

and 13 members from Rajya Sabha;
 that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next Session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make, and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee"

The motion was adopted

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion of the Demands for Grants Nos 23, 24, 25, 26 and 108 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. As the House is aware 4 hours have been allotted for the Demands of this Ministry.

Regarding the time limit for speeches, the usual practice has been to fix a time-limit of 15 minutes for all Members including Movers of cut motions and 20 minutes, if necessary or 30 minutes for Leaders of Groups.

There are a number of cut motions to these Demands. Hon Members may hand over at the Table within 15 minutes the numbers of the selected cut motions which they propose to

move. I shall treat them as moved, if the Members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and the motions are otherwise in order.

DEMAND No 23—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 3,39,51,000 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, 1958, in respect of "Tribal Areas"

DEMAND No 24—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 4,84,44,000 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, 1958, in respect of 'External Affairs'"

DEMAND No 25—STATE OF PONDICHERRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 1,92,69,000 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, 1958, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'"

DEMAND No 26—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 2,11,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum

*Moved with the recommendation of the President

[Mr. Speaker]

necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1958, in respect of Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs' "

DEMAND NO 108—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 17,50,000 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, 1958, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs:'"

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to move that the Demands standing under the Head External Affairs, Tribal Areas and State of Pondicherry etc, be taken into consideration.

You have just referred to the cut motions and I have been looking through all these cut motions and a large portion of them. Possibly, the largest number deal with tribal areas. I find that out of 15 cut motions dealing with tribal areas, 7 deal with what might be called the disturbed conditions in the Naga Hills District. Strictly speaking, the Naga Hills District does not come under this head at all because the Naga Hills are under the Assam Government, but the External Affairs Ministry deals with the North East Frontier Agency. Sometimes hon Members perhaps get a little confused between the two, because they are adjoining and sometimes also the problems also are similar. The fact that the Naga Hills does not come into this picture in this way, is not with a view to avoid anybody speaking on the Naga Hill situation, but perhaps dealing with it casually in this way will not help...

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central). May I point out that in the North East Frontier Agency also there have been disturbances and questions in this House have elicited certain answers very recently?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Nevertheless, I would say that most of these questions relating to these disturbances relate to the Naga Hills District and not to the Tuensang Division, but I am not raising a technical plea from that point of view. More than half of the cut motions relate to the Naga disturbances. Then there are fairly considerable number—14, I think—dealing with Pondicherry. Those are minor matters relating to the Pondicherry Administration. Then there are fairly considerable number relating to the economy of avoidance of waste of criticism of extra expenditure and the like, which, of course, is a perfectly legitimate and a very important aspect the administration which has to be looked into by the Ministry and by this House. There are a number of other matters ..

सेठ गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि

Mr. Speaker: Hon Members will kindly hold their souls in patience. After the hon Minister finishes if they have got a number of important questions which have not been answered by him, I would allow them another opportunity. Possibly he may anticipate and answer all questions.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं केवल एक बात आपसे पूछना चाहता था.....

Mr. Speaker: Not now

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West-Reserved-Sch Tribes). I rise on a point of order. You have just given 15 minutes for the various cut motions to be placed. The discussion

is to begin only after we know what the cut motions are before the House and then Members who have moved the cut motions may be absent from the House, in which case no time need be spent on discussing them

Mr. Speaker: He is answering all the cut motions The hon. Prime Minister.

The cut motions have already been given notice of They are in the Order Paper Hon Members will be given an opportunity to choose from among those of which notice has been given Such of the cut motions which they think are necessary and in the time allotted may be moved and referred in the House No Member is prevented in anticipation of referring to all the cut motions in general or groups and categories That is what the hon Prime Minister is doing

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Apart from the three categories that I have mentioned, there are those cut motions dealing with a variety of topics like Goa, like the hardy perennial of India's association with the Commonwealth and of people of India's descent in Ceylon, and Burma These are the main subjects and there is also a cut motion I believe dealing with our opening a Mission abroad in Madrid Now, this is hardly an occasion for me to deal with wider policy questions and although they are vague, I should like to say a few words and deal briefly at this stage with some of the criticisms and some of the cut motions

In considering the foreign policy and the work of our foreign missions, we cannot isolate them in conditions that prevail in the world today; nor indeed we may be able to isolate them from the past They are governed by those conditions and to some extent, we have to do many things that normally we would not do, or we would not like to do We have to go and accept the challenge of the establishment of a Commission in

Indo-China, which is not normally within the scope of our work, but for the sake of conditions there, we could not escape from that responsibility We went to Korea; we have got a detachment on the Israeli-Egyptian border today All these are really outside the normal scope of our work. Occupying the position that we do, that is to say, the position in which sometimes other countries like to put faith in our impartiality, we are called upon to undertake certain tasks and we cannot escape that burden

The world today, as everyone knows, has been for some time past pursued by this conflict between major Power Blocs, sometimes this is called cold war, sometimes by some other name This is the dominant feature of the political landscape in the world Whether you consider disarmament on the one hand or any other major question, whether you consider the question of Kashmir or any other, somehow it gets entangled so far as other countries are concerned in this cold war approach and cold war technique A distinguished statesman who was here only 2 or 3 days ago and who was here from abroad said in answer to a question about some of these problems including Kashmir that it is entangled in the cold war Otherwise, they might have been much easier to handle I am merely mentioning this so that people may realise how much we are conditioned by these major factors and every problem today, whether it is discussed in the United Nations or elsewhere, is conditioned, is affected, by this approach We have tried and tried with success to keep outside these military groupings and we have tried to judge every problem on the merits so far as we can, even though, of course, we do not live in some ivory tower cut off from the rest of the world; we are affected by the world's happenings We have often adopted policies and programmes which have to take into consideration the facts of life, if I may say so. I am not just ideological

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

If I may give an instance, there is the instance of Algeria. All of us here, I take it, feel very strongly about the tragedy of Algeria. We want Algerian freedom. We have functioned in regard to Algeria in the United Nations, however, not merely proclaiming loudly that we are in favour of Algerian freedom, but also always trying to find some way to approach it, some way to bring people together, some way even to influence in so far as we can the Republic of France in a friendly way, because our object has been to get something done, to get peace established, so that freedom may advance and not merely to shout out everything that we dislike.

There are so many things in this world that we dislike. There are so many things in our own country that we dislike. If we merely shout out at them all the time peacefully, it would yield no result. Sometimes we are criticised because we do not go out as champions proclaiming our faith in the various things that ought to be done in the world. I suppose that would be a noble attitude, but apart from not yielding any results always it actually may put back the clock, because if one has to solve the world's problems by peaceful methods, one has always to try, while adhering to a principle to win over the other side, to influence the other side by various methods such as might lead to a peaceful approach, whatever the problem may be. I ask this House to bear this in mind whether the problem is that of, let us say Indians in South Africa on which every single person here and in the country and many people outside this country have the strongest feelings about the policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa. We are limited in what we can do. We cannot declare war on South Africa. We go to the United Nations, we take other steps. Unfortunately those steps had not yielded any great results, although I believe world

opinion has very largely accepted, I will not say our view-point, but at any rate accepted the view-point that the South African Government's policy is completely wrong, not only wrong, but highly objectionable. That has happened. But even that question is tied up with this cold war. Even the question of Goa about which we feel so much is tied up with the cold war. So every subject that you touch gets tied up with these major conflicts. That does not mean that we should give up that particular subject, we should go on dealing with it, but we must realise that that particular subject or conflict, simple as it may appear to us to be, is not simple because it is tied up with the major conflicts in the world today, and all kinds of pressures are brought upon us in regard to the major conflicts in this way. The House knows how the question of Kashmir has been dragged into this in many ways. Other countries, regardless of the merits of the case, judge it from the point of view of the cold war.

The cold war technique, we feel, is a very wrong technique because ultimately the cold war technique is a technique if not of actual violence, always thinking in terms of violence and hatred thereby increasing the conflicts, not really solving the problem, but keeping it on the brink of major conflicts. It is in this context that we have to function in the world and deal with every single problem on foreign affairs today. We have tried, and again in a large measure succeeded, to keep friendly relations with all countries, even those countries that are opposed to us in many ways and with whose policies we do not agree.

Take another instance, I believe there is a cut motion on that. Take the question of Hungary. I do not quite know what some hon. Members expected us to do at that time. Possibly we were more exercised, as

much or even more exercised, about developments in Hungary than many others who should rather loudly about it. But we were terribly exercised at that time to see that it did not suddenly flare up into a world war. That much in itself and been bad enough, of course, but it would have meant absolute disaster for Hungary itself. We wanted to serve and help in this cause and we tried our best there and elsewhere not merely by shouting or condemning, but expressing our frank opinion about it privately and publicly and thereby, I believe, at least having some influence on the developments that took place. Therefore, I am trying to put before this House that whatever subject there may be in the context of foreign affairs, we try to approach it from this broad standpoint, in order to try to solve it peacefully without giving up any single principle of ours, because there is no other way. The other way is one of war. If we want to avoid war, we should not all the time talk in terms of war or in terms of threats and counter-threats. We have to express ourselves strongly occasionally because we feel strongly, but we try to avoid condemning any country as far as possible—sometimes one has to do it in discussing a policy,—because condemnation does not take us anywhere, more especially when the condemnation is not of a particular country, but inevitably is seen in the context of these groups against each other and, instead of throwing any light on the situation, it merely aggravates it and angers the party condemned.

I do not think I need say much about the present situation in the world except that in the course of the last few months what is called the Middle-East or Western Asia has been the centre of a great deal of tension. In fact, it was a centre of military operations last year and the tension continues. There again, there are many problems of that region, but every single problem has been made more difficult by the military

approach, by the cold war approach, by the military alliance approach, by the Baghdad pact approach. I confess I have tried hard to understand how these military approaches have in practice, apart from theory, helped in easing the situation there. It is my belief that but for these military approaches, but for the Baghdad pact, the situation would never have deteriorated as it did last year in Western Asia. In my belief, it is only by giving up these military approaches, the situation there and elsewhere will gradually stabilise itself. I do not say that the problems will be solved by that. I do not say that any country can forget the problems of its own security. We have to talk of our security from danger. We are, I believe, more peacefully inclined than any other country in the world, I believe, at least as much. Yet, we have to talk of our own security. We have to take measures for it. I cannot ask any country not to take measures for its security. It is one thing to take measures for security and quite another thing to talk in terms of war, to have threats and counter-threats and live in this atmosphere of cold war.

13 hrs

The world today is living under the shadow of the hydrogen bomb and atomic war. This House and the other too declared themselves quite clearly on this subject. I believe in the world today there is a very strong opinion among the people and even among many Governments against nuclear warfare and against nuclear test explosions. There is, perhaps, a little better atmosphere for disarmament too. Yet fears and apprehensions prevent nations from coming to agreement. All I can say is, I hope they will come to some kind of agreement however partial it may be. We cannot hope for full and complete agreement suddenly. Even if small agreements are made, they create a better atmosphere for the next advance. But, in particular, this business of test explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs seems to us

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

completely immoral from any point of view, completely injurious and to consider that they are advancing the cause of peace in the world seems to me rather an extraordinary way of looking at things

In regard to some of our major problems with our neighbouring country Pakistan, problems of Kashmir, canal waters, etc, I will not say much except, again, to say that one of the chief difficulties about these problems is this cold war which has been brought to India's borders by these pacts like the Bagdad Pact or the SEATO, by the military assistance given to Pakistan and thereby these problems have been made much more intricate and more difficult

Take the canal waters problem We handed it over to the World Bank for their help For five years, they dealt with it After two or three years, they made a proposal which, broadly, we accepted Pakistan did not accept it Again, for two or three years, they had been going on discussing this matter Some of our best engineers, for five years, had been sitting in Washington, going backwards and forwards We lose their services here We spent large sums of money in keeping a huge delegation discussing it there We have pursued this policy because we wanted to solve the canal water problem peacefully, to the advantage of both the countries It is not a political problem at all It is a technical problem which technicians should have solved, sitting together It is well known that there is quite enough water in the various rivers of the Punjab to go round and much more left over for the sea It is only a question of arrangement with some expenditure involved Yet, this has been made into a purely political problem Year after year has passed and Pakistan has taken up an attitude which becomes more and more intransigent

I am amazed, if I may say so, at the kind of speeches recently delivered by the Prime Minister of Pakistan

in the USA and to some extent, even in the United Kingdom; Pakistan is suffering from hunger and thirst because of canal water disputes; what will not a hungry and thirsty man or a country do, it will not die of hunger and thirst. This is an extraordinary approach to these problems At any time that would have been bad. At a time when the World Bank has, again, put forward some proposals which cast a heavy burden on India, a very heavy burden and yet, for the sake of peace we have again accepted, subject to certain minor matters to be discussed,—we have not yet got Pakistan's reply—for the Prime Minister of Pakistan to go about in the United States and say that we are bent on reducing Pakistan to a desert by cutting off water and placing the population of Pakistan in such agonies, does seem to me to be a thing very far, far from the truth It is a realm of fancy which should not normally be brought into play in dealing with solid matters of fact. I regret this tendency on the part of the Pakistan Prime Minister It is not a question of difference of opinion We differ in many ways We differ in our outlook on life, way of life, way of thinking That may be better But, there are certain standards, I think, which should normally be kept up by people who occupy responsible positions I regret that these standards are being repeatedly ignored

About this canal water question, I may remind this House, because there is so much talk about it, that here in Delhi, in May, 1948, we actually came to a friendly understanding, agreement, a kind of treaty which we signed, Pakistan and India It was on the 4th of May, if I remember rightly, in 1948 In spite of that, after two years, it was denounced by Pakistan Since then, all these arguments have taken place

In all these matters, we live under the shadow of cold war Unfortunately, Pakistan, through these military alliances and the rest, is encouraged to pursue wrong paths

which prevent the settlement of so many problems that we have with Pakistan. It is obvious that two countries like India and Pakistan, which are neighbours, which will continue to be neighbours and which have so much in common, must be friends, should be co-operative and help each other. Any kind of injury to Pakistan ultimately is bound to be an injury to India just as an injury to India is bound to injure Pakistan. But, it has been our misfortune during the past many years to live in this state of mental conflict and actual conflict sometimes with Pakistan. In spite of our efforts to normalise our relations, they have not improved to any considerable extent.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): May I interrupt and just say a word?

Mr. Speaker: Not now.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: If the hon. Prime Minister allows, I will just say a word.

Mr. Speaker: He won't allow and I don't allow.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As I said, there are a great many cut motions about extravagance and waste in our foreign missions. It is not for me to say that our foreign missions, all of them, are perfectly run without any waste, without any extravagance. In so many missions that we have all over the world, there may be waste. We try to check them. We have checked them and we will go on checking them. But, I would like the House to keep in mind two or three factors. One is to compare them with other countries' missions. I do not mean to say that we should compete with others in extravagance or waste, but still, after all, we should have some manner of comparison, and I think if these are compared with other countries, it would be found that our missions are much more economically run than almost any country. Secondly, I speak from some personal experience, many of our younger officers abroad—I am not talking for the moment of ambassadors and high commissioners

but of first secretaries, second secretaries and others—the cost of living is different in various places, but by and large many of these officers are hard put to carry on a decent existence. It may appear that they are being paid heavily, but there are quite a number of Members of this House who have gone abroad, who have seen some of our missions abroad, and almost every one of them has reported to me that they were distressed and sometimes even shocked at the difficulties that our younger officers had to face; that is, the salary and allowances given to them were not enough for them to live as decently and properly as they ought to do. I am not judging these various opinions, but I am merely pointing out to this House that any impression abroad that our officers abroad are terribly extravagant and wasteful is not justified.

Some may be, naturally, when hundreds and thousands of people are there, I am not speaking for all. Some missions may be wasteful. The larger the establishment, the more difficult it becomes to make it run according to an ideal system. All kinds of difficulties arise. But broadly speaking, I do maintain that our missions abroad are run much more economically, less is spent on them than missions of other countries, and more especially, our younger officers as well as the other staff, the subordinate staff, is by no means heavily paid or even well paid by any standards.

The work that they have to do is not just filing papers or signing documents or files. A foreign mission has to be always on the alert, ought to be. The officer has to keep in touch with all kinds of people there, he has to mix with them, he has to invite them, he has to have social relations with them, political relations with other people. All this cannot be done easily unless he is given facilities for this.

Anyhow, we are constantly trying to look into this question. Again instructions have been issued, and I have no doubt that under the stress

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

of circumstances we shall make some further economies, because we are all aware of this.

Our biggest mission abroad in the point of numbers is the High Commission in London. The High Commission in London is much more than an embassy because it deals with several things. Firstly, there is stores purchase which is a very big affair. Then, there are more students abroad in England than any other foreign country. We have got to look after them. And we have to maintain there representatives of our Army, Navy and Air Force also, chiefly for purchases and for other purposes too. So that the High Commission plus the Indian Stores Department etc., is a very big organisation.

We have gone into it repeatedly. We have had some economies made, not a big figure. We are again going into it. It was our intention to send some officers there to help in this process. Then when I was there in London recently with our Secretary-General of the External Affairs Ministry, we felt that it would be better for a close scrutiny to be made by the High Commissioner and the senior officers there first of these departments and then later for a finance officer from here and a senior officer from the External Affairs Ministry to go there, because otherwise if these people go there, it is very difficult in three, four or five weeks time for them perhaps to get a full insight into the picture. So also we are dealing with other cases.

I should like to repeat that while I have pointed out that I think that the expenditure, heavy as it is, on our foreign missions is not very great considering the type of work they have to do, considering what other missions have to spend, nevertheless, I have no doubt that in the vast establishments there is extravagance in places, and that has to be and ought to be checked, and will be checked I hope. We have indeed sometimes come down rather heavily

on some of our officers who according to us have not behaved properly.

Then, I will not say much about Pondicherry. We have been waiting for a long, long time for the French Government to pass their law so that the transfer of the French territories here might become legal, *de jure*—up till now it is *de facto*. The House knows that French Governments have been changed frequently and all kinds of difficulties have been faced by them, and this thing which should have been a formal affair has not yet been done. We are now assured that in the course of the next month or two it will be done. I hope so.

As for the internal administration of Pondicherry, I do not wish to take up the time of this House, but those Members who are interested in this matter may see me and I shall gladly discuss it with them outside at some convenient moment.

Then there is this old question of our being, continuing in the Commonwealth. I do not know if I can add anything to what I have previously said on this issue. It seems to me that the difference in opinion on this issue arises really from a different conception of what we are there and what we do there. If it is a conception that by being in the Commonwealth we are in any sense subordinate to anybody, in any sense tied up to something that might come in our way, then I would be completely at one with those who object to our being in the Commonwealth. If, on the other hand, it does not come in our way in the slightest degree, and in fact give us certain opportunities, helpful opportunities, to serve the larger causes that we have at heart, then it is worth while being there.

I have asked in this House previously and I would like to ask that question again now. I can understand somebody feeling sentimental; well, he does not like it. To that, of course, there is no logical reply. But I should like to know practically how

our being in the Commonwealth has injured our policies or our advocacy of any cause that we hold dear. It has helped us, I say, in influencing others. It has helped us in regard to other matters too. And broadly speaking, I am against breaking any kind of association with any nation which I have. I want more associations, not less.

Our association with our neighbour country like Burma is a very close one, with other countries also it is often very close. It may not be dignified by a special name, but it is very closer in many ways than our association with many of the Commonwealth countries. So, I just do not understand this except that I can understand it on the ground of sentiment. In the Commonwealth there is the Union of South Africa with which we have nothing to do.

Now, certain changes are coming over the Commonwealth which I think are good in the wider scheme of things, that is the coming into the Commonwealth of independent Ghana a new nation, an African nation, to be followed a little later by Nigeria. To be followed presumably a little later by Nigeria. All these things really have a great deal of historical significance and we can help or hinder in these processes which are not only of importance to those countries concerned, but in the wider context of Africa and Asia and world peace.

Why should we

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura)
It is habitual slavery

(Raja Mahendra Pratap then left
the House)

An Hon Member: Why this walk-out?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are only one or two small points to which I shall refer now. There are one or two cut motions which refer to our issuing visas or not issuing visas to the World Peace Congress, I think which was held in Colombo, and something in regard to the Youth Festival in Moscow.

90 L S D—

So far as the Youth Festival is concerned, I do not quite know, but I think we have issued probably over two hundred. So, it is not a question of our not issuing visas. Certainly we do not quite understand this tremendous urge for people to attend Peace Congresses, and now the cause of peace to which we are committed is helped by these repeated assemblies gathering together in various parts of the world and holding aloft the banner of peace. We do not prevent people from going there, but we do not encourage them, and we make it quite clear that we do not encourage them. If they want to go, they can go certainly. Why do we say so? We say so because, I feel that many of these Peace Congresses, although in the name of peace, and although, no doubt, desiring peace, become political platforms also for other purposes, with the result that somehow the cause of peace itself becomes associated with a political platform, and thereby, to some extent, this bright shining surface is tarnished. Therefore, I can understand, of course, these discussions occasionally but how these repeated Peace Congresses help in the cause of peace has not been made clear to me yet.

There is one thing more. There is a cut motion about the continuation of the Gurkha recruitment camps. I must confess that I feel very distressed about this continuation. And we have tried our hardest to hurry this removal. Two countries are concerned, not only the United Kingdom, but Nepal, and there are limits beyond which we do not want to go. In this matter, we press them, we talk to them, we write to them, and they promise to take early steps. I believe, now, they have again told us that it should not take very long. I do not know what else to do in the present context, and so, they have continued much to our regret. That is all that I wish to say at this stage.

Perhaps, if necessary, I may answer any criticism made afterwards.

Mr. Speaker: The Demands for Grants Nos 23, 24, 25, 26 and 108 are

[Mr Speaker]

now before the House I have not yet received a prepared list of the cut motions which hon Members would like to move. As soon as I get the list, I shall read them out to the House.

Now, I shall call hon Members to speak on both the Demands for Grants and the cut motions.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am glad the Prime Minister has made certain preliminary observations, for, in spite of their length, they have the effect, I am sure, of assisting our discussion. In any case, especially in view of an intimation from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that later in this session, we are likely to have another opportunity of discussing foreign policy, I had already decided to confine myself to specific demands which are now being asked by the Ministry of External Affairs.

I need not reiterate that though the Prime Minister quite evidently has certain mental reservations about our attitude towards his foreign policy, we do offer by and large our support to his foreign policy, though, of course, we do not approve of such things as the Prime Minister's fixation—I use that word with respect—which recently appeared to be a little loosened, but still it appeared to be a fixation about the quality of the British Commonwealth and its potentiality for good in the context of today. But, in any case, I am not going to harp on that aspect of the matter. I shall refer to specific points on which I wish Government give us some satisfactory reply.

Several cut motions refer to the failure of the steps taken so far to bring about lasting peace, in what I might call the Naga land, since there is some difficulty, some technical difficulty, about most of the Nagas concerned living in the Naga Hills District of Assam—but quite a large chunk of them inhabit the North East Frontier Agency. Last session, on the 27th May, a question was asked, i.e.

starred question No 389, and the answer gave us the information that, last year, that is, in 1956, the number of hostile Nagas killed in NEFA was 155. But this year, up to the 30th April, in four months' time, the number killed is already 84.

This shows that all is not well in this area, and that is why I was very glad when, the other day, the Prime Minister made a categorical statement in answer to a question which I put, that he was perfectly prepared to consider amendments to the Sixth Schedule of our Constitution in consultation with the people concerned. I very heartily welcome this categorical statement, and I suggest that this statement of the Prime Minister is very widely publicised in the Naga areas. I would beg of the Prime Minister not to make a complete restoration of the law and order situation—which, of course, is very important—to be an absolute condition precedent to the kind of consultation which he says he is ready to have immediately. I wish that he proceeds in this matter.

Meanwhile, I would ask him to rectify such disproportion as I notice in the budget figures. I find, for example, that out of Rs 1 09 crores odd provided for economic development of tribal areas, under the head 'External Affairs', more than Rs 60 lakhs go towards the pay of officers and of establishments and their allowances, which is much more than 50 per cent of the total. Perhaps, this is not quite the way of winning the hearts of the people of the area.

The country, now being told so often of governmental austerity, has been perturbed by reports of unwarranted extravagance and I am glad the Prime Minister says that wherever extravagance is detected, it should be checked and stopped if that is possible. Last March, in the last session of the First Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee presented a report, that made some very serious revelations about the state

of affairs in the External Ministry. We find, for example, from that report:

"During the period 1st April, 1954 to 15th July, 1954, about Rs. 94,000 were spent on 144 parties.

"There was overlapping of parties given in some cases. Although Hyderabad House has been taken over and suitably furnished for the purpose of official entertainments, the majority of parties were held at the residence of officials. The charges paid per head for a party varied widely from Rs. 9 to Rs. 50 in the case of a dinner party. Although under the rules, sanction of Finance was necessary for expenditure exceeding Rs 1000 in computing this limit, the cost of wines etc. supplied from stock was excluded".

All this sounds rather peculiar in the context of the Prohibition policy which Government persists in sticking to in spite of certain suggestions being made from certain quarters that if perhaps prohibition can be modified, a good deal of revenue might come to our coffers.

The Report goes on to say:

"While the Committee recognise the need for such entertainments, they consider that the ceiling rates fixed by the Ministry in some of the cases are too liberal, specially when those rates did not include the cost of drinks. They trust that the Ministry of Finance would scrutinise the rates carefully and fix them reasonably"

Then, Sir, the Report presented last March referred to the case of an officer who had drawn advances three times for the purchase of a motor car, which he purchased and sold again and gave false reports to the Ministry. In regard to this, the observations of the Public Accounts Committee have led the Ministry to take certain steps, that is to say to

recover the amount from this officer and credit it to Government.

Now, I feel that in cases of this sort, when quite egregiously the Government's revenue is being taken away by means which are absolutely reprehensible, definite steps ought to be taken and, prosecution ought to be instituted. The Committee—our own Public Accounts Committee—has said:

"We are distressed to note that even after the matter had been brought to the notice of the Ministry by Audit, the Ministry has taken too lenient a view. It is a matter that merits serious action".

This came to us in March 1957. As against this, I find a special article in the *Statesman* over the signature of a very well known journalist of our country who says, — rightly or wrongly, I do not know—(this is from the Calcutta edition dated 5th July):

"Believe it or not, the first tangible result in New Delhi of the economy drive in the Administration which has been announced to the country in a blaze of publicity, is the discharge of 40 peons in the External Affairs Ministry".

Then it goes on to say

"This is more ridiculous than it is painful. Mark you"—these are his words—"their discharge from service is not accompanied by the slightest change in the pattern of the system which they embodied. There has been no alternation in the scale of peon allotment—"

this is a new expression, new to me anyhow—

"to Ministers and officials" Perhaps steps are being taken in this direction, but it is more than time something is done very definitely to see to it that our Administration is purged of the dross which this kind of behaviour represents"

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Real economy must begin to be practised not only in the over-ramified administration here, but also, with all respect to the Prime Minister, in our Embassies. My suggestion is: do not stint on our publicity abroad. It has already been inadequate and ineffective. I know in such countries as Afghanistan, for example, our publicity officers get so very little that they cannot entertain journalists. They cannot ask people to come and have a cup of tea with them—if you are so much insistent on prohibition. But they have not even got the money to ask them to a cup of tea. That is a position which we ought to change. Our publicity already so far has been very ineffective and inadequate. Make them adequate. Make them effective. Put capable men there. But economise on other things.

For example, I do not understand why in our Peking Embassy when postage, telegram and telephone charges are supposed to come down from Rs. 1,41,000 in 1956-57 to Rs. 65,000 in 1957-58—I do not know why—at the same time purchase and maintenance of furniture jumped from Rs. 25,400 in 1956-57 to Rs. 45,000 in 1957-58, and purchase and maintenance of cars from Rs. 8,000 in 1956-57 to Rs. 35,000 in 1957-58. This is a pattern of activity which, at least being strangers to the art of good living, we are quite unable to understand.

I do not think the country will like it—in spite of the Prime Minister's pleading—that we are going to open a new Embassy in Madrid. Spain wishing to have an Embassy here in Delhi is no reason for us to oblige them. Next door physically and ideologically to Portugal, Spain is a country with which our trade also is entirely negligible. Neither for political, nor for cultural nor for commercial reasons, do we have such intercourse as necessitates the institution of an Embassy, which is going to cost us, according to the budget figures, Rs. 2,20,100. But when the *charge d' affairs* goes and when the

full-fledged Ambassador goes to Madrid in all his glory, naturally the expenses of the Madrid establishment will go up.

I feel that this is extremely ill-advised. Contact with Spain—I do mind contact with Spain; I have no sense of untouchability about that kind of thing—contact at the consular level is good enough. Let us put a Consul-General there. We already perhaps have in Barcelona a Consulate-General—I am not very sure. We must have a Consulate-General. Let us have trade with Spain, and if things improve, let us have further diplomatic relations. But for the time being, there is no point in opening an Embassy in Madrid.

The Prime Minister has referred to our High Commission in London which, we find from figures supplied to us, spends a fabulous amount which of course, everybody knows. This figure is perhaps something which will bear retelling. Last time, the Prime Minister told us—on the 30th May, 1957 in reply to unstarred question No. 494—that the total expenditure in London in the High Commissioner's office was Rs. 1,58,52,788 and some naye paise added to it. Out of this, Rs. 60,82,334 was accounted for to 'External Affairs' and the rest to other Ministries like Works, Housing and Supply, Education and so on and so forth.

Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood in the least, but it does irk—it does irk all of us—when we find, for example, foreign journalists making bantering comments. I was in the Parliament Library the other day and I looked up a foreign journal which stated.

"India parades her austerity, but the High Commissioner for India in London rides a new Rolls Royce which is bigger than the English Queen's Daimler".

I know that perhaps the Prime Minister has a very adequate reply, let us know, let the country be assured that as far as avoidable expenditure-

ca in the High Commission in London are concerned, we are avoiding them. Let us know that as far as the purchases by the High Commissioner in London are concerned, we are making them as low as possible.

I got a reply the other day to a question in regard to the kind of work which the High Commission does in London, and I got the answer that Rs. 25 crores were paid by the High Commission, in London through foreign banks. Now we get periodicals like the *Swadeshi* of Bombay. Those who run this journal are very far from my way of thinking, but at the same time, as far as using swadeshi goods and services are concerned, we are all agreed. Why in the name of whatever you deem sacred, why do we utilise foreign banks and not India banks, who are coming forward to say that they too have foreign exchange facilities these days, to the extent of Rs. 25 crores in the year July 1955 to June 1956? That was the figure given to us. Why do we work in that fashion? Why is the working of the High Commission in London so extravagant that it is entirely oblivious of the real interests of our people and of our country at the present time? That is why I say—I do not want to say anything about the many scandals happening earlier, like the Jeep scandal, this scandal and that scandal and so on and so forth; I do not want to rake all that up—that is why I say that in regard to this it is very necessary that we have to be careful. We cannot be too careful, and our expenditure in London should be properly screened and suitably brought down.

The Prime Minister had told us about his distress over the continuation in our country of these Gurkha recruiting camps. This matter, as the House knows, has been hanging fire for more than five years. We were very blissfully under the impression that what the Prime Minister had told us even as late as July 1956 was the real state of things. We were absolutely assured that the

British Army was not being given a recruiting camp for Gurkhas on Indian soil. We knew that for the time being the Indian Government was giving the British Army facilities for the transit of Gurkhas across the country to Malaya. We did not like that at all. But, we had to swallow the bitter pill. That was all that was happening. But, now, suddenly, early this month, on the 2nd of July, I saw an item on 'Recruitment of Gurkha Soldiers' in the *Calcutta Statesman* and it says that for all practical purposes the Lehra Depot near Gorakhpur continues to be a well-organised centre for training Gurkha soldiers. The special correspondent of the *Statesman* from Gorakhpur says, somewhere in near Darjeeling, Kalimpong or other place, I do not know, the recruiting camps are still continuing and the British Gurkhas have an address in Calcutta. In the *Calcutta Telephone Directory*, I see that there is an entry "British Gurkhas." Anyhow, they continue.

But, why are we still having this kind of thing? The Prime Minister goes to the Commonwealth Conference; we do not mind. But, why should this kind of thing continue? Why, in spite of assurances being given by the British Government that they are not going to tarnish our fair name by recruiting Gurkhas on Indian soil to send them to Malaya to get rid of those who are for good reason or for bad reason trying to fight for their own liberation in their own way, why should the British Government behave in this fashion? The Prime Minister says that we should be very careful very cautious. I agree everything is tied up with the cold war and I know everything is tied up with cold war. Otherwise, we would not have this opportunity of shouting against this kind of thing. But, at the same time, everything being tied with cold war is no excuse for our having a bloodless policy all the time. Let us be very careful, let us be very discreet, as polite as we can be; let us not behave as, perhaps, I behave in this House. But, let us,

[Shri H N Mukerjee]

at any rate, be effective (*Interruptions*) Let us try to bring a real and effective change in the cold war atmosphere Occasionally, we have to say a few strong things in a strong voice to certain people and I need not specify who those particular people are

I wish the House is given an opportunity, I think the Prime Minister will agree, to discuss the state of Pondicherry whose *de jure* accession to India will, perhaps, soon materialise But, I would like just to say, because we have this opportunity now, that in the Pondicherry Representative Assembly, the Opposition, which is nearly equal in number to the Government, is not given any representation in committees like we do get here in Parliament or in the States I hear also that the textile industry in Pondicherry, deprived of its former market in the French Empire, needs special help which is not being forthcoming

Then, again, I have been told that only Rs 20 lakhs have been set apart for building a pier in Pondicherry, but that is not enough What is needed is the development of the port so that it may, one day, become a major port in the country There are certain difficulties about Pondicherry which, I think, the Prime Minister will take into consideration and take the necessary steps

I refer now to Indo-Pakistan relationships and I must begin by saying that the country, certainly, supports the Prime Minister's policy on this point, especially in regard to Kashmir Only, sometimes, being rather troublesome, we suggest that, perhaps, it is better that we withdraw the Kashmir issue from the Security Council But, anyhow, we are all with the Prime Minister as far as that policy is concerned

With the Pakistan Prime Minister, whom we know rather well because he comes from our part of the country, there can hardly be any hope of

successful negotiations But, surely, we can try, in spite of the difficulties in the situation, we can try to do a little more than we are doing now to explain our position to the people of Pakistan and to show that we really can truly befriend them This is a job which ought to be done and is not being done Publicity should help in regard to this matter For example, there is the canal waters dispute Our publicity on this matter should reach Pakistan and we should take steps to do so

Then, we can also tell the people of East Pakistan, for example, that it is India's object to utilise the waters of the Ganga, that India wants to build a barrage at Farraka, not in order to deprive Pakistan of any part of the waters of the Ganga but so that Pakistan as well as Bengal can gain, and, with the Ganga barrage at Farraka the future of Calcutta port can be ensured and the future of the Calcutta port involves also the future of the economy not only of India but also of East Pakistan So, it is very necessary that this kind of thing is put across to the people of Pakistan.

Then, I feel—it might be a fantastic suggestion—that we have a trade agreement with Pakistan, and we might go on and tell them that we want to develop this into something like a *zollverein* or customs union The Indo-Pakistan continent is an economic unity and it is necessary if in Europe they can talk about European free trade area and all that sort of thing why cannot we, at the same time, suggest the idea of a kind of Indo-Pakistan understanding on economic matters? (*Interruption*) Why all this controversy and trouble about canal waters and other things? To the devil with all this trouble! People can lead The Commerce and Industry Minister is there The Prime Minister is there The Prime Minister is the best man for the purpose He can make a few gestures I know he is perhaps tired of making gestures now He has made so many of

them and some of them have been responded to and more of them have not been, as far as Pakistan is concerned. At the same time, I feel that we have to make a gesture to the people of Pakistan. And this reminds me of an answer which, very happily, the Prime Minister gave me the other day.

He said, in answer to a question I asked about Pakistani nationals in India, in my part of the country, in Bengal and Assam also, fearing about their jobs—security of jobs—that there is going to be no throwing out by discrimination on this side. I was all the more happy that he said it. But the trouble is that, as a matter of fact, the Pakistani nationals coming to West Bengal—and they have been coming for generations to West Bengal—to earn their living, are in a kind of panic. Here is a member from Howrah, Mr. Muhammad Elias—he is a trade unionist—who tells me that in Howrah district there are Muslim workers from East Bengal who work there, because they do know some specialised jobs, in the jute factories and in the engineering industries and many of them are taking out their provident fund because an impression has been created that, at any time, their jobs might go.

I have read editorial articles in Calcutta newspapers, with large circulations, suggesting that in order to solve the unemployment problem in India, the service of the 80,000 and odd Pakistani nationals who work in West Bengal and Assam should be dispensed with as soon as ever that is possible. I find a report in a newspaper which I do not usually credit, a Bombay paper, which said that on the 15th of May, 1957, a conference of police officials from West Bengal was held with the Home Ministry here and the suggestion that was mooted was that in order to secure popularity of Congress it was better that you offered employment opportunities to Indian nationals and pushed out these Pakistanis. This may be an inaccurate report. But the impression has been created, particularly in the Calcutta Port.

Now, Sir, the port is manned by people who come from East Bengal, from Chittagong, from Noakhali, and such other areas. They have been coming there for generations. They know no other way of earning their living. They are the cheapest and the most efficient seamen in the world. They have been coming for generations. All these people are in some kind of fear. A word from the Prime Minister, if properly reported, will mean a great deal. What he said in answer to my question, the papers did not report because, after all, it was a question from me, even though the Prime Minister was kind enough to answer it. But, if something goes out from the Prime Minister, it would put heart in those people and if we can get the support of the people of Pakistan then, and then alone, can we bring about a change in the policies of the Government of Pakistan.

The Government of Pakistan, as at present constituted, is behaving in a fashion which I want to characterise by an adjective which the Prime Minister and yourself would certainly disapprove of and so I desist. But, after all, what we should try to do is to get the friendship of the people of Pakistan. And, for that purpose, I beg of the Prime Minister to take whatever steps he can in regard to this matter. Their fears may be exaggerated but the fears are there. Let not the fears be worked up into a panic because in that case all kinds of ill effects ensue.

The Prime Minister has referred to his virtual disapproval of people going to repeated peace conferences and youth festivals and so on and so forth. While I was quite ready to understand what exactly was in the Prime Minister's mind, I do not quite approve of his allergy towards Indian contacts with socialist countries. The Youth Festival is being held in Moscow and the idea, I understand, is that every two years, there is a youth festival, I think, in Moscow, Prague or in some other place. It is only a biennial affair; it is not held too often. They invited a thousand people or so from India. As for myself, I would not like

[Shri H N Mukerjee]

a thousand people to go That is my personal view I do not mind the Prime Minister saying I would not send more than 200 people But, what I do mind is the way in which the Government has proceeded in this matter

I did not know, but I only learnt recently that in the Moscow Youth Festival, they have set apart a certain time for the performance of Tagore's songs and drama and that kind of thing An entire Tagore programme was there Certain people were chosen by a Festival Committee It held a festival and a large number of people joined in it and they chose a few to go and take part in the Tagore performance The position is so bad now that nobody can go and sing a Tagore song This matter was brought to the notice of the Education Ministry by my hon friend, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty and Maulana Azad was good enough to say that this should have been done earlier and that these people should have been permitted to go The Festival people have been in touch with all kinds of important people in Delhi Unluckily, the Prime Minister was absent Perhaps if he were here, he might have done something about it because it was a very clear case of the necessity of our participation in the Tagore programme of the youth Festival but that was not done

I do not like the Prime Minister disapproving of the Peace Conferences quite in the manner that he does After all, when the Colombo meeting of the World Peace Council was held the Government of Ceylon behaved as if they were the hosts of the congregation The Ministers of the Ceylon Government came more than once to take part in the proceedings and something like a national wave of enthusiasm over the whole idea of peace gripped the whole island of Ceylon But, a Member of this House, Shri Ilias again who happens to be a member of the World Peace Council wanted to go to Colombo but did not have the pass-port He wanted a pass-port but could not get

This might be due to something in the red tape apparatus which is the bane of our country and unless it is changed altogether no results are going to ensue whatever huge Plans you may have It may be due to something and the red tape apparatus has got to be looked into The red tape apparatus has got to be re-moulded if you want to bring the country nearer the kind of life that we want our people to have

There are so many matters that the Prime Minister should apply his mind to I am not going to refer in general terms to the many points that the Prime Minister has referred to only by implication and by suggestion and I hope we shall have another opportunity of having a full dress discussion on foreign affairs when certain of the points which have been hunted by the Prime Minister may be amplified or may be discussed properly by the House

But I feel that as far as the Demands for Grants are concerned, there are certain points, very specific points which we have brought up

These points are all linked up with what we consider to be the Achilles heel of the Prime Minister's foreign policy, the unique weakness of his foreign policy He does not know that from time to time, he has to take a strong stand, he is always harping on the idea of our advantages on account of continuance in the Commonwealth. After all having been in the Commonwealth, what are we getting from time to time? Over Goa, have we got assistance? Over Kashmir, have we got any assistance? Over this European Economic area are we going to have any assistance? No Every time, it is no And at the same time we are to go on juggling the illusion that being in the Commonwealth in the way that we are really makes for progress

The Prime Minister does say that we are much more friendly with a country like Burma than many other countries in the Commonwealth That is not the whole story When the Citizenship Act was put on the Statute

Book, this was pointed out over and over again. Anybody from Canada or Australia or New Zealand or other countries in the Commonwealth can come to India and more or less enjoy the rights of citizenship. But a man from Burma cannot. We have said to the Home Minister so many times. Why cannot we have some kind of understanding? He says you cannot. There may perhaps be some technical difficulties. But, then let us not be told that our relations with Burma are very much closer than our relations with U.K. They are not.

Our relations with the United Kingdom are the most crucial factor of all—that is the most inhibiting factor—of all. The Prime Minister is not going to get out of the Commonwealth and I am not talking dangerously. To get out of the Commonwealth does not mean that we become unfriendly with England. So many of us on this side of the House are friendly with English people. With the English traditions also, we have a certain acquaintance. With the English language and literature also, we have a certain kind of acquaintance. So, naturally all our sympathies are very largely perhaps on the English side. England has no reason to fear if we get out of the Commonwealth. Getting out of the Commonwealth does not mean the adoption of bellicose anti-British policy. On the contrary, if we get out of the Commonwealth, we shall be rid of the incubus which, like that old man in the story of Sindbad the Sailor, prevents us from acting in the way we ought to. But, that is the real position.

If I go on in this fashion, I shall only be adding to the irritation I might already have caused to the members of the ruling Party which delights in saying that I repeat. We do repeat the same thing if that is an important thing. We say the same thing if that thing remains to be done and is always undone.

Therefore, without making any apologies for referring to the Commonwealth, I would say this. I would not pursue the matter but I suggest that

the Prime Minister who is loaded with so many anxieties gives a little more basic thought to basic matters. Then, perhaps he would be able to help us very much more than he has been so far. He has done a great job of work, I know, but, he can do a very much greater job of work only if he rid himself of certain incubuses which have made a kind of permanent settlement in his mind.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara) In spite of all that the Prime Minister had said, I wish to put forward a viewpoint which has been demanding our withdrawal from the Commonwealth. I feel that the pledge given to the nation in the year 1930 would be left unhonoured if we do not decide on our dissociation from the Commonwealth. There was a great expectation all over the country when, following the Anglo-French aggression on Egypt, the Prime Minister stated that the time had come to reconsider our association with the Commonwealth. When Britain conducted an unprovoked aggression against a small country like Egypt, India was not even informed but countries like the United States, which are outside the Commonwealth, were taken into confidence. India was neither consulted nor informed of the aggression. Again, regarding the hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific—we all know how the people in this part of the world are very much concerned about it,—Britain is quite unmindful of the sentiments, difficulties and dangers that such action may entail upon the less unfortunate partners of the Commonwealth.

Therefore, it was expected when the recent Commonwealth Conference was meeting against this background some reference to these two incidents would be made. But, I am sorry to say that the cryptic communique that was issued gave no indication to these. According to the PTI correspondent in London, it was stated that this communique was capable of different interpretations. The Manchester Guardian put it more positively on June 28, 1957.

“There was no attempt to hold a post mortem on the issues but

[Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedy]

one of the most interesting aspects of yesterday's discussion is that Nehru apparently referred to the past events in generous terms."....

"He showed no resentment about the events of last October, nor did he criticise the action of the United Kingdom Government."

14 hrs.

Sir, really it is a matter of surprise that the resentment that was shown all over the country, not only in India but even in Asia and Africa, vanished into the sky when we reached the Commonwealth Conference and our Prime Minister remained calm. I think he owes an explanation to this country. Why is it that such a cowardly act of aggression was not taken into account? When he himself had condemned it in no uncertain terms, why is it that it was not included in the discussions? Will I be wrong, Sir, if I say that there was some sort of political horse trading in this Commonwealth Conference?

Again, according to the P.T.I. correspondent:

"The blistering attack" on Russia for or reprehensible conduct in Hungary was dropped from the final communique at the instance of Nehru. In return, perhaps, the Anglo-French attack was not condemned.

In other words, we became a party to a decision where these two wanton aggressions were condoned.

I agree with the Prime Minister when he says that we are not subordinate to any other country by remaining in the Commonwealth. But, can he say that we are not carrying on any political obligations by remaining in the Commonwealth? This is one of the instances which shows that we have to carry out certain obligations.

14.02 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

There is new slogan raised in the country that the nature of the Commonwealth has been changing; Ghana has been admitted as a member and Malaya is coming into it after 31st August. The father of this slogan is Mr. Bevan who came to this country. So far as British interests are concerned, there is no difference between a Conservative and a Labourite.

They say: 'You will have a majority in the Commonwealth. Why are you afraid? Go forward and have close contacts with new nations that are joining the Commonwealth.' I wish to impress upon you, Sir, that, perhaps, it is a fact that no decision in the Commonwealth is taken on a majority or minority basis.

Actually, I feel that our association with the Commonwealth vitiates our relations between countries like Ghana and India. If we are really serious to develop our contacts with freedom loving Asian and African nations, it must be on the basis of unity of outlook upholding freedom and social justice, and its sphere is not certainly the Commonwealth.

Again, I would like to point out that on the question of Cyprus also the Commonwealth remained silent, and I have no doubt that by remaining silent it has done a great blow to our prestige, because although we supported the Cyprus struggle in the United Nations, when we go to the Commonwealth we forget ourselves and we go the way the Londoners want us to go.

I would have thought that there was some substance, some reason for our remaining in the Commonwealth if by our association it was possible for us to contribute towards better understanding amongst the different nations that constitute the Commonwealth. But what is the real achieve-

ment in this regard? None of the Commonwealth countries with which we had so many disputes have been able to really understand our view points properly. We are still in the midst of disputes as we were before, there is no proper understanding.

It is not that Britain has ever shown its inclination to help us in problems with which we are greatly interested. Take the question of Goa. I am proud that our Prime Minister is wanted very much for consultation in other countries. President Nasser wanted his help and guidance in certain very important matters. I would like our Prime Minister also to take some lessons from men like President Nasser. How did he solve the Suez problem? He had the boldness to take a step, and after some years you will see that in spite of all international complications Suez is going to be that of Egypt after a year. Can our Prime Minister also not take this lesson from President Nasser, and take a bold step to see that Goa also becomes part of India without delay?

Sir, when the Commonwealth Conference was going on it must have come to your notice that there was lathi-charge in Johannesburg on Indians. Even that fact was not taken notice of and there was no condemnation from any quarter whatsoever. The Prime Minister is telling us about different countries, but it seems for some time past he is completely silent over this racial question.

Therefore, I feel that it is not only on account of sentimental reasons but because of very practical reasons it is necessary that we should dissociate ourselves from the Commonwealth. By all means develop friendship, enter into treaties with England for commercial and cultural purposes, and let us also have closer and intimate contacts in a more freer atmosphere with other Asian and African nations, but for God's sake leave this Commonwealth.

It is said that there are some economic advantages. I do not know

what these are. The Prime Minister himself has admitted in a statement that the prospects of a development loan from Britain is very bleak. One of the terms of this loan, I am told, seems to be to maintain our sterling balances at a certain level. Why should we agree to such a proposal? We know what happened to Egypt. All assets of Egypt were frozen as soon as there was a little quarrel.

It will also be seen that because of the Commonwealth relations British profits on visible and invisible exports to Commonwealth countries are about £260 million a year. But, what is the assistance or grants that Britain is giving to the Commonwealth countries? It is not more than £60 million a year.

My friend Mr Mookherjee has already referred to our attitude towards this recent European free trade plan. Australia and New Zealand have expressed their misgivings. I want to know what India has to say about it, and whether India has been informed about it.

I have a feeling, if we dissociate ourselves from the Commonwealth, perhaps, we will be able to develop an international relationship of our own for money and other international transactions. Therefore, we strongly feel that the time has come when this relationship, our association with the Commonwealth should be done away with.

Having said this much, I will refer to the economy in the Embassies. I am glad that the Prime Minister realises that there is some extravagance which ought to be looked into. I am not complaining that we have given excessive grants. I realise that when our foreign relations are going to be expanded there is need for more money. What I want to point out is that whatever amount is allotted is not properly spent or, in most cases, mis-spent. I looked into the Explanatory Memorandum, pages 260 to 361, Volume I, but I am sorry to say that it does not give us any details.

[Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedy]

I find there are some changes as regards entertainment and discretionary expenditure. There is a drop in entertainment charges but at the same time there is an increase in the discretionary expenditure. I would like to know from the Prime Minister what is the number of staff that are working in the different embassies and what is the actual work allotted to them. It will be seen that there are many duplications of duty and many of them are unnecessary. I won't go into the details about the Indian High Commissioner's Office. My friend has also referred to the report of the Public Accounts Committee but I want to point out why in spite of the fact that there is a huge building at the disposal of the Indian High Commission, containing many residential quarters, our visiting Ministers are living in hotels, very costly hotels. It appeared in the papers that our Defence Minister Shri Krishna Menon when he was in England was staying at Claridges paying 11 guineas a day and I do not know why. A friend here says it was 35 guineas a day. In the Indian High Commissioner's Office, I am told there are as many as 28 officers of the External Affairs Department and besides these we have as many as 62 officers representing different Ministries separately. I do not know why we are duplicating the staff. It is said we have to make purchases ...

An hon. Member: There may be a Parliament also there.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We want purchases. That is all right but it is also known that whenever any big purchases are to be undertaken big officials from this country also visit the place. If ultimately they are to decide the purchases, is it necessary to maintain this big staff at the Indian High Commissioner's Office? (Interruption).

I again want to point out that in our 37 embassies I learn on good authority that we have as many as 15

financial officers in the rank of joint or Deputy Secretaries. What is their work? Their work seems to be to sign all the financial papers that emerge out of the embassies. Ultimately these papers are to be submitted to the financial control of the External Affairs Department and then they go to the Finance Ministry itself. Why not this task be given to the Ambassadors themselves? They can as well do this job mostly easily.

I am told that when our revered Vice-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan was in Moscow there were as many as 9 Secretaries at the Moscow Embassy but by the time he left or during the tenure of his office, he reduced the staff to two and if that could be done by a successful Ambassador like Dr. Radhakrishnan, I fail to see why this cannot be done in other embassies also. I would like to know what is the position in Moscow Embassy today.

I also feel that if we take into consideration the entire thing, you will find that even in the lower ranks, there is over-staff. I do not complain about because I am told that there is some very great defect in our economic system, in our accounting system, for which it is necessary that we have to send our men from this place, whereas in other embassies they have to import local men to do this type of job. I am told that in Switzerland in the British Embassy there are only 3 assistants, whereas in our embassy there are 5 assistants. We have already decided upon the metric system and can we not develop some accounting system of our own and cannot a beginning be made in our international affairs at least, if not in the vast accounting system that we have in this country?

I would like to point out another thing. I wish to be corrected if I am wrong. The entertainment allowance that is provided to the officers is not properly spent. It is just sometimes accounted in the name of the person for whom that is meant. Why not have a system in which, we

may make some arrangement in the embassy for the high salaried officers to entertain persons in the embassies just in the way it is done here in the case of ministers. I think that if some such device is made, there will be great economy in this matter.

I would like to finish my speech by referring to one more point and that is publicity. Already we have read so many reports in the Press from very responsible journalists from responsible papers that our publicity organization is most ineffectual. Recently our Prime Minister visited European countries and it was published in the Daily Express that the Prime Minister has changed his views on Hungary after a discussion in some Scandinavian countries, when the London Correspondent of the *Statesman* (*Statesman* published it on the 30th June 1957) pointed out, the Indian High Commissioner's Office said that they have no knowledge about it whatsoever. It is a fact that smaller countries like Pakistan have their publicity organization and they are so efficient that any matter of controversy or misrepresentation is contradicted within 24 hours. But unless it comes to the notice of our big guns probably we do not know what propaganda is carried on against us in other countries.

I will again point out to you something and on which I would seek some clarification from the Minister. In the *Statesman* dated the 12th May 1957, there was a column in which it was stated that there is some difference between the Indian High Commissioner and the Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon. It was further stated:

"Embarrassing as they are, the facts must be faced. No one visiting Britain or the U.S.A. these days fails to hear the most damaging stories about India's diplomatic reputation as a result of reports that Mr. Krishna Menon and Mrs. Pandit do not see eye to eye in official matters

concerning both or either. It is known that the Prime Minister is fully aware of the position, but it is obvious that his personal wishes in this matter are not always respected."

If this is so, I ask what will happen to our prestige. I therefore think that it is necessary that we should clarify matters like this.

As regards the internal publicity, I learn that the External Affairs Ministry has as many as 3 officers for internal publicity, for acquainting people and organizations in this country about the foreign policy. I want to ask whether these officers have ever met together to devise plans as to how they should contact the people here. So far as I know, there is no such work carried on. The people are quite ignorant of what is happening in other countries and the vehicle of this propaganda is certainly newspapers, political organizations and other such bodies. I want to know what the Prime Minister has to say about it. With these remarks, I conclude my speech.

सठ गौबिन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में मैं वैदेशिक विभाग की मांगों पर न जाने कितनी बार बोल चुका हूँ। इस बात को इस देश के प्रायः सभी लोग जानते हैं कि हमारी जो वैदेशिक नीति चल रही है उसका मैं सबसे बड़ा समर्थक हूँ। इसके कुछ कारण हैं। पहला कारण यह है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति भारतीय संस्कृति और भारतीय इतिहास के अनुरूप है और दूसरा कारण यह है कि संसार की इस समय की स्थिति में इस संसार का लाभ हमारी वैदेशिक नीति से ही हो सकता है। जब मैं आपसे यह कहता हूँ कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति भारतीय संस्कृति और भारतीय इतिहास के अनुसार है उस समय मैं आपको और इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों को स्मरण कराना चाहता हूँ कि इस संसार के और भारत के सब से पुराने ग्रन्थ ऋग्वेद में इस

[सिंठ गोविन्द दास]

सम्बन्ध में क्या कहा गया है। हमारे ऋषि, मुनियों ने हमारे तत्ववेत्ताओं ने, हमारे ज्ञानियों और संतों ने एक बात इस संसार में सबसे पहले जान ली थी कि यथार्थ में यह विश्व एक ही तत्व है और इस ज्ञान के अनुरूप उन्होंने ऋग्वेद के एक सूत्र में कहा था : "मर्वं खल्विद ब्रह्म", अर्थात् यह विश्व यथार्थ में ब्रह्म का रूप है। तो जब यह विश्व एक ही तत्व है, मैं वही हूँ जो आप हैं, आप वही हैं जो मैं हूँ और समस्त विश्व वही है जो आप और मैं, तब आप देखें कि हमारी वैदेशिक आर्थिक नीति भी इस ज्ञान के अनुसार चल रही है या नहीं चल रही है। हमारे कोई शत्रु नहीं हैं, हम किसी को अपना शत्रु नहीं मानते। मित्र मित्र देशों की नीति अपने अपने देश में चाहे कैसी ही क्यों न हो, वे अपने अपने देश में चाहे किन्हीं सिद्धान्तों के अनुरूप क्यों न चलते हों, उनकी राज-नीतिक, और आर्थिक नीति चाहे एक दूसरे के ठीक विपरीत क्यों न हों, दृष्टान्त के लिये आप अमरीका और रूस को ले लीजिये पर हम अमरीका के भी मित्र हैं और हम रूस के भी मित्र हैं। हमारी इस नीति के कारण कभी कभी गलत कहमिया भी होती है। कई बार अमरीका हमें गलत समझता है, कई बार रूस हमें गलत समझता है। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में भी आपको कुछ दृष्टान्त दूंगा।

कोरिया के सम्बन्ध में और अभी हंगरी के सम्बन्ध में अमरीका ने हमको गलत समझा, परन्तु हमने इस बात को सिद्ध कर दिया कि चाहे अमरीका हमें गलत समझे, लेकिन हम अपनी नीति के अनुसार चलते हैं। इसी प्रकार अनेक बार रूस और चीन भी हमें गलत समझते हैं। कामन-वेल्थ में रहने के प्रश्न को ही आप ले लीजिये। जब जब वैदेशिक नीति पर विवाद होता है हमेशा कामनवेल्थ का प्रश्न आता है। आज

भी मेरे मित्र श्री एच० एन० मुखर्जी ने श्री उनके पञ्चात् जों महाशय बोले उन्होंने कामनवेल्थ के सम्बन्ध में बहुत कुछ कहा, परन्तु उन्होंने आज या इससे पहले कभी भी हमें यह नहीं बताया कि कामनवेल्थ में रहने से हमारी कौन सी हानि हो रही है? कामनवेल्थ में रहने से हम क्या रूस और चीन के शत्रु हैं? हमारी कामनवेल्थ में रहने की नीति भी हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की पृष्ठभूमि में जो सिद्धान्त है, उन सिद्धान्तों के ठीक अनुरूप है। ग्रेट ब्रिटेन और ग्रेट ब्रिटेन के साथ रहने वाले देशों से हमारा बहुत पुराना सम्बन्ध है। स्वराज्य प्राप्त करने के बाद हमारा मैत्री का सम्बन्ध हो गया। आज जब दुनिया के देश एक दूसरे के इतने निकट आ गये हैं शीघ्रगामी यातायात के साधनों के कारण, तब हम यह नहीं चाहते कि हमारा देश एक छोटे से दायरे के अन्दर रहे। कामनवेल्थ में रहने से कोई नुकसान तो नहीं बताया गया पर एक बहुत बड़ा लाभ जो है उस और हमारे मित्रों का ध्यान नहीं जाता। कामनवेल्थ में रहने से हम एक व्यापक क्षेत्र में हो जाते हैं और व्यापक क्षेत्र में होने के कारण दुनिया से हम कुछ अधिक मिला सकते हैं, दुनिया को कुछ अधिक मिला सकते हैं, दुनिया के साथ कुछ अधिक दूर तक चल सकते हैं और दुनिया को अपने साथ कुछ अधिक दूर तक चला सकते हैं, यह बहुत बड़ा लाभ है हमारे कामनवेल्थ में रहने का।

मैंने अभी जैसा आप से निवेदन किया मेरी समझ में आज तक नहीं आया, कि कामनवेल्थ में रहने से हमारी हानि क्या है। यह कहा जाता है कि यदि हम कामनवेल्थ में हैं तो कामनवेल्थ में रहने का हमको कुछ लाभ होना चाहिये, मसलन गोष्ठा का प्रश्न, काश्मीर का प्रश्न। इन बातों में कुछ

सख्य आवश्यक है, इसको मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ परन्तु जिस नीति पर हम चल रहे हैं उसमें यदि हम को कुछ लाभ होंगे तो वे लाभ सम्बन्धी दौरान में होंगे, आज के आज हमको लाभ नहीं हो सकते। इसलिये जैसा मैंने अभी कहा कि कभी अमरीका हमको गलत समझता है कभी रूस और कभी ग्रेट ब्रिटेन भी। अभी स्ट्रेज नहर के मामले पर हमको इंग्लैंड में कितना गलत समझा गया। इंग्लैंड में उस समय मैंने सुना कि भारतीयों का रहना दूधर हो गया था। वहाँ पर हर एक भारतीय का एक प्रकार से अपमान होता था। एक बार तो मैंने यह सुना कि वहाँ पर एक विचित्र घटना घटित हुई। एक ट्राम में एक भारतीय जा रहा था, एक अंग्रेज भी वहाँ पर बैठा हुआ था उस भारतीय को देखते ही उन अंग्रेज महाशय को इतना क्रोध उमड़ आया कि उन्होंने कहा कि तुम्हें कामनवेल्थ में से निकाल देना चाहिये और शायद कुछ झड़प भी हो गई। उस भारतीय ने तुरन्त उत्तर दिया कि यदि हम कामनवेल्थ में से निकल गये तो आपकी समझ लेना चाहिये कि उस दिन ग्रेट ब्रिटेन एक छोटा सा टापुभर रह जायगा और उसका कोई महत्व नहीं रहेगा। इस प्रकार ग्रेट ब्रिटेन द्वारा भी हमको अनेक बार गलत समझा जाता है पर यह सब अस्थायी बातें होनी हैं। आज इंग्लैंड में हम को इस प्रकार गलत नहीं समझा जा रहा है कि जैसे उस समय समझा जा रहा था जब स्ट्रेज नहर का झगडा उठा हुआ था। भारत की नीति सब को भिन्न समझने की है किसी को शत्रु समझने की नहीं है, हम सब के भिन्न हैं हम किसी के शत्रु नहीं। इसलिये आज हमको चाहे कोई गुट गलत समझे, कल हमें चाहे कोई गुट गलत समझे, हमने जैसा बार बार कहा है हम किसी गुट में शामिल होने वाले नहीं हैं और हम सबको भिन्न समझने वाले हैं।

एक बात देख कर मुझे खुशी होती है। यहाँ जो कटीती के प्रस्ताव आये, मैंने उन्हें

देखा। एक समय था जब मैं देखता था कि वे कटीती के प्रस्ताव कुछ बड़े बड़े सिद्धान्तों पर रखे जाते थे पर अब मैं देखता हूँ कि इन कटीती के प्रस्तावों में कोई बड़े बड़े सिद्धान्त नहीं है, छोटी छोटी बातें कही गई हैं।

यहाँ पर अभी दूतावासों के खर्च के निम्बत कहा गया और हमारे वैदेशिक विभाग के मन्त्रालय के खर्च के सम्बन्ध में भी कहा गया।

श्री हीरेन्द्र नाथ मुकर्जी से मैं एक बात में सहमत हूँ कि हमारे मन्त्रालयों द्वारा दिल्ली में दूतावासों द्वारा जो भोज या प्रीति भोज दिये जाय, उनमें शराब का जरा भी उपयोग नहीं होना चाहिये उसे सर्वथा बन्द करना चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने कुछ दिन पहले एक प्रस्ताव कांग्रेस दल को भेजा था जिस में मैंने कहा था कि हमारे कांग्रेस के मंत्री, कांग्रेस के मन्त्रालय या कांग्रेसजन यदि कोई भोज दे तो उस में शराब का उपयोग नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं अभी भी इस मतका हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री इस सम्बन्ध में अपने मन्त्रालयों को हमारे मन्त्रालयों की ओर जहाँ जहाँ कांग्रेसवादियों का सम्बन्ध है उन सब स्थलों को स्पष्ट आदेश भेजे कि यदि उनके किसी भोज में किसी प्रीतिभोज में शराब का उपयोग हो है तो वह तत्पक्ष बन्द कर दिया जाय।

लेकिन इसके अतिरिक्त अभी यहाँ पर जो दो भाषण हुये उन में कुछ टुच्ची बातों को छोड़ कर कोई ऐसी बात नहीं रखी गई जिस में हम इस बात को मान लें कि हमारे दूतावासों में बहुत अधिक खर्च होना है। श्री हीरेन्द्र नाथ मुकर्जी ने पीकिंग के सम्बन्ध में दो बहुत छोटी बातें कही हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की छोटी बातें इस प्रकार क सदन में नहीं कही जानी चाहिये। उन्होंने कहा कि अमुक अमुक वर्ष में फिनचर पर इतना खर्च हुआ था इस वर्ष इतना खर्च हुआ। मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि शायद वह फिनचर बहुत खराब हो गया होगा और उस को बदलने की आवश्यकता होगी।

[सिठ गोविन्द दास]

क्या श्री हीरेन्द्र नाथ मुकर्जी और सदन के दूसरे सदस्य इस बात को नहीं जानते कि हमारे बंगलों का फर्निचर भी बदला जा रहा है और हम बड़े चाव से उस को बदलवा रहे हैं। वे यह देखेंगे कि हमारे बंगलो में इस वर्ष जो फर्निचर भेजा जा रहा है उसके कारण इस वर्ष फर्निचर के मद का खर्च शायद गत वर्ष के खर्च की अपेक्षा कहीं ज्यादा होगी। तो फर्निचर बदलने की बात कहना, मोटर बदलने की बात कहना, यह कहना, कि मोटर बदलने में पीकिंग से आठ हजार रुपये ज्यादा लगा, मैं समझता हूँ कि बड़ी टुन्बी बातें हैं, बहुत छोटी बातें हैं, और इस प्रकार की बातें इस सदन में नहीं की जानी चाहियें।

मैं प्रायः दुनिया के सभी देशों में ही आया हूँ। मैंने अपने दूतावासों को देखा है, और मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे दूतावासों में जितना कम खर्च होना है, उतना दुनिया का कोई और देश नहीं करता, पाकिस्तान का दूतावास भी नहीं करता। हमारे दूतावासों के जो कर्मचारी हैं उन को इतना अधिक काम करना पड़ता है कि उन को छुट्टियाँ नहीं मिलती। कहा जाता है कि हमारे दूतावासों में अधिक आदमी है, मैं तो कहता हूँ कि हमारे दूतावासों में बहुत कम आदमी है। जहाँ तक हमारे दूतावासों का सम्बन्ध है, मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि उन को खर्च कम नहीं मिलना चाहिये उन को तो और ज्यादा खर्च मिलना चाहिये क्योंकि उन के खर्च में कमी करने से हमारे पूरे बजट के खर्च में कोई भारी कमी नहीं हो जायगी। गांव वानों को एक सहायक है कि यदि मुर्दे के बाल काट दिये जायें तो उसका वजन कुछ कम नहीं होता, वह उतने का उतना ही रहता है। इसलिये जो हमारी इतनी बड़ी सरकार चल रही है और उसको जो खर्च हो रहा है, उसके खर्च में दूतावासों के खर्च में कमी करके, कोई कमी नहीं हो जायगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश

के हित की दृष्टि से और दूसरी दृष्टियों से इन दूतावासों को अधिक खर्च मिलना जरूरी है।

यहाँ नये दूतावासों के खोलने के सम्बन्ध में भी कहा गया। यह कहा गया कि जिन देशों के दूतावास यहाँ हैं उन सब देशों में हमारे भी दूतावास खोलें यह जरूरी नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि यह जरूरी नहीं है, परन्तु इस के साथ ही यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कहीं कहीं पर इस प्रकार के दूतावास बहुत आवश्यक हो जाते हैं। मैं दक्षिण अमरीका का उदाहरण दूँगा। दक्षिण अमरीका में हमारे केवल दो दूतावास हैं जब कि वहाँ छोटे बड़े सब मिला कर २१ देश हैं। यथार्थ में दक्षिण अमरीका एक देश न हो कर एक महाद्वीप है, एक कांटिनेंट है। वहाँ के देशों से हमारे बड़े प्रेमपूर्ण सम्बन्ध हैं अमरीका में हमें कुछ और दूतावास खोलने की आवश्यकता है। मैंने अभी आप से कहा कि शीघ्रगामी यातायात के कारण यह दुनिया बहुत छोटी हो गई है। अपनी वैदेशिक नीति के कारण हम सब के मित्र हैं और इसलिये किमों भी दूतावास में किमों भी वक्त खर्च देने की तरफ सकोच करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमें उन्हें और अधिक खर्च देना चाहिये और कुछ दूतावास हमें और खोलने चाहिये।

जैसा मैंने आप से कहा, मैंने जिन कटीती प्रस्तावों को देखा उन में मुझे मालूम हुआ कि यह कटीती के प्रस्ताव कोई बड़े बड़े सिद्धांतों के ऊपर नहीं हैं, बहुत छोटी छोटी बातों पर हैं। कुछ बातें और हैं जैसे हमारे और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध, काश्मीर का मसला, नहरों पानी का सवाल, गोवा का प्रश्न, यह सब प्रश्न अभी तक ऐसे हैं जो हल नहीं हुये हैं। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में आज हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कुछ कहा वह ध्यान देने योग्य है। उन्होंने कहा कि

इस सब प्रश्नों को हल करने के लिये हमें तरीकों की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये। हमें इस पर विचार करना चाहिये कि हम इन सब प्रश्नों को किन तरीकों से हल करना चाहते हैं। जो रास्ता हमने पकड़ा है वह चाहे जल्दी चीजों को हल न करे, लेकिन वह चीजों को स्थायी रूप से हल करने वाला है। हम बहुत दूर तक सफल भी हुये हैं। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति जितनी सफल हुई है, उतनी शायद और कोई नीति नहीं हुई।

जो हमारे पंचशील के सिद्धान्त हैं, जिन पर हमारी वैदेशिक नीति आधारित है, आज वे कई देशों द्वारा स्वीकार किये जा चुके हैं और आज प्रायः सारे संसार में यह माना जाता है कि इन पंचशील सिद्धान्तों पर चलने से ही इस संसार का कल्याण हो सकता है। पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों पर चलने के लिये हमको दुनिया में मनोवैज्ञानिक स्थिति क्या है इस तरफ ध्यान देना होगा। हम को लोगों की मनोवैज्ञानिक स्थिति को बदलने का प्रयत्न करना होगा। वह हम अनेक प्रकार से कर सकते हैं। हम उनसे कर सकते हैं अपने यहां के विद्वानों को, अपने यहां के कलाकारों को दूसरे देशों में भेज कर और वहां के लोगों को यहां पर बुला कर। हम आदान-प्रदान से हम एक विशेष प्रकार का मनोवैज्ञानिक स्थिति दुनिया में पैदा कर सकते हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के जो दोरे होते हैं, और वे प्रति वर्ष होते हैं, उनसे भी इस मनोवैज्ञानिक स्थिति में बहुत परिवर्तन हुआ है। इससे हमारे देश की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ती है, हमारे देश के सिद्धांतों को, पंचशील के सिद्धांतों को, हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के सिद्धान्तों को समझने का मौका लोगों को मिलता है। इसलिये इस प्रकार आदान प्रदान होना चाहिये कि हमारे लोग विदेशों को जायें, विदेशों के लोग यहां आयें, हम एक दूसरे को अधिक समझने का प्रयत्न करें। यदि हम इस तरफ बढ़ते जायेंगे तो मुझे विश्वास है कि हम दुनिया

की मनोवैज्ञानिक स्थिति बदलने में सफल हो सकेंगे।

अन्त में मैं आप से एक बात और कहूंगा, जो मैं सदा ही कहता रहा हूँ। कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं जिन में भिन्न भिन्न दलों में रहने पर भी, चाहे हम कांग्रेस दल के हों, चाहे हम प्रजा समाजवादी दल के हों, चाहे साम्यवादी, हिन्दु सभा, रामराज्य परिषद्, राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक सघ, जनसंघ, किमी भी दल के हों, चाहे हम स्वतन्त्र हों, हम मिल कर काम कर सकते हैं। चुनावों में हम एक दूसरे से लड़ सकते हैं, इस प्रकार के मौके और भी आ सकते हैं, जिनमें हम एक दूसरे का विरोध करें, पर इसके साथ ही कुछ ऐसे काम भी हैं, जो कि हम मिलकर कर सकते हैं, और उन कामों में मैं वैदेशिक नीति को सबसे प्रधान मानता हूँ। मेरा यह मत है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति, जिसको कि अब इस देण के प्रायः सभी दल स्वीकार करने लगे हैं, जिसका समर्थन आज दुनिया में भी बहुत दूर तक हो गया है, उस वैदेशिक नीति में हम सब जितने भी दल हैं, मिल कर उस का समर्थन करें, उसके अनुसार काम करें।

जैसा कि मैंने आरम्भ में कहा था, अन्त में फिर दुहराता हूँ कि इस वैदेशिक नीति का मैं बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ। आज भी हूँ। अतः आज इस अवसर पर भी मैं इस वैदेशिक नीति का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya):
This afternoon I will make nine concrete suggestions for the earnest consideration of the Ministry and this House.

My first suggestion is that an offer of a federal union or a military alliance should be made to China and Russia. Pakistani troops are standing on our borders in unusually large numbers. I do not expect any help from America, for it is America which has armed Pakistan to the teeth, and even if America offers

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

help militarily in the event of a conflict between India and Pakistan, I would not like the Government of India to take any advantage of the offer, for they will want air bases, land bases, ports and harbours in order to attack Pakistan, but if we take the help of the Communist countries, Russia and China in particular, they do not require to come here in order to attack Pakistan. Therefore, it is militarily and politically advantageous for us to enter into a military alliance with both these countries.

This is my second suggestion. A sub-committee of the Cabinet should be set up to explore the possibilities of a federal union with all the other countries of the Afro-Asian land mass in general, and with Egypt and Syria in particular.

Thirdly, a sub-committee of the Bandung Powers should also be set up to explore the possibilities of a federal union.

Fourthly, the goal of an Arab world should be actively supported by the Government of India. We cannot pursue a dog-in-the-manger policy. We do not want the Americans to fill the vacuum in the Middle East. We do not want Russia to fill the vacuum. There is a political vacuum in the Middle East and this vacuum cannot remain unfilled for long. There is no other alternative but to support some native power or powers of the Middle East so that they may fill the vacuum themselves. If America fills the vacuum in the Middle East, our power position will be liquidated. Therefore, I support the goal of an Arab world.

My fifth suggestion is this. The only way of resolving the deadlock between the Jews and the Arabs is the establishment of a federal union between Israel and the Arab world. (Laughter).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member need not wait for the reactions of the Members immediately.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am amazed at this stupendous ignorance of the hon. Members who laugh with-

out understanding the implications of my suggestions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is presumed that every hon. Member is well acquainted with all these policies. Therefore ignorance or any other thing should not be attributed.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: It is so good of you to say so.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): We are trying to be his colleagues.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: My sixth suggestion is that a joint warning by India and Russia should be publicly administered to Pakistan. Pakistan must be confronted with the strategy of a war on two fronts. Unless this is done, there is likely to be aggression. Pakistan is under the impression that because of the Prime Minister's idealistic stand on Hungary, Russia is not likely to support India. Therefore, it can easily invade India. This misapprehension should be removed. If this warning is publicly given, then I am certain that Pakistan will not take the risk.

My seventh suggestion is that Goa should be occupied if there is any danger of its being transformed into a SEATO base for military operations. Not otherwise. Let me be frank about it. I do not want that we should be entangled in some complications unnecessarily at this moment. Formosa is still in American hands and the Chinese are sitting tight. They are not taking any military steps. Why should we? But if there is any danger of Goa being transformed into a SEATO base for military operations, then we cannot wait.

My eighth suggestion is this. To prevent the partition of Algeria, to facilitate the admission of China into the UNO, to prevent further test explosions and to facilitate integration of the Afro-Eurasian land mass, I suggest that no economic aid should be taken from the USA.

My ninth suggestion is that arms and military planes should be pur-

chased from Communist countries also. I do not know of any type of weapons which the Russians cannot manufacture within a period of three months. The argument that because our army is modelled on the British pattern, we cannot import weapons from Soviet Russia and the other countries of Eastern Europe lacks substance. The Russians are prepared to train our personnel in India itself. If there is any struggle between India and Pakistan, I apprehend our arms supplies will be stopped. This door must always remain open.

When I say that we should not take any aid from the United States, I am likely to be told that economic considerations should govern foreign policy. I think it is a first class political blunder to think that economic consideration should primarily govern foreign policy. There are no economic considerations behind the foreign policies of either Russia or America. Their goal is primarily political. Their aim is to establish world hegemony. Economic considerations govern the foreign policies of satellite State. I am certain that no Member of this House will accept the position of a satellite State of America and seek economic aid from that country.

Dr. P. Subbaroyan (Tiruchengode): What about being a satellite of the other two countries which the hon. Member mentioned?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I have not been able to understand the meaning of the word 'alignment', though I have been a Member of this House and I have tried to understand it; possibly, due to my limited intelligence, I have not been able to understand it.

Shri Jaipal Singh: No, no.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I have failed to understand the meaning of the word 'alignment'. China is aligned with Russia. Does alignment mean subservience? Is China a servile State? Are there not differences of opinion on most problems of foreign policy between England and America. How has alignment acted as a brake

in any way on the independence of either England or China? Economic aid from the West hinders the political integration of the old world, and political integration of the old world is the only solution of all the problems of international politics.

Economic aid from the West also widens the gulf between India and Russia. This is hardly the time to irritate Russia or to widen the gulf. When Pakistani troops are standing on our borders, I think it is high time for us to show some gesture of goodwill and friendship to Russia, and for this, I suggest that we should abandon the taking of aid from the West.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Once again, the question of the Commonwealth has been raised in this discussion, and I would like to examine it, on this occasion, a little more objectively.

Unfortunately, two friends sitting on this side of the House have expressed their opinion in a particular manner, but I fail to agree with their point of view. It has become a slogan, in my opinion, of the movement of the left. Perhaps, this slogan is persisted in, because it is presumed it might appeal to our past hostility and to a certain amount of hatred that we had towards the British people, when they wielded power here.

In order to examine this opinion in a dispassionate way, I have tried to ascertain the views of people who command the respect of this section of the House. For instance, I learn on good authority that a great thinker like Rajini Palme Dutt now holds that this question of the connection with the Commonwealth should not be stressed too far. I am quoting this opinion in order to strengthen the view that I want to place before this House.

If it could be proved that this connection with the Commonwealth is in any way having a restraining influence, that it is constraining us from following a policy in this direction or in that direction, or a certain economic

[Shri Khadilkar]

development that we have planned for, if it could be proved that the old colonial domination is coming in our way, I am prepared to accept it, otherwise, I am not convinced about this

After freedom, particularly, some of the nations that belonged to the Commonwealth formerly, are feeling a sense of isolation. That is human nature. Their immediate needs are more social and economic than anything else. As for the contact with the West of an informal nature, where the Commonwealth statesmen in their old age meet in a spirit of a jamboree, as one of the leading Left journals in the West has put it, does it do any harm? Does it impel us to make any commitment contrary to our interests? That is the point at issue to be considered.

So, I do not share the view of my hon friends on this side regarding the Commonwealth connection. Our foreign policy at the present juncture is being pursued in the spirit of a mission, of a crusading nature, and to a large measure, under the given conditions, it has achieved success. Its success depends much more today on the personality of our Prime Minister. We must admit that. If I may put it that way, it has a sort of rose-water quality about it. When you sprinkle a little of it, cools, refreshes, and gives good fragrance. But when you try to search for the base, sometimes you are disillusioned.

From this angle, I would like to suggest that instead of laying great stress on our connection with the Commonwealth, we should try to evolve simultaneously something very concrete in this part of the world, namely the Indian Ocean area. For instance, as I said in the beginning, those nations which have become free, such as Burma and Ceylon, and Malaya and Singapore also, which have achieved freedom recently, are all in this area. I would suggest that they should be combined in some manner, and India should become a sort of focal point for such combina-

tion. Their needs are much more economic and social than anything else. Shri H N Mukerjee has pointed out regarding Pakistan one ought to realise that under the given circumstances, their connection with big Powers, with hydrogen bombs and other things, their sovereignty has lost its former significance.

In the context of the modern world, the freedom of the smaller nations, however, much they may parade their freedom and sovereignty, has very limited significance. That must be clearly understood. So, within the orbit of the Commonwealth, I would propose a sort of a new line, a suggestion for consideration, namely, that our Prime Minister should try to evolve an Indian Ocean Power Pact, where there will be an organisation for defence, where individual nations will not be put to great burden of defence. Collectively, if we evolve such a defence organisation having a common defence and a common economic policy,—we may call it the Indian Ocean Nations' Organisation—taking in Egypt taking in Ceylon, Burma, Singapore, Malaya etc, then we would be helping the immediate needs of these countries, the economic needs of these countries, by lessening the burden of defence, as we are feeling it today. When an additional demand of Rs 50 crores for defence was proposed, everybody from this side felt it very much. That is too great a burden for India at this period of our development tempo. But we have no other alternative, if on the one hand we want the Plan to succeed and on the other, we want the needs of security also to be met. Unless an organisation of the type that I have visualised is developed, whatever we might say, these nations will either go this side or that side. There is a tendency to align oneself this way or that way. Human nature is such that one does not like to remain isolated. Therefore, I maintain that as we maintain our contact with the Commonwealth, we should try to link ourselves—all these nations—in one or-

ganisation that would be mutually helpful to serve the defence needs and lessen the economic burdens of these small countries. This is one suggestion I would make.

15 hrs.

Another point is about Indians overseas. We have about 30 lakh Indians overseas. We are keeping contact with them. They are far and wide settled down. Perhaps we keep contact with them through our Embassies, Consulates or otherwise. But after independence, we must strengthen the cultural contacts with Indians overseas. I have seen what China is doing. They invite missions on popular level. Why not invite missions from Overseas Indians to participate in August 15 or the Republic Day celebrations? Let them participate, let them see what we are doing, how we have progressed. Let them carry this message. Will it not strengthen our cultural and other ties with them, people who have chosen their home elsewhere and are loyal to those countries?

I do not for a moment want to raise the question of dual nationality here, as was raised in South East Asian countries in connection with China. Let them be nationals of those countries. At the same time, there is such a thing as cultural contact. There is such a thing as past heritage which they cannot wipe out. Therefore, I would very strongly urge that our External Affairs Ministry should take note of this suggestion and try to invite missions from overseas Indians. It won't cost much. If we are short of funds, invite a small mission from Trinidad, Mauritius, Madagascar, East Africa and South Africa on a popular level, and let them participate in our Independence Day. This will definitely strengthen in their own conviction and they will be happy to find how India is progressing after independence. This is my second suggestion.

I would like to touch on another point which is a bit controversial. We

know that our attitude to Hungary was criticised in many quarters. I know it has created a certain amount of dissatisfaction even in quarters which are not in a sense anti-communist. There was a Committee appointed by the UN to inquire into this matter. When a certain attitude was adopted *vis-a-vis* the popular uprising in Hungary at that time, there was an attack on Egypt. The situation was very delicate. The possibility of it developing into a world war was there. That possibility no longer remains. Things have more or less normalised.

In such a context, this issue will come before the United Nations. Our Prime Minister, while he was in Scandinavian countries, gave expression to his views on this point. I do not rely on the Report of the Committee, I have seen a summary of the Report of the UN Committee, we were not a party to that Report, nor has India led any evidence. Of course, the Indian Ambassador had the privilege to go there and find out what was the truth. When a motion that a UN representative should be sent to Hungary was there, along with Ceylon and, if I mistake not, Indonesia, India supported it. But it was rejected and, therefore, when a UN representative was not allowed to go there, a certain Committee was set up to inquire into the happenings in that country and its report is now published. I have read the summary of the Report, but still I do not rely on it. I would like to rely much more on a book or other correspondence and documentary evidence—actual evidence—that has appeared in one of the progressive weeklies of England, a great admirer of our Prime Minister. I mean the *New Statesman and Nation*. I have gone through it very thoroughly and the *Daily Worker* correspondent, Mr Peter Fryer, who was there when things happened, has reported on the tragedy of Hungary. His book is available here.

If you see through the whole thing, this matter needs reconsideration and

[Shri Khadilkar]

an expression of opinion not from the point of view of an anti-communist. I do not for a minute say that anti-communists or western imperialists did not try to foment certain disturbances there. But they failed to reach it.

It was a great event in modern world history. I consider it as great, perhaps, as the events of 1917. After 40 years, people who have lived under this new civilisation, have realised that they are getting the bread promised to them; a pair of shoes, they see a lot of production statistics, scientific advance, hydrogen bomb and the like, but the vital needs of human life, truth, a certain amount of dignity and freedom, are denied to them. That feeling has dawned on them in this great revolution, the popular uprising in Hungary, in which students, teachers, intellectuals, soldiers, peasants and workers took the lead. It was not an anti-communist show, on all evidence.

Therefore, with due respect, whatever has happened in the past, I would like to say this. There was a certain diplomatic attitude at a particular moment. I do not want to go into the question whether it was justified or not. At the same time, I would urge—very strongly urge—that we keep friendly relations with the Soviet Union on a State level. Certainly, we would like to do that with China, the Soviet Union and the socialist world. We must keep the best and most friendly relations with them. But that should not restrain us from saying anything in making a critical appraisal of their policies as they affect the Soviet people or the Chinese people.

I am glad to observe that recently our Prime Minister said something about recent developments in the Soviet Union. They were very good remarks. But still we have got to examine, after the emergence of the new civilisation which we feel has created some new values, not only material values but values which can be measured in human terms, and if

we find that these are being suppressed, then I am afraid we are, by not saying so, brushing aside so far as Hungary is concerned, our basic policy of *Panchsheel*.

What happened to the people of this small nation when they rose in revolt? They wanted to protest against the order of things that prevailed so as to bring about change for better socialist reconstruction. They did not want to throw away the baby with the bath-water. They wanted to have socialism. They wanted to organise their own society in a particular manner; their liberty to live according to their likes and according to their conviction, was denied to them and we say nothing. If at all *Panchsheel* means anything in the context of modern world politics, it is this, that smaller nations or bigger nations, all guarantee freedom to different people, whether they are small or big, powerful or weak. This is the main concept of *Panchsheel*, and if this principle is violated anywhere in the world, we must raise our voice of protest and clear our position once for all.

Therefore, I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister to clarify our position, not taking a cue from the anti-communist world front—I do not belong to that—but taking a stand on human considerations, of human freedom and pronounce our judgment on events in Hungary.

In conclusion, I would like to make only a small point because I wanted to offer some criticisms on the administrative side of the department but for want of time, I cannot deal with it at length. It is rather very insignificant, but from my own experience I am telling this. This happened when I was once or twice in foreign countries, particularly in the West. On the 15th of August, I was in Switzerland sitting with our Ambassador. I had that privilege because he was a friend of mine. What happened? Many people were invited for the 15th of August celebrations and hardly a few responded. I asked my

friend why there was no response He told me—whether it is correct or not I do not know—that on such occasions, in western countries, normally drinks are served Next day, I found there was an informal party and more than a thousand people had gathered So, the hypocrisy of prohibition in our foreign embassies must be banished This is wrong This is happening everywhere

I was in Vienna, I visited our Consular head there I was in Switzerland, in Berlin I was before our regular Embassy was opened there I discovered in western society at least, we should not try to carry too far this hypocrisy Let us limit it to ourselves at least I do not wish to say a word against prohibition as such for the moment I am not against prohibition But, the implementation of it at this level creates a wrong impression Therefore, in the end I would like to make a submission that this policy of prohibition so far as our Missions in foreign countries are concerned, must be modified in the light of experience

Mr Deputy Speaker The following are the selected cut motions relating to various Demands under the Ministry of External Affairs which have been indicated by the member to be moved

Demand No	No of Cut Motion
23	160, 161, 34, 35
24	163, 164, 23, 89, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 261, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 275, 279, 281.
25	188, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290.

Administration of tribal areas

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move

‘That the demand under the head ‘Tribal Areas’ be reduced to Re 1”

Inadequacy of the funds allotted for economic development of tribal areas

Shri Vasudevan Nair I beg to move

‘That the demand under the head ‘Tribal Areas’ be reduced to Re 1”

Failure to take effective steps towards ensuring peace in the Naga Hills

Shri Hem Barua: I beg to move

That the demand under the head ‘Tribal Areas’ be reduced by Rs 100”

Failure to meet the linguistic aspirations of the NEFA people

Shari Hem Barua I beg to move

That the demand under the head ‘Tribal Areas’ be reduced by Rs 100”

Continued association of India with Commonwealth

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move

That the demand under the head ‘External Affairs’ be reduced to Re 1”

Proposed opening of an embassy in Madrid

Shri Vasudevan Nair. I beg to move

“That the demand under the head ‘External Affairs’ be reduced to Re 1”

Failure to take effective action in the matter of Goa and other Portuguese enclaves

Shri Nandir Bharucha: I beg to move

“That the demand under the head ‘External Affairs’ be reduced by Rs 100”

Waste in the Ministry

Shri Supakar: I beg to move:

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

Denial of passports to a number of participants in the World Peace Congress Session in Colombo

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move:

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

Policy of issuing passports

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move.

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

Position of the people of Indian origin in Ceylon

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move:

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

Extravagance in certain Indian missions abroad

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move:

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

Restriction on the number of participants in the World Youth Festival in Moscow

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move:

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

Inefficiency of our Information Service abroad

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move:

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

Lack of efficiency in the External Affairs publicity arrangements

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

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

Failure to dissociate India from the Commonwealth of Nations

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

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

Need of economy in the working of the embassies and missions abroad

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

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

Plight of Tamil speaking people of Indian origin in Ceylon

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

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

Lack of interest in the repatriation of the Tamil speaking people from Ceylon

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

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

Refusal of passports to several delegates from India for World Peace Conference at Colombo

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

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

Foreign Publicity

Shri Bimal Ghose: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs 1000"

Failure to take note of the dissatisfaction of the Indians settled in Ceylon

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

Failure to check the growing extravagance in the administration

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

Administration of Pondicherry

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100 "

Delay in developing Pondicherry Port

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100 "

Lack of sufficient help for regular running of textile mills

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100

Failure to provide employment to recently retrenched workers of Bharathi and other mills

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Attitude of the Pondicherry Representative Assembly and the Council of Advisers towards the opposition

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Council of Advisers, impediments to Pondicherry Municipal administration on political grounds

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Arrest and prosecution of the Mayor of Pondicherry prior to a bye-election to the Pondicherry Municipal Council

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs 100 "

Failure of the Council of Advisers to hold elections to Temple Panchayats.

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100 "

Interference by the Council of Advisers in the smooth working of Temple Panchayat at Murungappaur even after chief secretary's assurance.

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to supply cheap electricity to Industrial Units in consultation with the State Government of Madras

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs 100."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These cut motions are before the House.

Dr. P. Subbaroyan (Tiruchengode): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the foreign policy that is followed by my leader has had the general approval of this House. I agree there have been some differences which have been pointed out. But, I am glad that the House, as a whole, approves the policy that has been followed for the last 10 years

Of course, my friend, Shri Mukerjee touched on the Commonwealth and Commonwealth relations. May I tell him that I am an impenitent supporter of the Commonwealth relation for the simple reason that it does not tie us to any particular policy. On the other hand, as the Prime Minister explained we have differed from the Commonwealth. There are nations in the Commonwealth like South Africa, for instance, from whom we fundamentally disagree. But, I think, there is this advantage of the old association, there is the advantage of our being able to influence others on critical occasions, and thus save peace. I know we became rather unpopular during the Suez crisis. But, that again shows that at least our influence did avert a bigger catastrophe than what would have happened if we had not been a member of the Commonwealth.

As the Prime Minister has explained time and again, that if he finds that this association is not leading us anywhere, he may rethink about it. But, I do not think such a time has come. I am glad that the previous speaker at least did say that he is not an opponent of the present association with the Commonwealth.

My friend, Shri Mukerjee talked of the expenditure in various Embassies. Having been an Ambassador myself, of a very small Embassy no doubt, I can tell you, that the Prime Minister said was absolutely correct. The younger officers, the men in the foreign service, do find themselves placed in a very difficult position. They find themselves unable to meet the

ordinary expenditure of their life in those countries. They find it difficult on the small salaries we give our Foreign Service, compared with, as he said, the other Embassies our expenditure is really very limited.

Shri Mukerjee also talked of our opening an Embassy in Madrid. We are in the United Nations. Spain has become a member of the United Nations and I do not see why we should not have diplomatic associations with countries who are members of the United Nations.

An Hon. Member: What about South Africa?

Dr. P. Subbaroyan: South Africa is in a very different position because of the treatment of their nationals of Indian origin in South Africa, and the policy of apartheid which we totally disapprove.

We may differ from them fundamentally. But, we have no such quarrel with Spain. In a small way, we should have an Embassy. An Embassy is really a listening post supposed to bring home to our Government what happens in any particular area. We may differ from the Spanish Government in every way. We may not agree with their ideologies. But, I think, Spain is a big enough country for us to understand what is happening there.

Shri Mukerjee talked of Portugal and our trouble with Portugal and the Goa situation. Spain has nothing to do with that. Spain is not responsible for her neighbour's action in this country.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): All the more reason why we should be very near.

Dr. P. Subbaroyan: My friend, Shri Ranga says that it is all the more why we should be very near. We can know from the Ambassador in Spain what is happening in Portugal. Apparently, that is his idea. I agree with him on that.

There are a large number of countries who want ambassadorial representation in this country and, to a certain extent, we have got to reciprocate. For instance, in South America, we have only two Embassies, one in Brazil and the other in Argentine. There is Cuba, for instance, which is demanding that we should have some sort of representative in Cuba. South America is very distant for us, no doubt. But, in the United Nations, a large number of votes belong to South American countries and they very often go with the United States. We may be able to influence them in a very large way if we have representatives in these countries. But, the financial situation being what it is, it may not be possible for us to be represented in every country we want to be represented in. At the same time, there is the advantage of knowing the feeling in any country if we have an Ambassador or a Minister on the spot and he is able to report back to our Foreign Office what is happening at a particular moment in that particular country.

I heard my friend, Shri Brajeshwar Prashad, rather carefully. His suggestions are not new to me because I have known his opinion for a long time. For instance, federation with China and Russia. Our policy has been based on no military alliances with any country whatever. If we become a federation with these two big Powers, we do make a military alliance.

The Prime Minister, even in the beginning of his speech in moving this Demand, said that he is against all military pacts because military pacts lead to cold war and we get into the cold war at once because of what is happening in our neighbouring country, Pakistan. As he properly said, I think, both the Kashmir problem and the canal waters problem have assumed a political aspect because of the Baghdad Pact and SEATO etc.

That is what we want. I think it is correct that our foreign policy should be passed on friendship with other nations but not military alliances with any one. That has been the policy for the past ten years and I welcome it. I think it has saved the world from many catastrophes.

Have you in history heard of any country going to places like Korea or Indo-China or recently to Suez, not for fighting, but to preserve peace. That, I think, is a great contribution our Prime Minister has made to world politics and I wish him every success in this venture of trying to keep peace and trying to get more countries to understand the basis of our policy.

I hope, as he himself said, there is some hope that there is going to be a partial disarmament agreement. In fact, I was rather pleased to read what Rajaji said this morning in the *Hindustan Times*. I entirely agree that this talk of ten months stoppage of nuclear tests is like a man threatening to fast from breakfast to lunch. That is really what it means. I hope that the nations will see that a long period like one or two years at least is allowed for the stoppage of these experiments.

After all, these two big giants have got enough experience of these bombs and they have enough storage of these too. So, by stopping for two years, they are not going to lose in the race. President Eisenhower himself said that he dreads the idea of an atomic war. If he does dread the idea, he must make his contribution towards banning war by getting the disarmament agreement partially no doubt, but at the same time doing something tangible which will appeal to the world and make the world feel that we are at a period when we shall move into peace.

Shri V. Raju (Visakhapatnam): Sir, listening to the foreign affairs debate gives one a rather dismal feeling. It is one long stretch of eulogy of the Prime Minister's actions, the good that is the outcome of the

[Shri V. Raju]

foreign policy of our country. This mood is, I am afraid, carried from the Opposition to the Congress benches. But, I am one of those persons who do not carry the same mood. There is a great deal in our foreign policy which could be rectified.

I believe that the policy of the country should be considered from two stand points. The first principle of any foreign policy should be its direct effectiveness in such areas where the Government can act positively and be of some use. When use the word 'use', I mean 'be of help' to the persons residing in those areas. The second type of area is the one in which the Government could act through its policy. There, the Government of India has no direct relationship but it can indirectly affect the lives and prosperity and happiness of the citizens.

If we are to take up our foreign policy from this point, we find that in areas where we have a direct relationship and our foreign policy can affect the lives of people individually and collectively and create for them better existence, the Government's policy, to say the least, has been reactionary and not progressive. On account of the extreme suspicion that exists between the larger power blocs—Russia and the United States—the tendency is to place all difficulties that exist in our foreign policy at the door of the cold war. This is an unrealistic attitude in relation to the first category of territories.

I would refer to the NEFA where today the Government of India has waged an active war against our own people. Apart from that, the whole of that area has been divided into four separate territories. We have the NEFA under the External Affairs Ministry, Manipur and Tripura under the Home Minister and the Naga Hills under the Assam Government. We have four separate divisions of this one area. Strangely, the attitude of our Government in relation to this area is absolutely similar to the atti-

tude taken by the previous imperialist Government to the people of the North Western Frontier which bombed the tribesmen and did that sort of thing. As a student, I remember, how angry all of us became when that area was bombed. Yet, I have not seen a single voice of protest when there is this organised murder that is taking place...

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member seems to imply that we have been bombing that area, we have never done that anywhere at any time. Indeed, I am amazed that he talks like this (*Interruptions.*)

An Hon. Member: He is talking in dreams but that is Dr. Lohia's politics.

Shri V. Raju: Dr. Lohia is not here to defend himself (*Interruptions.*) There has been no bombing but there has been shooting. There is no dispute about that I suppose. The figures provided in this House go to show that people have been shot in that area. Apart from that, we know how one or two of their leaders like Phizo are being hunted. Any gentleman who is able to catch him will be given Rs 10,000. I do not know by which agency.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Is he in NEFA?

Shri V. Raju: It is all one area but there are four separate divisions. They are all Nagas. (*Interruptions.*) They are all tribesmen, I stand corrected.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should not mix them up.

Shri V. Raju: I am not mixed up. I think the Prime Minister himself has stated that his department was not connected with the other areas but even then he would answer the question that was put. Therefore, I am raising this question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he is prepared to answer it, it does not mean that we should go out of our trend.

He said that he did not take shelter under that plea but would be prepared to answer the question.

Shri V. Raju: I am making these statements and it is for the Government to say that it is wrong. After all, I have been elected to this House and I represent a view point I want it to be clearly understood that I cannot understand why we have this section in the North-Eastern Agency which is separate from the nation, apart from the fact that we have a Member in the Parliament who represents this area—he is Shri Gohain, a nominated Member I cannot understand even why he is nominated and why the electoral process is not there. If he can sit as a Member of this House, then how does it become part of our foreign affairs? I am only introducing it in that sense I know this could have been introduced in the debate on Home Affairs. Why I am trying to point this out here is this I had earlier mentioned that there are two criteria on which I would like to base my remarks today. One is about areas in which our policy can directly affect the happiness of the persons concerned, and this is one of such areas. When Mr Phizo

An Hon. Member: Is that under Foreign Affairs?

Shri V. Raju: There is a demand to that extent. I believe that a definite stand should be taken by the Government. All these areas should be integrated as far as possible. There is a demand, I know, for a separate State. It is possible that we cannot grant them this demand. But, at the same time, in coming to friendly relations with these tribal people we have to know how to deal with them.

For instance, they are a very proud race. They are not prepared to come forward and negotiate without their leaders being given the opportunity to talk on equal terms. When they use the term 'equal' of course, I know that the might of Delhi can never be equal to some village in the North-East Frontier Agency. Still, it is a matter of pride, it is a matter of human rela-

tions which can be developed. And, here I believe that a gesture is necessary; not merely a gesture, the Government must definitely come forward, reorganise that whole area and try to create a situation where it is not placed outside the pale of India but becomes an integral part of our nation.

Apart from this, there are two other areas where Government of India's actions have in my opinion been suspected to a large measure. We have gone out of our way always to say that we do not believe in satellites, protectorates, arms pacts and various other associations which disturb peace. As a nation carrying the heritage and background of a revolution, of a freedom struggle just ten years back, and apart from the fact that we had the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, we have always prided ourselves in our capacity to export two things: peace and change, not mere peace but peace with change—'change' means being able to forget, transcend the past, the past of imperialism. Here I find that the Indian Government, in a sense, is once again creating a new type of imperialism, and that has taken place in the protectorate status that we have now given to Bhutan and Sikkim, two small Himalayan States which are next to us.

In Sikkim, for instance, a popular Government has now been deposed and we have come to terms with the rulers, we are giving them protection. I know for a fact that in these areas it is not possible for a people's movement to begin, because on all counts they are liable to be affected by our military and police forces. Treaty rights have been made directly between our nation on one side and autocratic rulers in Bhutan and Sikkim on the other. These are direct instances which I would like to point out, apart from the fact that closer at home, where we have to deal with our own nationals, in Ceylon, South Africa or Pakistan the relationship may be more strained,

[Shri V. Raju]

because I know that other factors get involved in those issues.

My second point, as I stated, is on the larger issue, on foreign policy in relation to nations where we have indirect relationship, if I may use the term. In this I am rather surprised at the trend or attitude whereby the Government's policy in this country tends to affect or nullify the attitudes of even progressive governments that may be taking place in our neighbouring countries. I am reading from the Report of 1956-57 that has been circulated by the External Affairs Department. As far as the Burma Government is concerned, it says:

"Certain measures taken by the Government of Burma in the sphere of trade and economy have adversely affected Indian interests in that country. Indian nationals living in Burma have experienced difficulties in making remittances to their dependants in India. A large number of cases involving the claims of Indian ex-employees of the Burma Government for pension, gratuity, arrears of pay, leave salary etc., still remain to be settled although as a result of our Embassy's efforts some relief was secured. The Government of Burma invited applications during the year for payment of compensation for lands nationalized by the Government. While the Government of Burma is responsive to our requests in matters concerning Indian nationals, its own economic difficulties have not permitted a great deal of co-operation in this regard in the past.

All this I can understand, because it is all a statement of fact. Then it is said:

"This, however, was not allowed to interfere with the cordial rela-

tions existing between the two countries."

When it is said: "this was not allowed to interfere", we are led to believe that it is possible that the difficult conditions in which the Burmese Government is going through may not allow the Burmese Government to pay the Indian staff their salaries etc. and, therefore, they should be absolved. I can understand that position. But, when we add to this attitude the question of payment of compensation to landlords, the Indian landlords who owned practically the whole of Burma's rice productive area before the war, what do we mean? After all, the whole Burmese nation was mortgaged to Indians at one point or other, and today when we try to stress in this negative fashion that we do not allow this relationship to be spoiled we give a tendency, apart from the impression that is caused in the external sphere, to the landlord classes here, an impression internally to the landlords in this country that without payment of compensation no progress can take place, in spite of the fact that land holdings are one of the major stumbling blocks in our nation for the progress of our agriculture.

Why I am pointing this out is, as I had earlier said, our nation should be in a position to create two ideas: (a) the idea of peace and (b) the idea of progress. I assume that progress is more important, because it is not merely the idea of negative peace that we want, we want positive progress. The Prime Minister is keen on saying about the idea of Panch Sheela. What exactly is Panch Sheela? It is something positive; it cannot mean merely negative expressions between people. Therefore, to a large extent, our foreign policy has to reflect our internal ideology in terms of our external relationships and here I find that we are indirectly supporting vested interests in these countries and giving expression to such a situation.

Similarly, as I was listening to the debate, I have the feeling that we are not able to express ourselves fully and clearly. There is a restraint that is there in the House. This is something that does not directly relate to External Affairs, it has direct relation also to Defence questions. The whole thing is tied up and today there is a general lack of confidence throughout the nation. There is the general subconscious fear that lurks in the country.

An Hon. Member: Question

Shri V Raju That it is possible for the country to be hurt, to be attacked externally and the cause for this is that all these problems happen to be decided by us. Partly it is true this fact may be caused by a false understanding of us by others and yet I believe that to a large extent much of this problem has been caused by this self gagging that has taken place in this country the direct, critical appraisal of the policies pursued by the Congress and the policies expressed by other parties.

While I was speaking here, an hon. Member from the State of Mysore referred to one of the leaders of my Party. I am only bringing this fact incidentally to show that in politics we must be prepared to accept clear, precise and openly expressed sentiments of approval as well as disapproval and I find that it is approved that is expressed as far as the policies in foreign affairs and defence are concerned.

Here I would like to point out another summary of the report and I am sure that when this report was put forward the full implications would not have been completely—I won't say understood—out appreciated as I would like to express them and I would like to point out also to you. This demonstrates to us the deterioration of the principle of free expression and debate, the deterioration of our democratic structure in this country

to some extent and the glorification of the cult of the individual. It says here.

"The Government of India have acceded to the request of the Iranian Embassy that necessary facilities be provided to them for establishing cultural institutes in Delhi and Bombay. One such institute has been established in Bombay" and continuing

The Government of India have decided to subsidise the translation of some of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's books into Persian. A sum of Rs 5,000 has been sanctioned in connection with the translation of his 'Autobiography', the book has since been printed. The translation of 'Glimpses of World History' and the 'Discovery of India' is being taken up. The Government of India have also subsidised the Arabic translations of 'Gitanjali' and 'Fruit Gathering'."

We do not know who is the author of the two books.

Shri S V Ramaswami (Salem)
These are all gems of literature.

Shri V Raju It is perfectly correct, but I would like to point out this difference because about one month back many questions arose and in one instance the Prime Minister had also written to one of the leaders of the political parties in this nation and said that the question of using Indian aeroplanes was for security reasons and that he was not responsible for such things. Perfectly all right. But here is a position where right in front of us we go into such forms of expenditure. I do not think I need say any more in this context. I think my implication is perfectly clear.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Moreover the time is up.

Shri V. Raju Very well, Sir
(At this stage Raja Mahendra Pratap rose)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order The hon Member may have something to say But two hon Members are standing simultaneously Let the Member finish his speech Has the hon Member concluded?

Shri V. Raju: I have not

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order The hon Member may conclude his speech He should however finish within a minute

Shri V. Raju: Therefore, I would like to say that if our foreign policy if it is to be effective has to be sure of accepting the concomitant policy 'strife' where necessary This principle has always been accepted as a part of our political and philosophical doctrine or theory that is part of the Indian nation We have never shirked or ran away from responsibility on the plea that peace would be effected on the one hand and therefore, Indian political theory has accepted two principles peace not at all costs, but peace with principle and in the event of principle being ineffective, peace also should be foregone because peace becomes cowardice at a certain point and therefore one of our Gods told a person going to the battle field that he had necessarily to fight even if it was against his own family and relatives With these few words I would like to say that the Government of India policy has to pursue peace, and honour and also pursue then effectively and not negatively, as has been the case so far

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am a newcomer to this House and I was very eagerly listening to the speeches from the Opposition benches in the hope of hearing something very worthwhile I must say I was not only sorely disappointed, but I was deeply distressed to hear some of the statements that have been made, which are worse than half truths, which are exaggera-

tions, which are confusions and which are liable to be exploited by unscrupulous neighbours as well as those others who never miss an opportunity to throw bricks at us Their difficulty is that India has always set such high standards in the international field India has always stood by principles and has set up precedents and practices of such a high order that they cannot keep pace with us and the only way in which they can try to show their worth in the world is by trying to make use of some ill-informed incorrect and confused statements of some of our friends, who in their zeal to criticize the Government forget the larger interests of the country

Now the hon Member has just stated that the Government has entered into some kind of agreements with reactionary Governments in Sikkim and Bhutan Surely, the Government has to enter into agreement with the Government that is there whatever there may be While in our own country we are setting up very high standards of democracy we cannot interfere with the internal affairs of other countries big or small The hon Member said that democratic standards are deteriorating If that was so, the hon Member would not have been able to make the speech that he has made here The very fact that he was able to speak in an uninterrupted manner—even when he was interrupted, the hon Deputy Speaker came to his rescue and made him complete his speeches—shows how strongly the foundations of democracy have been laid in this country

The hon Member said something about Government referring to compensation to some of the Indians who owned property in Burma Surely the Government of India has to look to the interests of Indians in other countries Just a short while ago, some other hon Members were complaining that Government was not doing enough about it Now, the hon Member of the Opposition seems to confuse his ideas of socialism with the

responsibility of the Government towards its nationals in this country and in countries abroad. If in Burma, the law of the land was such that no compensation was to be paid to anyone, it would be perfectly all right. Then the Government of India would not have asked for compensation for its nationals in Burma. What is it that the Government of India have stated in the pamphlet? In spite of the fact that there are these difficulties which our nationals are facing and the fact that we are trying to get justice for them, in spite of that, our normal cordial relations with that country continue. In other words, our Government is keeping its principles and standards high and the small irritations are not allowed to interfere with the larger perspective of having goodwill, understanding and cordial relations with all the nations of the world.

The hon Member even criticised the translation of some of the writings of our Prime Minister and the great poet, Tagore. I wonder whether the hon Member has taken the trouble to read these books. If he had read them, he would not have indulged in the kind of remarks he did. Whether our Prime Minister is remembered as the Prime Minister of India or not he will be surely remembered as the author of the many books he has written. I have no doubt that he will be remembered both as a great statesman and as a writer for all times. Today on the face of this earth, there is not another man who can stand comparison with him, whether as a statesman, as a writer, as a human-being or as a great man. Yet, the hon Member of the Opposition had the temerity to say that we are indulging in the cult of personality. All such men can be criticised. The newspapers can go for him, the hon Members of the Opposition can go for him and yet he says democratic standards are deteriorating. It is an amazing statement.

Another hon Member on this side said something about Pakistani troops

being on the border and therefore the need for alliances with Russia, China etc. This country, as has been already pointed out by Dr Subharayan, has always stood for strong opposition to all military alliances and stood for the principle of solving all problems peacefully. As a matter of fact, non-alignment has been the stand of our Prime Minister, not a passive non-alignment, but a non-alignment which stands for this principle that physical force solves no problems. I am often reminded of what Bapu used to say. Gandhiji often said, "there may be differences between me and Jawaharlal while I live, but, when I am no more, Jawaharlal will speak my language". When one hears and reads our Prime Minister's speeches on international problems, in international gatherings, or at home, one is very much reminded of those words of Gandhiji. It is this one great heritage which has today given a high status and great prestige to our country throughout the world. Even in those countries where some of the Governments may not quite appreciate our policy of non-alignment, their people are full of appreciation and admiration for this stand of India. Under these circumstances where does the question of our forming alliances with anybody arise?

Moreover, I would like the hon Member to remember that India has chosen the path of democracy. We are friends with all the world. We have chosen the path of Panch Sheel. What our Prime Minister has been saying and what our Government has stood for is, let democracy and the method of communism both pursue their own path and show by practical example which is the better method, and, mankind will follow that method. While we stand for that principle, the fact remains that in our country we have chosen the path of democracy and we are following that path solidly and persistently. Under these circumstances, it is fantastic to think in terms of making a suggestion made by the hon Member.

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

What is more, I do not see why we should be afraid of Pakistani troops. We are not a small country; we are not a weak country. While we do not want fight and while we stand for peace, at the same time, we are a country which unarmed was able to throw out the Britishers from this country. Today we are not unarmed. We have spent money, we are armed; we have courage and we have faith in our force. So, there is no reason why we should think in terms of fear and get excited about it and begin to talk in the manner in which the hon. Member did.

The trouble with Pakistan, of course, is there. The difficulty is, as everyone remembers, at the time of partition many people said that Pakistan would not be viable economically and therefore Pakistan would not be accepted by the Muslim League and so on. They did accept Pakistan and we conceded to it. What they want us to do now obviously is to make them economically viable at our expense. The Prime Minister said that we have accepted the award of the World Bank in principle. I do not know the details, but from what I have heard, I believe it is a fantastic sum of money that Pakistan wants from us. There is no reason why, in order to make Pakistan economically viable, in order to make a success of their mistakes or overcome the effects of their mistakes, India should be made to pay these fantastic sums of money. In a way, we are asked to pay them the price of our own vivisection so to say. If the World Bank or the United Nations are so anxious to help Pakistan, let them find the money. Why do they want us to find the money? It is not our responsibility. The trouble is that they live on the hymn of hate. In Othello, Iago was asked by Othello; "Why do you hate me," and he said, "you are so beautiful that you make me look ugly". In comparison to India, they look black. That is not our fault. Let them raise their standards; let them behave better; let them do

more things for their people and let them try to develop their country. We want nothing better than stability in our next door and we wish them prosperity, so that both of us may live in peace. Surely they cannot ask us to make sacrifices and find money for their prosperity and development after they have chosen the path of partition and separation.

Then, there was something said regarding the extravagance in foreign missions. I entirely agree with the Prime Minister that most of our officers, particularly below the rank of ambassadors are very hard put. I have seen several of them in some of the countries, I have seen the difficulties in which they are living. For instance, during my recent visit to New York, I discovered that since 1955, the year of my last visit, the costs of several necessary articles of life have risen by 50 per cent. If they had to pay 10 cents for a cup of coffee in 1955, today they have to pay 15 cents. If they had to pay 10 cents in 1955 for the underground train, today, they have to pay 15 cents. These have got to be kept in mind. There is no use saying that we are representatives of a poor country and therefore we must live in that way. I won't mind if the Government of India set up a colony in each of these countries where all the inhabitants of our missions can live together. They can live with any standard or live the Indian way of living, whatever it be. As it is, they have to live in the midst of those people and in a short time, they have to make contacts and also represent our country. As such, they have to have the necessary means to do that. Many of our officers, I must say, are living like students. They are not able to live like officers as they should be living. I think that this question has to be very carefully considered. Various items of necessity and the cost of living should be considered and salaries and allowances should be fixed in accordance with those prices.

16 hrs.

I would, however, say this. I feel that in some places there is perhaps room for retrenchment. The Prime Minister himself mentioned the case of the High Commissioner's Office in London. While there are various responsibilities that that office has, the fact remains that an elaborate retrenchment scheme was worked out, so far as I know, by our previous High Commissioner Shri B G Kher. I do not know why it has not been implemented during the several years it has been in existence and operation. I was told by some of the young men and women working there that they would not have more than one hour's work. They wanted more work. That is a case which needs looking into very carefully.

One of the reasons given by some of the people there was this. They say that the people that are brought from India are not able to work and their output is not half of the output of the people that are recruited locally. I have had the opportunity of working with some of those recruited from India and foreign recruits. I think the output of our people is not less and their willingness to work for longer hours is much greater. But, even if it be true that the output of our people is not so good, it only means that we are not making careful selection when we are sending people outside. It very often happens that somebody they wish to get rid of from the States is sent to the Central Government and from the Central Government, he is sent to the foreign missions. Every one of our people there, whether high-ups or lower-downs, is an ambassador of a sort because he represents India. From his way of working, or way of living or way of behaving, people judge our country. Therefore, I am strongly of the opinion that we should send to our foreign missions the most competent, the most desirable and well selected people. Then, we won't have this trouble that their output is not so good.

Another thing that I would like to point out in regard to some of these officers of ours is this. There are married officers with wives and children. The Government pays for taking their wives and children with them. Those who are bachelors have their dependents too. They cannot take them. It is rather hard. It means that their dependents have to be supported in India. They have to send money to keep their establishment here. That makes it very difficult for them to support themselves. What happens is this. I met a delightful girl, one of our First Secretaries. For years, the girl has lived by herself. She has a mother and she could have her mother with her. But, she cannot afford and she could have her passage. The Government won't pay. Married officers are given this facility. It is very hard to go home after a hard day's work just to face the bare walls. There is nobody in the house. This is a point to which the hon. Prime Minister may give some attention. For these dependents, widowed mother, younger brother or sister, the same facilities should be extended in the case of unmarried people as in the case of married officers, particularly in view of the customs in India. A family does not consist only of a man, his wife and children. It extends much further.

I would like to point out something with regard to prohibition and publicity. An hon. member said that people do not come to our parties, Independence Day party, etc., because of prohibition, this is farce, this is hypocrisy. I beg to differ. I wish to say that my experience is very different. I have been to Independence Day parties where there has been prohibition. A large number of people have come to these parties. What is more, in a country like America, when I talked with some of the very high people in the State Department, they said, if you people do not serve liquor, we will be very happy and we will not have to serve it to you either. As a matter of fact, what happens is, our people get it there free of duty and it

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

is cheaper. For them, it is much more expensive. They respect us. As a matter of fact, I was asked in several places, you have a policy of prohibition, but how is it that you people drink? There are only a very few of you who don't drink. I said that they drink in order to please you, in order not to offend you. I did not know what else to say to them.

If we have adopted a policy of prohibition at home, this policy should be strictly enforced in the missions abroad. Some of our Officers say, you make them drink and then pump out secrets out of them. Those people are greater adepts in drinking than our people, relatively. There is no point in speaking in this fashion. There is competition in drinking. There is a heirarchy. Instead of all our people whether clerks or high-ups, living as one family, there seems to be a stratification. I do not know to what extent that is due to the fact that many of our Ambassadors abroad are I.C.S. officers and other officials who have grown up in the tradition of stratification. But, that is so even in respect of people who have been with the people, who have been popular persons, who have lived with the masses and understand the masses. I would really request the Prime Minister to look into this aspect also to the extent it is possible.

On the publicity side, I feel that perhaps we are not doing all that we should possibly do. I found to my amazement that some of our own people who should be able to convince others with regard to several of our policies, themselves were doubtful about them. They wondered whether we had gone back on certain commitments, on certain words of ours. When I explained to them the points—we discussed several matters whether it was Kashmir or anything else—there was a different look in their faces and in their eyes. With regard to Kashmir, when I explained to some foreigners that there have been two general elections, popular elections on

this issue of accession and they have been won by the leaders of the National Conference who are ruling Kashmir, the only question that they asked was: "were these elections fair" I asked: "Are you convinced that our elections in India were fair"? They were, in fact, asking about Kerala. I told them, if the elections are not fair, how do you expect the communists to come to power in Kerala. Then, they said, they believed that the elections in India were fair. Then, they agreed that if the elections are fair in Kerala, there is no reason to doubt the fairness of the elections in Kashmir. Pakistan uses every Pakistani national in that country, whether a student or anybody else and they are all living propaganda machines. Our people do not know all the facts. They are not informed and they are not made use of. I am sorry to say that there is not enough contact between our embassies and the Indian nationals living in those countries. There may be difficulties, there may be hardships, there is not much time for me to go into these in detail, but this is a matter which does need looking into, so that our people understand things. Our case is strong, but we have to present it. We have done a good job at the recent meetings of the United Nations, and we have brought out several of the facts which had got rusted over, but much more has to be done in this respect not only with regard to one issue, but several issues. After all, we stand by very high principles, and our practice has been of a very high standard and there is no reason why these countries should not understand. If they understand our case, I have no doubt in my mind that they will stand by it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought I might be able to accommodate one more Member, but that is not possible now. Members will excuse me. The hon. Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall endeavour to deal briefly with some of the remarks, comments and criticisms made.

To begin with, hon. Member Shri H. N. Mukerjee spoke about the policy governing our tribal areas and expressed his appreciation of what I had said the other day, that is that the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution could be amended. I was a little surprised to learn that because I have often said that before too. In fact, I have said something more. Our attitude in regard to the Naga Hills District or any other tribal area, in fact, is that we should give them as much autonomy as possible and we should amend the Sixth Schedule by consultation. That has been proclaimed repeatedly and I should like to make that clear even now.

And further, there is no question of our pursuing even those who have been opposed to us, or even those who have done much which is highly deplorable. We do not wish to have any reprisals, and we want to deal with them as our fellow countrymen and take as lenient a view as possible even of what might be called criminal offences in the course of these troubles. Our approach has all along been friendly, but a friendly approach means nothing at all unless it is also a firm approach. Otherwise, the friendliness is only supposed to be weakness and fear. Therefore, it has to be firm and at the same time a friendly approach.

The hon. Member Shri V. Raju said many things to which I listened with considerable amazement so far as the facts are concerned. There is no question of my being surprised at his ideas because it is open to him to hold any ideas he likes, however absurd they might be, but so far as facts are concerned, there is a certain limitation, I take it, that they should conform to reality.

He laid great stress on apparently some terrible thing that had happened in these areas in the east, that one area had been divided by us into four, this one area being Tripura, Manipur, the Naga Hills and NEFA. I do not know at what time this was one area

from any point of view—politically, geographically, biologically, historically, culturally. I do not know. Because it was never one area. Each part of it is as different from the others as anything can be. Take even Manipur and Tripura which have been States for hundreds and hundreds of years, separate States with very distinctive cultures. Most Members know something of their famous culture, their dancing and other things. There is nothing in common, if I may say so, between let us say the Manipuri dance and many things that you might see in the NEFA region. It is as different as two human beings can be different in Europe and America and India and anywhere.

So, to imagine this was one area which has been split up because of some nefarious design on the part of Government is completely without foundation.

To some extent we are always bound by certain historical development. I do not know but it may be a time may come when these areas may be brought together under one administration. It might be a good thing. I am not opposed to it. In fact, I am rather inclined to think it might be a good thing. But it is not our desire to compel these areas against their will to do so. There was a very strong feeling in Tripura, in Manipur, against any such merger of theirs with other parts and we recognised that for the time being I do not know what the future will be.

Anyhow, my submission is that the whole basis of his argument was so fallacious about this one solid area being split up that almost everything that followed from it was wrong.

He referred then to our treating this area, or perhaps only the Naga Hills District, in the same way as the British used to treat the North West Frontier Province, bombing etc., but I ventured to point that there has been no bombing. He said: "All right, then, shooting." I cannot deny that there

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

has been shooting, but I would like hon Members to consider what would normally happen in any country, what might have happened in British times, or might happen even now in other countries where a kind of revolt of this type took place which was carried on with smping, murder and all kinds of things, and then compare what we have done. Compare even the casualties. They are amazingly few. There are parts of the world where things are happening today. Guns go off quickly and bombs are dropped. Nobody likes this kind of conflict. We hate it. But I think we may justly say that our army there, apart from odd instances, regrettable instances, have behaved with restraint, and that has been one reason why the army could not perform its function as rapidly as it might have done. But we preferred taking much more time over it than sowing the seeds of hatred and bitterness which will carry on, because we are out to win these people, make friends and comrades of them, not enemies.

Then again, Shri Raju referred to Bhutan and Sikkim and to our having put down, crushed popular movements there. That again was news to me.

Shri V. Raju: I did not say you put it down. I said you made a treaty with the Rulers there and in the case of Sikkim there was a popular Government before the treaty was made which is no longer there at the moment.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Who exactly we should make a treaty with there or in any country except with the Government of the country is not clear to me. Normally we deal with Governments, whether it was the Government of Bhutan or Sikkim. As a matter of fact, we had treaties with them. We have inherited treaties. Since then we have had new treaties made, or amendments to the old treaties. There was a special relationship between India and Sikkim and Bhutan. It is not the same relationship. They differ, there is some difference between

the two. We inherited it, and having inherited it, we interpreted that relationship in as free a way as possible, to encourage these Governments to have their own free life without interference. We are not interested in them except, naturally, that we would like them to progress. We are interested in them certainly because they are frontier Governments and what happens in them is of deep interest to us. For the rest we are only interested in their development according to their lines and wishes. So far as Bhutan is concerned, we have not even got a representative sitting in Bhutan. From what Shri V. Raju has said, one might imagine that we have got armies stationed there. We have not even got a mission or a representative or an agent in the whole of Bhutan, so far as I can remember, unless something has taken place very recently that I do not know.

Occasionally, our representative who sits in Gangtok has been to Bhutan. It is a long journey, about seven or eight days' journey to reach from the border of Bhutan to the capital. The capital itself is a moving capital. It is a cut-off place, probably more cut off, certainly much more cut off than Tibet is nowadays. Probably, there is hardly a place in the world which is quite so cut off.

There is no question of interference by us. There are many things that happened there which we may like or dislike. We cannot interfere with a country like that. We are friendly with them. We have given them some help. They wanted some engineers. We gave them some engineers. They want some teachers. And there has been some little surveying by our engineers about roads. That is all. So, I think, for anyone to say that we are carrying on some kind of an imperialist tradition in Sikkim and Bhutan is very very far from reality or the facts.

There are a number of small matters to which I shall make a reference, Shri H. N. Mukerjee had referred to the Gurkha recruitment centres of the U.K. I had previously also referred to these centres, and I had expressed my regret that they continue. But I should like to make it perfectly clear that they do not recruit in India. It has nothing to do with recruitment. We stopped that long ago. We certainly have allowed them to continue as transit centres; they bring these Gurkhas from Nepal, and they stay in these transit centres, are given clothing etc and then passed on, and I believe, they are also examined medically there. I am not justifying that, because we do not want these things to continue there. I only wish to say, however, that nobody is allowed to be recruited here. This facility that was given was a transit facility. I am told that other depots in Nepal territory are being built now by the British.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Does that mean that no training is given in these transit centres as used to be the case previously?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: To my knowledge, no training is given. If the hon. Member wants, I can find out. What I have been told is that these transit centres are places for storage and clothing, they are also used for X-ray screening, payment of pensions, collection and staging of parties to Calcutta and handling of leave and discharge parties. That is the definition. These depots would be closed, as soon as the British depot under construction in Daran Bazar is completed.

There was some reference made to a colossal figure of Rs. 25 crores, which Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, apparently, had to go through British banks. I was myself surprised to hear that; and I knew nothing about it. I had to enquire from the Finance Ministry, because the External Affairs Ministry has really nothing to do with this. They have sent me some papers, which I have been unable to read quickly. But from these papers, it appears that all our money is dealt

with, of course, by Indian banks, so far as London is concerned. But where money has to be sent to other parts of Europe, the position is that Indian banks do not function there yet, unfortunately, and, therefore, for any transfers from London to other places, we have had to utilise the services of the British banking system—to what extent, I cannot immediately say.

But, obviously, it is our desire to do away with this practice, and to use Indian agencies, and Indian services, wherever we can possibly do so. It is quite absurd if we cannot do so. It was only when we could not do so that we have had to have recourse to other countries' services.

An instance was mentioned by Shri H. N. Mukerjee of an officer who is said to have bought several cars in a brief period of time. The Public Accounts Committee had drawn attention to this.

16 25 hrs

[MR SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

When I saw this reference in the Public Accounts Committee's report, I enquired into this matter. I found that perhaps, all the facts had not been placed before the Public Accounts Committee; perhaps, they had come out subsequently. The facts were, very briefly, that this officer of ours had purchased cars three times in the course of four years, which, on the face of it, sounds odd, and certainly it appears to be something wrong; and on one or two occasions, he had asked for advances to purchase these cars. But the fact is that this poor man was being transferred repeatedly. He had six transfers during a period of four years, and when he was transferred, he had the option to carry his car with him or sell it. And apparently, he preferred selling it.

Secondly, Government did not suffer the slightest loss in it. Government do not come into the picture at all. But we suspected, and the thought came to us that perhaps, this

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

repeated buying and selling might have led to some considerable profit, and we did not like that, although, of course, if he had suffered loss, he would have had to suffer the great loss, and we would not have made that good. But we did not like it. When we went into it, we found that in these three transactions, he had made a profit of Rs 1000, that is, in these three buyings and sellings, and we made him pay up that Rs 1000 to the Ministry.

An Hon. Member. It was absurd.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am merely stating the facts. I am merely giving the House the facts.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Under what rule was this officer made to pay that Rs 1000 to the Ministry?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know under what rule. It was no rule.

Mr Speaker: Illegal profit.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: When this matter came up, and we enquired into it—I find that the exact sum was Rs 1,100 and not Rs 1,000—we simply asked him to pay that money to the Ministry, and the officer paid it. He did not go to a court of law about it.

Shri Goray: It must be out of fright.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyhow, this can hardly be termed as any serious offence.

The hon. Member opposite has referred the discharge of peons recently said something about the peon allotment to officers remaining the same. It has not remained the same. It is because the peon allotment is being changed that they are being discharged, really, they are not discharged, we are not discharging them, but we are discharging them from their present functions, and trying to find other work for them.

There is another question that has been raised, and that is about the posts and telegraph charges from, I think, our China Embassy, from Peking to Hong Kong. The decrease in the posts and telegraph charges was due to the introduction of a weekly courier service. There has been some corresponding increase on travelling allowance of courier from Peking to Hong Kong. But by this introduction of the courier service, there has been a net saving of over Rs 50,000.

There was also some criticism about more and more furniture in Peking. Well, the furniture was for the India base staff which was sent there, and some provision was made for the maintenance of it. These are relatively minor matters which it is very difficult to deal with separately.

It may of course be, that in some places out of the fifty or seventy missions that we have, something goes wrong here or there, I cannot guarantee but the only thing I can say is that we are trying to keep a check on this.

There is another thing about entertainment in Delhi, to which reference has been made. I think the Public Accounts Committee had made some reference to it, that money had been spent more on one occasion and less on others, in private houses, and not in Hyderabad House. It is true that entertainments took place by permission in private houses occasionally, because it is rather difficult let us say, if half a dozen persons are to be invited, to take the Hyderabad House for half a dozen persons.

It is all very well for a big party, dinner party or reception, but for four or five or six persons to sit in a huge hall is rather inappropriate. So the matter was referred to me. I said that in such cases it was better to have a little homelier atmosphere in one's home than to go to Hyderabad House or a hotel. Since then, certain scales have been laid down beyond which they are not allowed to go.

Two or three hon Members have referred to the question of alcoholic drinks in our Embassies, some in favour and some against I should like to say that I do not agree with the statement which is sometimes made even by our Ambassadors that drinks attract people to their parties and if there are no drinks, people will not come I have told them quite clearly that if people are only attracted by drinks, they had better keep away from our Embassies

✓ I am not for the moment supporting or opposing prohibition, that is a different matter But I do not believe in this type or kind of diplomacy which depends on drinking As one hon Member said, if we have to indulge in that particular type of diplomacy, we are less trained for it and others are likely to win It often happens As a matter of fact apart from the question of prohibition, it is undesirable for certain types of officers—in fact, for everybody—but more especially for certain types of officers: like defence officers and defence men and foreign office men to drink, because they are supposed to be in possession of all kinds of secret information, and once you drink, you may not be drunk but your tongue is loosened and you talk about things which you should not talk about

Therefore, it is the practice even in countries where drink is allowed and there is no prohibition, to have strict injunctions as to when people should drink, officers and others who are dealing with secret matters

So far as we are concerned, since we follow a certain policy of prohibition, not complete prohibition—in some places more, in some places less—it would be highly unbecoming of our officers to attend big functions or parties elsewhere where drink is served We do not allow in formal functions alcoholic drinks, and I am not aware that they have suffered from the point of view of attendance

Shri Hem Barua: Is it a fact that to our Embassies abroad drinks are given at 50 per cent less concession?

Shri Ranga: By whom?

Mr. Speaker: It is not such an important matter as to call for an interruption

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: All diplomats, wherever they are, in Delhi or outside, get various articles cheaper than those paid by ordinary human beings, because certain duties do not apply to diplomats All the foreign missions here—not Indians here—can get their alcoholic drinks plus other things minus the duty That is obviously much cheaper, and that applies to Indian missions abroad It is a common thing which applies to all missions they can get these things minus certain duties

I was saying that we do not permit alcoholic drinks at normal, big, official functions We have relaxed the rules somewhat at small parties where we have permitted wines to be served wine cup—can—not very strong drinks

About publicity, I must confess that I have myself often been very much dissatisfied at the results of our publicity We have shifted and changed it We are constantly thinking about it, and yet the results appear to be less than hoped for I cannot suggest a remedy which will give us full results But I would like to point out that the reaction to publicity in many countries depends so much on the policy that that country pursues That is, if our policy is contrary to that country's policy, we do not get much publicity there, and it does not affect people—I am talking about the governmental circles or the Press The Press may be very free, and the Press is supposed to be free and is, in a sense, free, and yet in another sense, not legal, I mean, it is as regimented as anything can be, not forcibly regimented, but simply ideologically regimented I am not merely talking about countries which are supposed to be totalitarian but other countries

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

too where the Press not all the Press—follows one line, because they are used to that line. They do not like anything said in contradiction of it.

So that publicity, properly carried out, should be helpful, and probably the best kind of publicity ultimately is the personal approach and the personal explanation, and that way again, our people serving in our Embassies ought to be given facilities for the personal approach and personal explanation meeting people. That is also slightly expensive, a little costly matter, not very expensive.

But the real thing is that when policies conflict, in these days of rather passionate attachment to one programme or policy, anyone not agreeing with it is *prima facie* supposed to be a person in the wrong and all eyes and ears are closed to him.

I would like to say, however, that whatever Governments and others or even the Press may say or may not say about India,—I say so with all respect and with some hesitation—the fact is that to the common people in every country, in their minds India is popular. I have no doubt about it. They are increasingly interested in India, her work and difficulties in India's philosophy, if you like, but I am not talking about our civilisation, but about what we are doing today. It is extraordinary interest in our Five Year Plans and in our efforts has grown in a great part of the world, I do not say all over the world—I cannot speak for all the world, but certainly for very large parts of the world. This interest has grown very greatly. There is appreciation that even though we might make many mistakes, we try to live up to certain standards in our public life and in our foreign policy.

There was some reference to our opening a mission in Madrid. We have resisted opening an office there for many years and for various reasons. Ultimately, we felt that this

was not in conformity with the general policy we had laid down. What is this policy? We have said that China, for instance, should be recognised—we have recognised her, I am talking about other countries—regardless of the fact whether we agree with China's policy or not. It is a fact and it should be recognised and dealt with as a great nation. Now, if that is so, if we say that we do not agree with the policy of another country and we won't have dealings with her, that argument was put before us repeatedly. We had no real answer. For other reasons too, we made this decision. After all, many of us for long years had certain sympathies in regard to Spain. Even the United Nations, at one time, expressed an opinion which was not favourable to the present regime in Spain and asked countries not to have Missions there. That was years ago and years have passed, and we have felt that it would not be right in the present circumstances for us not to have recognised the Government of Spain and to have our Mission there and to exchange Missions from there.

Another small matter. Reference was made and a quotation was read from some English newspapers about the Rolls Royce attached to our High Commission in London. I think I have seen that paper. The hon. Member did not read the name of it. But, it is a newspaper, so far as I remember, which takes a peculiar delight in running down India in every way. There are a few such newspapers in England. And, I do not think the hon. Member, Prof. Mukerjee, normally would care to read what newspaper writes. As far as the Rolls Royce is concerned, it is one of the best investments that was made 9 years ago. It is not a new car, it was bought, I think, 9 or 8½ years ago and it has proved a good investment and it is in excellent condition than other cars, they have changed, the smaller cars, but this has gone on and I have the privilege of using it whenever I go to London.

But, in regard to one matter, I express, if I may with all respect, my agreement with Shri Raju. That is about the payment of some kind of subsidy for the production of a translation of one or two books in Iran. I was not aware of that. I knew that repeatedly requests came to us from those countries, sometimes from our own mission. They thought that this would be good publicity, these books being placed there. Sometimes, the citizens of those countries were doing that and wanted some help. But, I was not aware that actually any grant was given. I think I agree with him that it should not have been done.

Shri C D Pande (Naim Tal)
Tagore's book 'Gitanjali' was there

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Coming to Hungary. It is rather difficult to deal with this matter in all its aspects. But, I should like to point out two or three aspects of it. There has never been any doubt in any person's mind—any person acquainted with the facts—about certain major developments there. First, and undoubtedly it was or it developed into a national uprising. I do not think to begin with, it was organised as such. Obviously, there was the feeling there. It began in a small way but, because of certain circumstances, it spread and became undoubtedly a national uprising. Undoubtedly also, various elements took advantage of that national uprising which are normally called fascist and the like. Various people from outside Hungary also came into the picture. Even before that there had been continuous efforts to create trouble. All this was there and, nevertheless, it is true that it was a national uprising. It is also true that this national uprising was forcibly crushed by the military, chiefly the Soviet forces that came in. Some emphasise one aspect more than the other, but these facts are clear.

The point is to look at them in a certain context of events. In one sense, the context goes far back. Of

course, development has been there; I am not referring to that, but to the fact that all this coincided with what happened in Egypt at the time and Suez Canal. It was a great misfortune for Hungary that this coincided with the Anglo-French intervention in Egypt because both those things coming together raised the tempo of the world situation and the temperature was high no doubt. There was grave danger in the minds of many people and many Governments that war was coming. Because of that, many things were done which, perhaps, normally would not have been done. A situation had arisen in Poland which, as the House knows, was settled peacefully and to the satisfaction more or less of all the parties concerned. It is quite conceivable that the same thing would not have happened in Hungary but for what took place immediately in Egypt, the invasion of Egypt and the Suez Canal. That is, a situation arose when every country began to think in terms of war coming, in terms of security, in terms of seeing that it does not lose its strategic point, in terms of seeing that the hostile frontier did not come nearer to us. All kinds of tactics came in. These are not the excuses. I am only trying to understand the situation that had arisen.

So far as we are concerned although all these factors were before us, nevertheless we, right from the beginning—some people think that I stated in Scandinavia something which I had not stated before—but from the beginning we have said that we do not like to go about merely condemning. We stated from the beginning that the people of Hungary should be given freedom to decide their own way whatever they wish. And, secondly that foreign forces should be withdrawn from there as from everywhere.

This was our attitude throughout in the United Nations as well as everywhere. The only thing we were anxious to avoid doing was to

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

take a step at that very critical moment which might have plunged, we thought at that time, Europe and the world into war; not by our action, but every small thing counts at that time. So, It is in this perspective that I would like the House to consider this matter.

Of course, even that is a smaller perspective. One should go back to the last war decisions. After all, we are in a happy position; but, nonetheless, the decisions at Yalta and other places we have to consider and the facts and consequences of some of those decisions taken there. Anyhow, I believe that for a variety of reasons, the developments that are now taking place are in the right direction and it should be our endeavour to encourage them instead of discouraging and not doing something which comes in the way of action.

I just referred to Rs. 5,000 for the Persian translation. I find, the facts are that we did not pay for the translation; but a translation was made in Iran and copies were purchased for distribution as publicity in Iran by our Mission—the Publicity Division—as this was considered good publicity. May I express my gratitude to the Members of the House who have, in spite of minor criticisms, have dealt with this matter in a friendly and gentle manner?

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the cut motions together to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the Demands to the vote of the House. The question is:

“That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts 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, 1958, in respect of the following heads of demands entered in the second column thereof:—

Demands Nos. 23, 24, 25, 26 and 100.

The motion was adopted

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

DEMAND No. 23—TRIBAL AREAS

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,39,51,000 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, 1958, in respect of ‘Tribal Areas’”.

DEMAND No. 24—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,84,44,000 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, 1958, in respect of ‘External Affairs’”.

DEMAND No. 25—STATE OF PONDICHERY

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,92,69,000 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, 1958, in respect of ‘State of Pondicherry’”.

DEMAND No. 26—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,11,000 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, 1958, in respect of ‘Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs’”.

DEMAND No. 108—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,50,000 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, 1958, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs' "

DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the discussion of the Demands for Grants Nos. 97, 98 and 135 relating to the Department of Atomic Energy. As the House is aware, 2 hours have been allotted for the Demands of this Department.

Hon. Members may hand over at the Table, within 15 minutes, the numbers of selected Cut Motions, which they propose to move. I shall treat them as moved, if the Members in whose names those Cut Motions stand are present in the House and the Motions are otherwise in order.

DEMAND No. 97—DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,97,000 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, 1958, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Department of Atomic Energy' "

DEMAND No. 98—ATOMIC ENERGY RESEARCH

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,80,83,000 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, 1958, in respect of 'Atomic Energy Research' "

DEMAND No. 135—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,25,00,000 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, 1958, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Department of Atomic Energy' "

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up the time of the House at this stage. I find that some of the cut motions set down for this Demand are rather unusual in character. In fact, they are not cut motions at all. They want more to be spent and more to be done in regard to that. In view of that, I would rather wait for others to throw light as to what more we shall do and then I shall venture to say something in reply.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khan-desh): Sir, the hon Prime Minister has said that we have tabled rather cut motions of unusual character because we desire that something more should be spent on development of atomic energy. But, may I point out that the rules of the House do not permit any other method of raising a discussion and hence this was the procedure?

Coming to the question of development of atomic energy of this country—it is being debated, to my knowledge, for the first time here, though occasional references have been made to it—I have to offer the following remarks. The need for finding new fuel resources is so great that unless we evolve a new type of fuel, there is a great danger of our limited resources of coal and oil not being sufficient for the requirement of our developing economy. The Prime Minister repeatedly emphasised that we have entered a new era and that India cannot afford to remain aloof from that new era. But, I am not sure that we have done all that

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

we can in order to develop nuclear energy

Power generation is the main reason why we want nuclear energy to be developed. Power generation, in the first place, implies that there should be more intensive and extensive survey of the country for locating fissionable mineral deposits.

It will also be necessary, after these deposits have been located, to have adequate resources for processing of fissionable minerals.

That brings us to the question whether we are going to breed the new type of nuclear fuel and whether we are going to have reactors for that purpose. Judging by the thinness of this House, it appears that hardly any Member is interested in this question which, to my mind, is of such a significance that unless we sit up, take notice and prepare for development of atomic energy on a vast scale, a time may come when we may find that our lack of energy in this respect constitutes a serious handicap to our economic development.

I was referring to the question of reactors. Reactor to a layman means something with which he is not concerned, which he does not understand. But, let us try and understand something of what we have been doing, so that we shall be able to know whether the reactors that we have already got in hand and those that are under construction will suffice for our purpose and requirements.

This House is aware that as far back as 1948, nearly ten years ago, the Atomic Energy Commission was set up. Its objectives were surveying the country for fissionable minerals and to see what minerals can be developed on an industrial scale. Even after ten years we are still very far from that. Another objective of the Commission was to conduct research in scientific and technical problems, and very little has been done in that direction. Then there is training of technical personnel. We have so far 300

nuclear scientists and we hope to have 800 by 1959. Again, there is slow progress in this direction. Another objective was to conduct fundamental research in the science of "nucleonics".

Later on, these objectives have been re-stated with more practical bias, namely, that the aim of Atomic Department is to develop atomic energy as a source of atomic power and to promote its use in agriculture, industry and medicine.

If we are to achieve these things what should we do, because we must have a clear objective before us. First is an extensive survey of the country for fissionable minerals. I am afraid, in this direction we have not done enough. We also require resources for processing them for extraction of fissionable fuel. We are very far from construction of reactors. We have got only one and that has got going. I believe on 4th August 1956. With regard to experimenting there is the question of training of technical staff and we are very far from all these things. If we have these things then alone we can proceed in the matter of generating electrical power by means of nuclear energy.

When I said progress in this direction has been slow, I must not be misunderstood that our scientists—at this stage I might pay a tribute to the Secretary of the Atomic Energy Department, who is a figure having a world-wide reputation in these matters—have been slow in their work. I am not attributing anything to slackness of our administrative authorities or our scientists. What I mean is that this House has not adequately appreciated the importance of development of atomic energy, and has not provided adequately for that purpose.

Though it was in 1948 that the Atomic Energy Commission was established, what is the position today? In Trombay near Bombay a plot of land of nearly 2500 acres is still waiting for 18 buildings to be

constructed and getting ready by 1959

I do pay a tribute to the work that has already been done. We have done quite a lot but, to my mind, that is not enough. What have we got so far? Under the establishment of the Atomic Energy Department we have got a Raw Materials Division which looks into the survey. How does it look to the survey of the country? By providing one jeep and one helicopter, and of course, supplying certain motors to a few private persons. May I ask the hon. Prime Minister, when can we complete the survey of the country at that rate? In other countries, what do they do? They have a sort of vacation and college students well versed in science are provided with some cheap type of motors and go about trying to find out and locate fissionable minerals in the country.

17 hrs.

We have got three main sections of the atomic energy establishment. There is the Physics section which deals with apart from theoretical physics and applied mathematics, nuclear physics, reactor control, electronics, and air monitoring. These are very elementary things. The Chemistry section deals with analysis of mineral samples, developing alternative methods of treating monazite sands for recovery of thorium, etc. So it is in the preliminary stage. There is an Engineering group which deals with designing of reactors and investigations on the preparation of uranium and thorium by electrolysis. So, it is also still in a very elementary stage.

The establishment is also concerned with certain industrial operations. We have got the Rare Earths Limited, a concern which treats 1500 tons of monazite to produce rare earth chlorides and carbonates and acts as a feeder to the thorium-uranium plant. I do not know whether the thorium-uranium plant is actually functioning, but it is supposed to process the residual cake left over from monazite after extraction of

rare earth. They have a pilot plant for extracting uranium from tailings of copper in some mines in Bihar, I do not know what amount of uranium you are going to get out of that.

The establishment has three reactors. One reactor has been curiously named as Apsara, but this Apsara is not very useful. What does this reactor do? It produces radioactive isotopes of a limited variety and it is also used for experiments of a very elementary character in neutron physics. It is used for studying properties of shielding materials for reactors, for irradiation of seeds and other biological materials and for training more personnel for advanced types of reactors. So we are very far from having our first power station run by nuclear fuel.

So, we have also been told in the report of the Atomic Energy Department that we have got the Canada-India NRX reactor which will go into operation by the end of 1958. I must point out that this reactor will only help us in detailed and intensive research. We are told that it is going to be one of the most powerful research reactors which will enable us to undertake advanced engineering research for the development of power stations. We are going to have that reactor only by the end of 1958 when we shall begin our experiments in the development of power stations. This reactor will also produce important radioisotopes like, for instance, cobalt, which is not being produced in the Apsara reactor.

So, it will be seen that today we are still in the very elementary stage of development when compared with other countries. We are told that we have got another reactor, the Zerlina. I do not know but the name sounds curiously feminine. We are told that it may help us to formulate new designs of reactors and particularly those using mixed lattices of uranium and thorium or plutonium and thorium. Therefore, we are still in an experimental stage. We are in an elementary stage of experiment, very far below other countries.

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

We are also told that there is going to be a high altitude cosmic ray research station constructed in Gulmarg. I do not understand anything about cosmic ray research. Dr Bhabha is a great authority. Some day, we shall be able to understand these things better. Today, I cannot say anything about it, how far research in cosmic ray has progressed and what direct bearing it will have on the development of nuclear energy.

Be that as it may, our Atomic Energy Establishment has been working in other directions also such as the supply of radio-active isotopes to interested parties. These isotopes have been imported. I do not know to what extent we are able to produce radio-active isotopes. We are also giving grants to various institutions for conducting research in other directions. Taking all things together, we are still far removed from having a nuclear power station. I am aware of the fact that the Report for 1956-57 emphasises the fact that India must have a nuclear power station of the capacity of 100,000 KW by the end of the Second Five Year Plan. I do not know whether going at the rate that we do today, it will ever be possible to attain that objective.

Let me repeat, when I say that there is slow progress it is because we have not given enough funds, because we have not paid sufficient attention to this. I am aware that there are no other people half as much interested in this subject as our Prime Minister. There is a general lack of interest in this House and therefore, we have not devoted more funds and therefore, there is slow progress. What we really want is a more extensive survey, a sort of thorium hunt holiday to make the country conscious of the necessity of having atomic power and to locate our resources. Perhaps, the hon Prime Minister will tell us that we have got sufficient deposits of these which are rich in themselves, and at the moment, there is no need for having an extensive

and intensive survey. I cannot understand that. Unless we have surveyed a fair portion of the country, we do not know where we are, whether we have got the richest and the most easily accessible deposits at present. Therefore, an extensive and intensive survey is necessary.

My concrete suggestion is this: Science students should be recruited in this campaign of surveying the country with the object of finding thorium and uranium deposits. Secondly, at the International Conference on Peaceful uses of Atomic Energy, certain conclusions were arrived at. These are highlighted, again, in the report for 1956-57. We are told, apart from other things, that there is sufficient uranium available in the world to generate sufficient power on a fairly high standard. But, the decision that concerns us is this: We are told that it is possible to breed in fast reactors with thorium as well as uranium. Breeding in thermal reactors with Thorium was shown to be possible, and that the Thorium-Uranium-233 Fuel Cycle was shown to be superior to the U-238-Plutonium Cycle. What is going to be our main fuel? It is going to be U-233 or Plutonium. I do not know whether any decision has been taken on this major policy issue because unless we take a decision, I do not know whether it would be possible for us to construct a reactor of one type or the other. Therefore, to my mind it is necessary that a quick decision on policy should be taken whether we want to adopt the thorium-U-233 fuel cycle or the U-238-plutonium cycle or both if we have to have reactors of different types, of different designs. Today, when we are so stingily giving money for the development of atomic energy I do not know whether we can have the luxury of these two types of reactors in our country.

Then, also it is necessary for us to take first steps for having some definite blueprint about having a power station

run by nuclear energy of a capacity of 100,000 KW which is supposed to be most economical I do not know whether anything has been done about it at all, because as I understand the atomic energy establishment today, we are still in an experimental stage about everything, about reactors, about fissionable material, about the type of ore that will be required, about the moderators and so many other things

Therefore, let us take a decision and let us have a blueprint so that the country will become conscious of the fact that we are really entering into a stage where nuclear power is being put to practical industrial purposes

It is high time we had a reactor which really means business Neither the 'Apsara' which I compare with a college girl in science class nor the NRX which is nothing but comparable to a compulsory post-graduate course, come near industrial development Government must decide on a policy and have a reactor which will breed fuel It is for the experts to suggest whether it will be plutonium or any other type of fuel, but let us have a breeder reactor If we have it, then I think it will be possible for us to tell the country that we have spent so many crores of rupees but not spent them in vain It will make them quite conscious that we are entering upon the industrial uses of nuclear energy That is one point where I feel there is very slow progress

The second point is that we have not taken sufficient steps to produce certain types of radio isotopes We have been experimenting far too much It may be necessary, I do not say no, but I believe if we can establish reciprocity on the basis of export of monazite sands or semi-processed sands in exchange for the results of experiments in the production of radio isotopes from other countries, it would cut out very considerable cost on our own experiments

We should also show to the country that nuclear energy and the peaceful uses of it can be straightaway put to a commercial use For instance, I would like that instead of taking any other problems, we should concentrate on the use of radio isotopes in industry, particularly for preservation of meat and fish by methods of sterilisation with nuclear radiation If we concentrate our attention on that, we will be increasing our food supplies to a very large extent Also, the same thing could be extended for the preservation of other tinned foods, and it would also be necessary to have use of tracer techniques in other directions

Let us take the case of agriculture There also I think nuclear energy can be used for preservation of storage in bulk such as foodgrains which may be subjected to infestation by pests Killing pests I believe with homoeopathic doses of radiation is possible, but if we direct our attention to such practical subjects instead of to other problems which to the scientists may be very interesting, that is to practical things to attain practical results, what an amount of saving in food would it mean I do not know what is the percentage of food that is lost every year as a result of pests attacking stores of foodgrains, but if you can cut that out even to a slight degree, not only will it increase the available sources of food, but also we will save so much of foreign exchange What is more, the psychological effect of it would be that it tells the people that nuclear energy is not merely something which is abstract, but is something which is of practical use and the peaceful and beneficial uses of nuclear energy can be brought home to them

Also, it may be necessary to experiment to induce mutations with the object of producing superior strains not only of foodgrains, but cattle These are urgent practical problems which require attention There is also the question of the use of tracer technique in crop production and also

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

in the breeding of particular types of animals through mutations. That might take a long time, I agree, and more expenditure may have to be incurred on them. But problems such as preservation of meat, fish, tinned provisions etc., and also preservation of foodgrains stores by sterilisation and radiation are things which immediately and directly concern us. But I do not think sufficient advance has been made in this direction, which can enable us to say that 'Yes, within ten years, we have made so much progress'. I repeat that I am not blaming anybody, I am not blaming those scientists who work day in and day out. I am aware of the things that they have achieved good many results.

I am only saying that we as a nation, even as a parliament, have not yet understood that we have to spend a great deal more on atomic energy if we want to have immediate practical results.

The use of radio isotopes in medicine is well known. I do not know whether any problem in medicine requires to be attacked immediately. There is also the question of the use of radio isotopes in biology. These are things which require yet to be done.

I suggest that if we concentrate our attention, first, on production of electrical power, and secondly, on these problems which concern us directly and immediately, I think we shall be in a position to tell the country that "Yes, the crores of rupees that we have spent on the Atomic Energy Department have not been wasted, and we shall soon be benefited by it".

There is one final point that I wish to make. I am not satisfied with the grants that we have made so far to the Atomic Energy Department, because I feel that Rs. 10 crores more could have been given in 1957-58 to this Department. The Prime Minister would ask me 'From where are we to get this amount?' I may tell

him straightway 'In the Defence Ministry, you are going to spend Rs. 50 crores. I am not satisfied with that. So long as the Defence Minister maintains a very peculiar and strange secrecy, I do not know whether these Rs. 50 crores will be spent in a wise and profitable manner.' If I were the Prime Minister, and if I had any say in this matter, I would take away Rs. 10 crores from the amount allotted to the Defence Ministry, and give it to the Atomic Energy Department, where it will be more wisely and more usefully spent, and the progress that would otherwise take years to make could be compressed and telescoped in a matter of three or four or at the most five years.

It is true, as the Prime Minister has said, it is a strange cut. I want more to be spent. I have moved that Rs. 100 be reduced. What can I do? There is no other method of raising this discussion.

I submit that Government should look at this problem in this direction. Perhaps, the experts in the Atomic Energy Department may have an answer to all these questions. But I am not a scientist, I am speaking only as a layman. But it does occur to me that our expenditure on atomic energy should be in this particular direction. If we can do this, maybe, we may be able to rouse the country to a greater consciousness of the need for developing nuclear power; also, side by side, we shall impress upon our country that we have entered into a totally new age, and we cannot afford to lag behind, for to do so would mean considerable handicap to the economic development on which all of us are so very keen.

Shri V P Nayar (Quilon): I have also moved some cut motions. Unfortunately, I was not present here when the Prime Minister made some reference to them. But I can assure him that these cut motions have been moved not with any pretensions or

knowledge about the details of working, but only with a desire to focus attention on certain matters. I am very glad that we are having an opportunity to discuss this subject.

It may be that most of us may have only to contribute little towards the running of the Atomic Energy Department. But it is a matter of such tremendous importance that criticism ought to be welcomed from whatever sources they might come, and I feel that the Prime Minister will certainly look into the various points which we may make.

As the hon. Member who spoke before me said, we are really proud that in the matter of atomic research and atomic energy, our country has come to a position of advantage in many Asian countries. We are also proud that we have among our scientists some who enjoy world-wide reputation today. But that does not mean that in the matter of atomic energy and its uses, we have gone to the extent that we should have. We are finding in the budget proposals that there is a sort of economy drive in this department. There should be no economy drive in this department at all. We would welcome any amount being spent on the activities of this department. We are not worried at all, we may even lose some money because it is a question of such tremendous importance not only to this generation but also to the coming generations. We are only sorry that the Government could not find more funds for this department when they could have effected economies from various other departments, and pooled the resources for the better working of this department.

I would not like to discuss the details because I happen to have no information at all about the various processes or the details of working of the department or the release of atomic energy. But I would only like to submit that in certain spheres of activities, we are lagging behind in a manner detrimental to the future

interest of our country. For one thing, the Report, which is a summary of the activities of this department, does not give us, laymen, an idea of what has been happening. I am not worried that the Report has no technical details because most of us cannot understand them. But from the Report, one is inclined to think that all is not very well with the working of this department.

For example, there is a very important work which the Commission has undertaken. You find from the Report that there is a Medical health and biology division. This is one of the points to which I want the House to bestow some attention. I find that although we are running this institution so far we have had experiments—this is what the Report says—only on one thing.

‘Experiments are undertaken to shed light on the path of conduction of the bacillus in leprosy using radio-active DDS.’

I know in other countries how far the application of isotopes have come to the relief of human suffering. In many cases where no medicines could be used and diagnosis could not be made, radio isotopes are doing the job which doctors could not do so far. I am not a doctor to know all the details, but I read various articles in the Press that today even in the case of heart ailments, radio-isotopes are employed to diagnose and to treat. In the case of cancer, one of the killing diseases, till very recently we had only the radium needle to rely upon. But what is happening today? I understand that many lives which would otherwise have been taken away by cancer are now being saved by radio-active cobalt.

I do not want to go into the details. It is not merely a question of destroying cancer even if it is deep-rooted, by radio-active cobalt, but cancer could be further prevented by introducing a suture with radio-active

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

cobalt. Things like this are being developed in other countries. I want to know what is the co-ordination between the Ministry of Health and this department in respect of the various problems which India has to face in this sphere. Many problems could be solved. It is not as if in the case of cancer alone we have a remedy. There are tracers which trace the position of brain tumours. There are other methods of detecting the exact part of infection.

I understand that recently they have also made an isotope cocktail as a remedy for infections in the thyroid gland. This will be taken orally. There are other types of cancer which can be cured by radio-active cobalt. I want our country, which has many afflictions from diseases, to at least initiate research in this. There will be many difficult problems; I understand the difficulties. But to content ourselves with the fact that there has been one research on the application of a particular drug in the case of leprosy this year is something which we cannot tolerate. There are other uses of atomic energy which we know other countries are employing, in the field of medicine, in the field of surgery and in relieving human pain. I do not know many hospitals in India which use such isotopes—at least not in my State. I understand from Shri Bharucha that one or two hospitals in Bombay or some private practitioners have started using it. I want the Prime Minister to consider how it will be possible to co-ordinate the activities of the Health Ministry or any other Ministry engaged in finding out remedies for tropical diseases, to have joint action with the Atomic Energy Commission in launching an effective attack on diseases.

Then, again, there is the question of industry. I do not propose to go into details. But, various problems in industry are today solved by the use of radio-active isotopes. I do not want to give the details. But, today there are in India many problems for

industries. How is it that our problems in industries are posed to the Atomic Energy Commission? Is there any connection between the Atomic Energy Commission and the various industrial undertakings run by Government or others? In the case of the Hindustan Aircraft Factory which I visited last year or year before last, I found that in the manufacture of component parts they were using X-ray. There may be many other uses of radio-active isotopes in industry. We have not been able to employ the use of radio-active isotopes in detecting errors in our industry.

Take the case of agriculture. My hon. friend suggested that we do not think in terms of production by radiation. I understand that new species have been evolved, disease-resisting species of plants. By using isotopes you can find the extent to which a particular fertiliser is absorbed by a particular species of plant and also choose a particular variety of fertilizer which will give the best results. You can evolve new strains which are rust-resistant, which are mould-resistant, which could be made to yield more and which could yield a particular variety of fruits, or flowers or leaves.

Very exciting experiments are going on and we still seem to be far far away from it. Maybe that our difficulties are such that we will not be allowed. But, here what is the measure of co-operation which exists between other departments and the department of agriculture which is in charge not merely of agriculture but of animal husbandry also. I read in some book the other day that by using the radio-active isotopes, even hens may be made to lay more eggs, the milk of goats can be increased and the casein contents of milk can be increased. There have been ever so many experiments. I would request the hon. Minister to consider what we have been doing. I at least do not find any indication of any work having been done by the Atomic Energy

Commission Maybe, they are doing it, but being small they have not come out. But, I want the Government to consider whether it is not time that we go into such activities because everything needs some move

Take, for example, two problems of agriculture, the two problems which confront us from Kerala very much more. There is a devastating disease in the coconut trees which form a very important part of our economy. For over a decade, all the skill and tools of science have been employed in developing a cure for the disease. We have not succeeded. Gardens and groves are being made of no use to the people. Is there any suggestion that the Agriculture Department should ask the Atomic Energy Commission to find out a remedy for this?

There are industries which depend upon our agricultural products, but do not get enough of them. For example, the cashew-nut industry. By activating the top of fruits by using radio-active elements, maybe from our own cashew trees we may be able to meet all India's requirements. There are many problems. I do not think these are the only problems. I want to say something more about

one particular aspect. That is the working of the raw material division. My friend was saying that there was only one jeep and probably one or two counters. I find that it is not so in other cases. In the community development projects, there are jeeps available for the officers even to go and purchase their own domestic supplies—fish, vegetables and every thing. But, for such an important work in such a big country as ours, for the purpose of prospecting and finding out whether atomic minerals are available, it is possible to have only one jeep! It is very deplorable state of affairs.

Even so, I want the House to consider whether we are doing everything in the right way. The other day, I asked a question about strontium. Strontium 90 has its other uses.

Shri T B Vittal Rao (Khammam)
It is already 5-30 P M

Mr Speaker: There are some other hon Members also, He may continue his speech tomorrow.

5-32 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday the 24th July 1957