek origin, we did not see any reason, unless they so wished and conditions were independent, that this should be made a matter of bargain between countries. After the first year, the Government of India succeeded in persuading the Greek Government to adopt this view. Therefore, the Greek Government has moved away from its original position of what was called ENOSIS and today supports self-government, an independent Cyprus, in the same way as we are independent. And when criticism is made of Cyprus, it should also be said that while this issue was being debated and no solution could be found, it was our delegation that suggested the solution

which was supported by Greece, by Turkey, by the United Kingdom, by the United States, the Soviet Union, the Arab countries and the Western countries. I suppose that does represent a degree of the success of the process of conciliation, and the basis of it was that the parties involved in it were the United Kingdom as a metropolitan power and the Cypriot people as the people who were not free, and therefore if they wanted to remain as part of the sisterhood of nations, of the Commonwealth, as we hope they would, it is up to them. We have always taken the view publicly and privately that the remedy lies in recognising before it is too late, and by not giving too little, the demand of the Cypriot people for their independence.

The hon. Member from Ranchi West asked about Chittagong. I believe the Prime Minister will reply to it some other time because really Chittagong is not part of external affairs. I think Pantji will have to deal with it some time in some form, but I think it is as well he should have drawn our attention to geography and various other factors. I hope this country will never put forward any claim to any territory on the ground that the populations are Hindus, Christians, Muslims or anything else because we have stood against it, and we cannot have one remedy for one situation and another remedy for another situation. It is quite true that these things were done in the hurry of independence because independence being won in a short period was probably worth a great deal of sacrifice and naturally when things are speedily done, there are rough edges. It is true, as the Prime Minister interjected yesterday, there were talks of negotiation at that time, but the House will certainly agree with the fact that this is not the only issue on which we have not been able to negotiate and come to an agreement with Pakistan. Therefore, while it is a very important matter and may have its relation to other

questions and is receiving the attention and will receive the attention of the Prime Minister, there is nothing more one can say except that the talk about negotiation must still be regarded as alive.

The hon. Member also referred to the question of sending delegations to the West African territories. The Prime Minister has already indicated that he would be willing to consider this subject, of course, to the Finance Minister's views on the availability of foreign exchange.

Now, there are only two other matters of a specific character. In dealing with them, it is necessary to make one reservation. These two matters are Goa and Kashmir. Neither of these is really a subject of debate in foreign policy. They are not foreign territories. They are Indian territories. They are parts of India. So, some explanation is required why we discuss Kashmir, for example, in the debate on foreign affairs. It is simply because it has become involved with the United Nations, and it has also become involved with the illegal occupation of a territory by an external power. That is the reason why we are discussing it. Otherwise, Kashmir is, as far as its local Government is concerned, a matter for the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, and in so far as it is connected with the federal Centre, it is a matter for the Home Ministry.

Various problems have been raised in regard to Goa and Kashmir. The hon. Member from Berhampore who has been in prison in Goa, spoke about conditions there and also said something more had to be done. I feel sure that no one in this House feels that everything that is possible has been done and that there is not any aspect which has not received attention. Therefore, there is a great deal to be done, but I would say we have always to weigh the gains and losses in these matters, the embarrassments we invite with the possibilities of achievement. So far as we are concerned, we have stated the position of Goa is what may be called

an unfinished, that is to say, the unfinished part of the liberation of our country. We were occupied by the British, the Portuguese and the French. The Dutch were driven out by other people. The British power terminated by agreement with us after the achievement of our national movement and contributed by progressive and liberal opinion of the metropolitan country itself. The French have done the same, or nearly done the same. Portugal remains. The only aspect to which I have to refer is that which concerns the United Nations. We were asked: why is it that this matter is not brought before the United Nations. For one thing, I think we have been sufficiently involved with the United Nations on other questions and it is far better to give a great deal more of thought before we get involved in other questions. Secondly, in fact, this question of Goa has been raised before the United Nations by such procedures as are open to us. It is the practice of the United Nations under the commitments by the Member States under article 73 of the Charter that they ought to send information on all non-political questions to the General Assembly, meaning educational, social and so on, and of course the Assembly stretches educational questions up to political questions, up to the point they are ruled out of order. In this way, the United Kingdom, France and all the other imperial or metropolitan countries do send information about their colonial territories which is the subject of discussion in the Committee on Non-self-governing Territories. Portugal, for the first time—and the only country—has taken up the position that she has no colonial empire, that neither Angola nor Portuguese East Africa, nor Mozambique, Portuguese West Africa, nor Timore in the Indonesian seas nor Macao nor Goa is colonial empire, they are Portugal itself. All one can say is that nations like individuals can suffer from hallucinations. Therefore, this matter is before the Trusteeship Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, and the bulk of

[Shri Krishna Menon]

opinion in the Assembly this year was that this matter must be considered next year and Portugal must fall in line with other people and submit information about colonial territories. In that way, the question of the colonial empire has come up. There are other aspects of it. As has been set out in the President's Address, it is our hope and our desire that the people of Goa will share the freedom of the rest of India. In this matter I may say we are often victims of the propaganda against us. It is common, for example, for us to speak about India and Kashmir, and not about Kashmir and the rest of India. So that, that is the position with regard to Goa.

In regard to Kashmir, in view of its international significance and certain other immediate circumstances, we cannot afford to let this matter and the various issues that have been raised go unanswered. Acharya Kripalani told us that foreigners do not understand this issue, but we must take care that we understand it ourselves.

Before I go to Kashmir, I should deal with the Israel question. The Government was charged with some hostility with regard to Israel. I have stated on behalf of the Government in the United Nations that we have no hostility whatsoever so far as the State of Israel is concerned. We are one among the countries which recognise it. Something was said about the tardiness of our recognition. The facts are these. Israel was declared a separate State by the United Nations on the 29th November, 1947. They proclaimed their own independence on the 14th May, 1948. They applied to the United Nations at the end of 1948 for membership. They were recommended by the United Nations Security Council for admission in early 1949 and they were admitted to the United Nations in the latter part of 1949 and in 1950 this country recognised Israel. It is not correct to say that there is no diplomatic engagement at all in this

matter because when we recognise some other country, it means we declare its existence as a sovereign State and that we have no quarrels with it and so on.

13 hrs.

Now with regard to exchange of representatives, there are probably eighty five nations, sovereign States, represented in this country, but we have not representatives in anything like half of them. These are decided by considerations, political, administrative, financial, and various other factors and it is untrue to give this impression abroad. Even in the Israel-Arab questions, or the issues in the Middle East, we have repeatedly stated that our position is not one of partisanship. We recognise the sovereignty of the Arab States; we recognise the territory of Israel that was granted by the United Nations. But what has happened in regard to the Middle East controversy is that we are accused of double standards. There are no double standards in this matter. Our position with regard to Middle East is exactly the same as in Kashmir—that is, you cannot establish rights by invasion, that conquest does not confer any legal rights.

Ours is perhaps one of the few countries in the world where people of Jewish religion and race have not suffered persecution. In so far as the Indian Jews are concerned, their ancestors came to this country in the fourth century before the Christian era. They are the descendants of twelve families which were shipwrecked on our coast; other migrants have come afterwards. We are one of the few countries in the world with no record of anti-Semitic feelings or racial persecution. I should say this because the statement would go round the world and not the answer. The relations of our delegations abroad with Israel have been cordial always. It is not only with Israel; we have very intimate relations with the United Kingdom, but we had to speak against their position in regard to the invasion of Egypt.

Now we come to Kashmir. In this matter we are asked as to why the Prime Minister ever agreed to a cease-fire. The territory is our sovereign territory. In agreeing to cease-fire all we did was to agree that the problem be resolved in pacific conditions. It is not possible to negotiate with fighting going on, and what is more there were casualties, and killings going on. Both in keeping with the traditions of this country and on general considerations of humanity, it is always necessary to make use of all attempts to stop a war. This is what the Prime Minister wrote to the Chairman of the Commission on the 20th August 1948—

“During the several conferences that we had with the Commission when it first came to Delhi, we placed before it what we considered the basic fact of the situation which had led to the conflict in Kashmir. This fact was the unwarranted aggression, at first indirect and subsequently direct, of the Pakistan Government on Indian Dominion territory in Kashmir. The Pakistan Government denied this although it was common knowledge. In recent months, very large forces of the regular Pakistan Army have further entered Indian Union territory in Kashmir and opposed the Indian Army which was sent there for the defence of the State.

In accordance with the resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations adopted on 17th January 1948, the Pakistan Government should have informed the Council immediately of any material change in the situation while the matter continued to be under the consideration of the Council.

Now we said all this to the Commission afterwards when they asked us to accept the resolution of cease fire which had been the result of long negotiations.

The Prime Minister said—

“Since our meeting of 18th August, we have given the Com-

mission's resolution our most earnest thought. There are many parts of it which we should have preferred to be otherwise and more in keeping with the fundamental facts of the situation, especially the flagrant aggression of the Pakistan Government on Indian Union territory. We recognise, however, that, if a successful effort is to be made to create satisfactory conditions for a solution of the Kashmir problem without further bloodshed, we should concentrate on certain essentials only at present and seek safeguards in regard to them. It was in this spirit that I placed the following considerations before Your Excellency. (These are the considerations).

(1) (a) To bring into question the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir Government over the portion of their territory evacuated by Pakistan troops;

(b) To afford any recognition of the so-called Azad Kashmir Government or

(c) To enable this territory to be consolidated in any way during the period of truce to the disadvantage of the State.

(2) That from our point of view the effective insurance of the security of the State against external aggression, from which Kashmir has suffered so much during the last ten months, was of the most vital significance and no less important than the observance of internal law and order, and that, therefore, the withdrawal of Indian troops and the strength of Indian forces maintained in Kashmir should be conditioned by this overriding factor.

Thus at any time the strength of the Indian forces maintained in Kashmir should be sufficient to ensure security against any form of external aggression as well as internal disorder.”

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Since this question was raised in connection with the overall authority of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, it would be useful to read also the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Korbelt, the Chairman of the Commission.

"You will recall that in our interview with the Commission on 17th August, I dealt at some length with the position of the sparsely populated and mountainous region of the Jammu and Kashmir State in the north. The authority of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir over this region as a whole has not been challenged or disturbed, except by roving bands of hostiles, or in some places like Skardu which have been occupied by irregulars or Pakistan troops. The Commission's resolution, as you agreed in the course of our interview on the 18th, does not deal with the problem of administration or defence in this large area. We desire that, after Pakistani troops and irregulars have withdrawn from the territory, the responsibility for the administration of the evacuated areas should revert to the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and that for defence to us. We must be free to maintain garrisons at selected points in this area for the dual purpose of preventing the incursion of tribesmen, who obey no authority, and to guard the main trade routes from the State into Central Asia."

That was the demand we made, which was in part accepted by the Commission itself. This was the reply of the Commission—

"The Commission wishes me to confirm that, due to peculiar conditions of this area, it did not specifically deal with the military aspect of the problem in its resolution of 13th August 1948. It believes, however, that the question raised in your letter could

be considered in the implementation of the resolution."

When the overall issue was raised and the responsibility of the Jammu and Kashmir Government for external defence and internal law and order which is now before the Security Council, this problem has come up. Therefore, when we agreed to cease-fire, it was for humanitarian reasons, it was for reasons of solving a situation. We did not go to the Security Council to decide a dispute over territory. In fact, the Security Council under the article of the Charter has no right to decide the jurisdiction of a territory. We went there for a specific settlement under the Charter. This is all the matter and there it is.

The next question that was asked was: why did my predecessor, the late Shri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, send a telegram, and a categorical answer was requested. There is considerable misunderstanding even among some of our own people about what was said in this matter. What he said was that this accession is permanent; this accession is as good as the accession of any other five hundred odd States that acceded to India. The wordings are in the same form; "whereas... 'we accept your accession'". But the meaning of what we said was this. Though the accession is there, in view of the circumstances, in view of the situation that has arisen, we would, if certain conditions, if certain things happened, namely, the plebiscite went against us, which plebiscite should again be taken under certain conditions, in the exercise of our sovereign rights concede that territory. Any country can give any part of its territory to anybody else. There is no such thing as conditional accession in our Constitution. In fact, those of us who have read the papers of the Secretary of State in the period between 1932 and 1936 will know that the Princes at that time tried very hard to get the Viceroy to agree to what was called conditional or periodic accession. They wanted to accede for a period of ten years and then fight out their case.

The British Government at that time refused to accept that. It is in that legal background we inherited we incorporated it in our Constitution. So, there is no question here as conditional accession.

Various other matters have been raised and I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to go into or to reopen the whole of the Kashmir debate. Two points, however, remain to be answered. Why is it that the Prime Minister, and we on his behalf, have just now trotted out the idea that Pakistan has "legally" annexed this territory. The reason is a very simple one, that we liked to adhere strictly to the facts, so that we may not be controverted. It was only when Pakistan passed the Constitution and article 1, clause (2)(b) and (c) became part of the law of Pakistan that it became incorporated. We could not just speak about her intentions. Now it is in black and white. Section 203 of their Constitution provides for the integration of the remaining part of Kashmir, but under this article that I mentioned, all the territories they administer are part of Pakistan. And what is more, that these territories are so administered has been spoken to by no less a person than Sir Owen Dixon whose general findings have been against us.

"The territory on the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line seemed to be administered through an Azad Kashmir 'Government' on the west but in the north through political agents directly responsible to the Pakistan Government."

So, even from that time, there was direct administration. When the Constitution came in, they said that all administered areas were part of Pakistan. So, it becomes part of Pakistan. And we could not say it was legally part of Pakistan until that Constitution had received the assent of the Governor-General of Pakistan at that time. That was the reason why we did not say so.

In regard to Kashmir, therefore, the position that we have stated remains,

that is to say, it is an integral part of India. And the problem before us today is the vacation of the aggression. It is not for me to argue this case in the Indian Parliament. But it is part of the Union of India like any other part of the Union of India. Its defence is the concern of India. And our engagements are limited to two resolutions of the Commission and the assurances going therewith.

Now, those resolutions cannot be read in parts, nor can any part out of it be selected by anybody just as he liked. I have stated under the instructions of Government, and I assure the House will endorse it, that this country will never go back at any time on its international obligations. Whatever commitments we have undertaken we will carry out. But we are not going into a position where if the Prime Minister opens his mouth or somebody explores something or says a hypothetical proposition or makes an offer, that is going to keep us down for ever. If an offer is made, it has to be accepted. If it is not accepted, it lapses.

So, on behalf of the Government, it has been stated in the Security Council that whatever might have been said in the course of these exploratory discussions for the purposes of speeding up the process of conciliation in good faith, we are bound, we are bound to the extent we can be bound, and in the terms of those resolutions with all those qualifications, with all those assurances, to what we have subscribed to, which means that, in the first instance, the aggression must be vacated. Whatever may be the rights and wrongs of our position in Kashmir—and our position in Kashmir is legally, morally and politically entirely correct, but even if it were not so for argument—Pakistan has no rights on that soil except the right of an invader. It is not no-man's-land. And what is more, even before Pakistani troops invaded that territory, under any interpretation of international law or procedure, the permission for hostiles to traverse across

[Shri Krishna Menon]

the territory is an act of aggression. And, therefore, the only title, the only *locus standi* they can have is what is based on invasion. If it is right for nations to gather together and say to these great countries, U.K. and France, that they are wrong in invading the sovereign territory of Egypt, the same thing applies to us.

As for invasion, there is no such thing as the invasion of Kashmir. Since the 27th of October, 1947, you could not speak legally or, in fact, in truth, of the invasion of Kashmir. It is an invasion of India. And we cannot submit ourselves to a position where a part of our territory is in this way invaded. Therefore, the position that has been taken up on behalf of the Government of India is that for nine years, we have tried, in spite of all our legal rights, to find ways of conciliation; we have made many concessions; we have explored many avenues, but we have never been able to find a position which is leading to a solution.

Criticism has been made of plebiscite. It is quite true that we have spoken about plebiscite. But just because we speak about a plebiscite, it does not mean that we undertook a plebiscite. What we said in this resolution was that if the conditions in part (i) and part (ii) were accomplished, and when the Commission had reported that they have been accomplished, then the two Governments would enter into consultation as to finding the best way or fair means of ascertaining the wishes of the people, that is, they would enter into conference.

But the Prime Minister, in his letter to the Commission, distinctly stated that if parts (i) and (ii) are not performed, there is no commitment with regard to part (iii); and that has been acknowledged by the Commission equally in black and white. Now, these assurances are not secret assurances either to the Prime Minister or to the Government. They were published at

that time. And what is more, Pakistan accepted these resolutions with the knowledge of those assurances.

So, while it is quite true that the world newspapers, including our own, may write columns and columns about a plebiscite, the plebiscite cannot be triggered, cannot come into operation—whatever arrangements you may make, you may build election booths, and have ballots and commissioners and everything else, all arrangements you can make, but you cannot have the operation of it—until those two parts are performed.

Our position as stated in the Security Council is today not on the second part, that is, that the truce is not performed, but that Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement, by which I mean not the violation of the frontier here, there, or everywhere, not the probing of our territory, not the invading here, there or at any other place, but that it is part of the cease-fire agreement that she cannot accumulate any more military personnel or military material since the time of the cease-fire. And since then, she has built up considerable forces in Azad area. She has built air-fields over the territory, which have been incorporated as part of the Pakistan military mechanism. And what is more, she has refused to carry out a final provision, namely to appeal to its people to maintain a peaceful atmosphere. So, when the cease-fire agreement is itself violated, any negotiations on that basis would require the resurrection of those conditions. But nothing that I have said, so far as I know, reflects any intention on the part of Government to shut its face, to shut itself against the processes of conciliation, should they arise. But they can only come in the context of the recognition of our sovereignty. They can only come in the context of the vacation of the aggression, because if we did not do this, what has begun in one place would begin in another. It is only when this country realises, as it does today, that there is no such place as

Kashmir separate from the Union of India, an aggression on Kashmir is the same as an aggression on Bombay; it is part and parcel of the territory of this country.

Acharya Kripalani said yesterday, there are two Prime Ministers here, and, therefore, Kashmir is in a separate position. Now, there again, with great respect, I say, that is to forget the provisions of our Constitution. Our Constitution provides for a constituent State to have relations with the Federal Centre by agreement. In some cases, there were initial Constituent Assemblies in some of the other States. They found it a wasteful procedure, and they joined in the Constituent Assembly instead. And, therefore, such establishment....

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Mr. Speaker, may I correct this? What I said was that it was likely to give a wrong impression to foreigners. That was what I said. I did not say that there need not be two Prime Ministers. But what I said was that it was likely to give an impression that we are putting Kashmir on a different footing.

Shri Krishna Menon: That is the impression that we have been trying to correct.

My distinguished colleague perhaps thinks that I bored the audience for seven hours. The time when I bore people, I will stop talking. But it so happened they were not bored. If I may say so with respect, are speeches to be measured by the time they take or by what there is to be said? One does not speak for 45 minutes if one can say it in five minutes. And one does not speak for 15 minutes, if it requires 1½ hours for, there it was.

But the whole of this case which has been laid over, as the Prime Minister said the other day, by years and years of negotiations involving discussions about the quantum of forces, the rifles they should carry, this, that and the other, all the details about the furniture of the house which we have been talking about for years, has

made us forget, or I should say, made other people forget the main issues, and it took a very long time for it to be brought back.

In the United Nations, you cannot judge public opinion merely by the vote on a proposition. We are put in the position of Pakistan having made a demand for the introduction of foreign troops on our soil, and this Government had with the necessary courage say to them that so long as this country was a free country, no foreigner could ever set his foot on its soil. We pointed out with great pains to the British delegation that it was a matter of regret to us that the United Kingdom, which was a foreign occupier of this country, having relegated, having abdicated from that position and transferred its powers peacefully should again subscribe itself to a proposition where on this soil of India which we have liberated, and in the liberation of which they co-operated, there should once again be introduced, under whatever name, foreign troops, and what is more, under conditions which are not sanctioned by the Charter. The Charter does not provide for the introduction of foreign troops in our territory, and our territory in this case includes the Pakistan-occupied area.

I have carefully refrained from introducing any heat into this Kashmir question because the Prime Minister is engaged in conversations with the former President of the Security Council and it is, therefore, not proper for me to go any further into these matters than has already been said, which are our unalterable positions. Those positions are: that we would abide by the Charter of the United Nations, we would honour our obligations, but we just are not going to be either flattered or intimidated by other people, just because a number of them come and say that the Prime Minister of India stands on a high moral pedestal in regard to others, but when he comes to himself, he defends his territory—thank God he does. After all, if we are not convinced about the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

morality of our position, any prescription of morality by us to others would not in itself be moral. Therefore, we have replied to this—no double standards. All that we have said is: after nine years, we thought it was necessary to speak in plain terms and in as simple terms as possible even if it took some time.

Mr. Speaker: Does Shri Kamath want to press his amendment?

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, regrets that even in the tenth year of our freedom and the eighth year of our Republic certain parts of Indian territory are in Portuguese and Pakistani occupation, and urges Government to take speedy measures for the liberation of these territories from foreign rule."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I will put the substitute motion moved by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, fully agrees with and approves the said policy."

The motion was adopted.

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS ON ACCOUNT

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with discussion of the Demands for Grants (Vote on Account.)

Hon. Members will recollect that 10 hours were allotted for general discussion and 5 hours for the discussion on the Demands for Grants (Vote on Account). We have had to cut short the time. All the same, we should conclude our deliberations on the 28th. In view of the time that has been taken for general discussion which exceeded by 1½ hours the originally allotted time, I would appeal to the House to reduce the time allotted for the discussion of the Demands for Grants from 5 hours to 3 hours.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Yes, for the present.

Mr. Speaker: It is only for the present. Vote on account always means for the present. When the new Parliament meets, there will be full discussion. Therefore, this is accepted. We will finish this by 4-30 p.m.

Hon. Members may give an indication as to the particular demands which they would like to discuss. They may say whatever they want to say on any of these.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): May I suggest that when a Member speaks, he may be allowed to speak on all the demands; so that the Ministers may reply one after another?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. May I have an idea as to how many hon. Members want to take part? Those who have taken part in the general discussion may not participate.... I see that three hon. Members want to speak. So we can finish quite early.

DEMAND NO. 1—MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 24,92,000 be granted to the

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.