

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

February, 1954, arising out of Starred Question No. 581 by Shri Ajit Singh Sarbadi regarding sugar factories in Punjab, I had stated that the licence given to the Morinda Sugar Mills had been rejected because of three reasons which, I regret, were not correct.

The correct reply to Sardar Iqbal Singh's Supplementary Question should, therefore, be as under:—

"The licence granted for the establishment of a co-operative sugar factory at Morinda, District Ambala, has not been withdrawn."

DEMANDS* FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 22 to 26 and 110 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs, for which five hours have been allotted. Hon. Members desirous of giving cut motions may kindly hand over the numbers at the Table within fifteen minutes. At what time shall I call upon the Prime Minister at the end? We will decide it later on. Hon. Members are already aware of the time limit for speeches.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. In doing so, I should like particularly to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Ministry of External Affairs not only deals with external affairs but also with many important activities which might be called domestic in India. In fact, from the expenditure point of view, if we take the last year's figures—may I say here that all this is given in the booklet that the Ministry has prepared for the Members of Parliament?—the expenditure was Rs. 1,772 lakhs in round figures. Out of this Rs. 1,772 lakhs,

Rs. 1,167 lakhs were for activities unconnected with the External Affairs proper. For instance, there were the Tribal Areas, the NEFA, the Naga Hills and Tuensang area and there was a fairly considerable expenditure on the Assam Rifles, which really is an extension of the army, which deals directly with the External Affairs. This, naturally, is rather an expensive item. Then there is Pondicherry. Then there are contributions to numerous international organisations and International Armistice and Supervisory Commissions in Indo-China, expenditure on demarcation of boundaries etc. etc. The point I wish to make is that in effect the expenditure on External Affairs proper last year, according to the revised estimates, came to Rs. 605 lakhs, a trifle over Rs. 6 crores.

Now, I do not wish to say much about the quality and the extent of our work abroad and our missions abroad. It is rather difficult to judge these things. But we may make comparisons to some extent with missions of other countries, from the point of view of expenditure. That is easier to compare; quality is rather difficult. If we compare it with any important country, the rate of our expenditure is far less. I do not mean to say that whatever we spend, every rupee, is well utilized. I do not mean to say that there is no wastage on our side and there is no need for economy. Of Course, there is need for economies; there always is. There is always a tendency for wastage, if one is not vigilant. What I wish to submit is that compared to any country, our foreign affairs are conducted in a much, well, less expensive way.

In this connection I would also say that—I am not defending high salaries or anything—broadly speaking, the rate of payment to our staff abroad is far lower than what other countries give to their Heads of Missions and others employed in their offices. There

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

again, I do not wish to generalise. What we may pay may be often inadequate to keep up a certain status which our Embassies and Legations are supposed to keep up. On other occasions it has been found that the money we pay them for this purpose is not fully and properly utilised. It is not spent. Therefore it would indicate that we are paying them too much. But these are rather rare cases. I am putting both sides of the picture to the House.

Naturally I cannot say that a large number of people employed in our foreign service are all of the same high level as we like them to be, but I do say that the quality of our Heads of Missions serving abroad is a high one compared to any diplomatic service that I know of. There are also people who are not so good and who do not come up to that standard. Naturally in a large Service we have occasional difficulties. We have to take some kind of disciplinary action. But taken all in all, I would submit to the House that our Missions abroad have carried out their functions with dignity and ability and, broadly speaking, at a much less cost than the diplomatic service or the missions of the major countries.

In this connection may I also say, although it is not part of external affairs, that in the NEFA two or three years ago we constituted a special cadre of political officers, who were specially recruited for that purpose. It is very difficult to deal with that situation and a very special type of officer was needed for it. It is a hard life. It is an isolated life—a life with practically no amenities of civilised existence, no people sometimes to talk to even and hard work. Therefore we require a very special type of person who likes that kind of jungle life and who is physically and mentally tough, who could get on and be friends with the tribal people he was meant to serve. So, we chose a number of people—our selection boards selected them—and I am happy to inform the House that most of these people

who were chosen, have done remarkably well.

I should like to mention here in this House that not only in our foreign missions but also in a case like the NEFA it is not merely the officer who counts but his wife also counts very much. People do not often realise that in employing an officer, we are really, in effect, employing two persons—the officer and his wife.

An Hon. Member: What about those who are bachelors?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We do not have the wife always—that is true—but in fact we expect the wife to play an important part on the social and human side. I am particularly thinking at present of these officers' wives in remote and tribal areas, NEFA and elsewhere. Only recently I had a report of one officer and his wife. That lady in that remote area had done a very fine piece of work, apart from her husband doing well, because she had gone out of her way to deal with the tribal people, serve them, make friends with them, make friends with their children, play with their children and help them in many ways. She really created a much better impression than what any formal work by the officer would have done. So for these people, in these remote areas, I should like to put in a good word and I am sure the House will appreciate the fact that these officers in remote areas, NEFA, tribal areas, Naga Hills and Tuensang area deserve well of us because they are doing their work under very difficult conditions with marked ability.

It is about ten years now since we started building up our Foreign Service in our Missions abroad. There were a very few missions before independence. There was India House in London and there was some kind of representation in Washington and a few others mostly dealing with commercial matters or educational matters sometimes. When we started with our career after independence we had this whole wide world to deal with. We started as a country in a big way—I do not mean to say that we are a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

big country, but we did not suddenly sort of creep in the international scene furtively. We came almost with a bang and people's attention was directed to our country. Many countries wanted to exchange diplomatic representatives with us. We were quite agreeable, of course, but it was no easy matter to do so, i.e., to build up the Foreign Service and to build up all the apparatus that goes with it. Foreign representation is not merely a question of good and educationally qualified men. It requires experience. Just as in the Army all the individual ability of a man is not quite enough to replace the experience of a General Staff which has inherited and accumulated experience—the experience of a General Staff cannot be produced by an individual, however brilliant he may be—so also in the Foreign Service of any country, the accumulated experience of a Foreign Office is a very useful thing, not perhaps quite so important, may be, as the General Staff in the Army, but it is important and this is regardless of the broad specific policy that you might pursue. This is a kind of background experience which helps one to judge a programme.

All hon. Members read a newspaper and come to some conclusions about some incident. I acting as the Foreign Minister, naturally have greater access to facts as they occur. It has often happened that I come to certain conclusions quickly but when I go deeper into it and find out the records in the Foreign Office as to how the problem arose and what had happened previously, I have to change my opinion—not on matters of high policy but on other matters—because there is the accumulated experience and facts. We started from scratch and gradually in the course of these ten years we have built up that experience and we are building it up.

We have now 41 embassies, seven high commissions, eleven legations—some of these are duplicated—28 con-

sulates and vice-consulates and sixteen commissions, special missions and agencies. Altogether we have 101 missions of some kind or other situated abroad apart from a considerable number of Indian Information Units abroad. Now, this is a fairly large number. I cannot, as I said, say that every unit, every person abroad is a brilliant officer. Naturally, there are various types. But, taking it all in all, they have preserved a fairly high level and there can be no doubt about it that they have a high reputation among the diplomatic personnel of the world.

As far as our relations with other countries are concerned, they are at a remarkably friendly level. Unfortunately, we have not been able to maintain the same co-operative and friendly level of intercourse with our neighbour country Pakistan. As the House knows, we have no relations with Portugal because of Goa. We have no diplomatic relations with South Africa. Also the reasons are known to this House. Apart from these, our diplomatic personnel are spread out directly or indirectly all over the world.

I do not propose to discuss at the present moment the question of broad policy or world affairs. I wish to refer briefly to some matters. Our broad policy in international affairs has, I believe, the cordial approval of a very large section of this House—not all—and of the country. There are criticisms, legitimate criticisms about particular aspects, emphasis, of some minor importance as to how things are done. But, the broad policy has had that approval and this approval of the House and of this country has naturally given great strength to the Government in carrying out this policy. Because, if we went abroad, whether to the United Nations or to other Chancelleries and put forward some policy which was a matter of dispute in this country in a big way, naturally, the effect we

produce would be very limited. I will not say anything about that broad policy.

At present, taking the big world questions, obviously, the most important thing is disarmament, which is likely to affect the whole future of the world as to what steps are to be taken. In this connection, many things have happened in the course of the last few months. The outstanding event in recent months or weeks has been the proposal made on behalf of the Soviet Government—not a proposal, but the decision—not to have nuclear test explosions. This has been criticised on the ground that having indulged in a vast number of tests, they can well afford not to have them for some time. That may be true. But, such criticisms can be advanced about any action taken. The major countries today, the United States and the Soviet Union, both probably have got a vast stock of atomic or hydrogen bombs. It is not necessary for them, from any point of view, to manufacture more, probably. Nevertheless, if they decided not to manufacture any more, it would be a great thing even though they do not actively require them. Therefore, a good step is a good step, however it might have come into being. We must welcome—and indeed the country has welcomed—this step of the Soviet Government in regard to stoppage of nuclear tests. In saying so, they have added a proviso or rather a warning that if others do not stop them, we shall resume them—more or less to that effect. I trust this contingency will not arise.

There has been a further development. It has been said on behalf of the Soviet Government that they are prepared for control and supervision. That is an important factor. Because, the real thing that comes in the way is fear and it has often been said that there can be no certain way of detecting an explosion. I am not a scientist enough to say whether that is right or wrong, because scientists

differ. The obvious course seems to be for the United Nations or some other organisation to appoint some scientist of high repute in these matters and ask him to find out how detection can be made certain if some kind of test explosion takes place.

Then, there is, on the side of the United States of America, a proposal made by President Eisenhower, the use of atoms for peace, that fissionable material should not be produced for war purposes, which is an important proposal. Here are all these proposals which, if taken together and acted upon together, would make an enormous difference to the present atmosphere of strain and fear in the world. I do not say that accepting any of these proposals means the solution of any major problem in the world. But, I do say that accepting them and acting up to them produces conditions which help in solving these problems of the world.

There is talk, as the House knows, of what is called the summit conference or high level conference. As far as we can judge,—I speak from no secret information, but from what is available to all Members of this House—the chances are that some such high level conference will be held in the course of this year. I have said often that while every country is interested in this matter, naturally, because the whole peace of the world depends upon it, the real two countries in whose hands lies the final issue of war and peace today are the United States and the Soviet Union. Therefore, any agreement must involve an agreement between these two apart from other countries. Any disarmament conference which leaves out one of them is no disarmament conference. It can produce no adequate results. Sometimes, India's name has been put forward for attendance, for participation in the high level conference. The question when put to us has rather embarrassed us. Always our reply has been that we do not wish to push ourselves into any

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

conference, but if our presence is wanted by the principal parties concerned and we feel that we can help, we want to be of help. These are world problems which affect us tremendously as they affect the whole world.

Only one thing more I should like to say about world problems and that is this. If the people are desirous of putting an end to this cold war, it seems to us that the approach should not be hostile, an approach of condemning your opponent. There is no doubt that countries differ in their policies, in their structures of Government, in their economic approaches. There is that difference. You cannot put an end to that difference by war, because you rule out war. Now, it is recognised that war will exterminate, not put an end to that difference. How then are we to approach? Surely, if we approach these questions with the mentality of war and with the language of war, then again, you are not likely to succeed. Therefore, while maintaining whatever opinions we may have in regard to our policy, while also it is natural for each country to think in terms of its security because no Government of any country can forget its security, while doing all that, yet the approach should be not a hostile approach, but a really friendly approach. Hold to your security, hold to your principles, but recognise the fact that we have to live in this world together in peace even though we differ from each other. We have to find a way to that, and the only way we can do it is by these peaceful methods, and not by thinking or action in terms of a cold war, which really means constant appeals to hatred, violence and fear. That, I think, is important because there is no other way of doing it.

Now, these are big world questions. So far as India is concerned, we are concerned with the world questions, but the questions of the most immediate concern to us are, if I may say

so, two or three—the matters relating to Pakistan, our neighbour country, Goa and, in a quite different category, the question of racial discrimination in South Africa and the treatment of people of Indian descent there who are mind you, not Indian nationals but who are South African nationals. The question of treatment of Indian nationals has not arisen in South Africa because there is no Indian national there. They are all of Indian descent who are South African nationals. Our interest in it is not only because we are against racial discrimination, but because there is a long history behind this, going back, I do not know, 50 or 60 years or more, and before independence and since independence we are intimately involved.

I will not say anything more about it except this, that in a deeper consideration of the world's problems today, there are many conflicts and many dangers, but probably something of, well, at least as much importance as any other matter is this question of racial conflict in South Africa. There are racial conflicts elsewhere in the world. There is not a racial conflict in that particular sense but something near or alike to it, in our own country when we suppress one people because they are called untouchable or depressed or this and that. Let us not imagine that our hands are clean in these matters. Of course, they are not clean, and we cannot merely condemn others without looking after our own house.

There are racial conflicts in the United States of America and elsewhere, but the thing that distinguishes the South Africa matter is this. In the United States of America efforts have been made—and made with growing success—to ease the racial problem. I do not say they have solved it, but the Government want to solve it, they try to solve it, they have succeeded, public opinion is helping, there is a progress in a certain direction; so

also elsewhere. But in South Africa it is the deliberate, acknowledged and loudly-proclaimed policy of the Government itself to maintain this segregation and racial domination. That is why the South African case is unique in the world. While there is racial trouble in many places in the world, and conflict, in South Africa it is the official policy, and if that is the official policy of a Government, well, that is a policy with which obviously no country, no person who believes in, let us say, the United Nations Charter—leave out other things—can ever compromise, because it uproots almost everything, whether it is the United Nations Charter, whether it is your ideas of democracy or anything else.

Then there are other matters which come up in questions here, about people of Indian descent in Ceylon. I will not go into that. It is a complicated problem. These problems become difficult, and they become more difficult, because of growth of population, unemployment, economic difficulties. You will find usually at the back of it there is some economic difficulty and unemployment. That is there. And the problem is, in the main, that of the Ceylon Government because these people, according to our showing, are not Indian nationals. Whether registered or not, we feel they are or ought to be Ceylon nationals. It is their problem. We are interested in it again because of past history. We are interested in the solution of this because we are friendly with the Ceylon Government. We are interested because of cultural contacts and all that. And it is unfortunate that it has dragged on for so long, but I would beg this House to remember that we should not be too eager to condemn any Government, or the Ceylon Government, merely because it has not solved it quickly. They have their difficulties, and they should realise our position just as we are perfectly prepared to consider their difficulties, but it is obvious that we cannot accept large numbers of people who have lived there, who

have been born there, and just ask them to walk across to India, or accept them as our nationals. Fortunately, in spite of this complicated and difficult problem, it is increasingly realised in Ceylon by the Government and others, and by us of course, that we should not treat it as a political problem or dispute, but as a human problem, because, ultimately, the welfare of large numbers of human beings is involved and I do hope that, however long it may take, it will be settled in a friendly way and to the advantage of this large number of human beings that are involved.

Now I come to this collection of problems and difficulties which represent Indo-Pakistan relations now. I do not propose to go deeply into this matter, and right at the commencement I would say that we can make a long list of our problems. There is Kashmir, there is canal waters, there is the exodus from East Pakistan, there is this question of displaced persons and rehabilitation, there are financial issues, and there are so many other matters. All seem to drag on. Sometimes some small matter is discussed and settled, some little progress is made, but by and large, none of our major problems go towards a settlement. It is most surprising because I think one thing that should be recognised by all of us, by every Indian present in this country, and I hope in Pakistan, is that the perpetuation of conflict or even any kind of a cold war between India and Pakistan is very bad for all of us and all of them. Whatever approach ours might be, except just the approach of an angry person which is not a good approach, whatever approach we might make, whether it is geographical, historical, cultural, past connections, present, future, it is patent that India and Pakistan should live co-operatively not interfering with each other's policies. They are independent countries; we may separate, we may become independent countries as we have done, but we cannot deny geography, we cannot deny history, we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

cannot deny a hundred things which exist, the other facts of life of our countries, and so it is inevitable that we must come together, and we must live co-operatively and carry on in our own ways. We cannot force them—we have no desire to force them—to adopt any particular policy, even though we may consider their policy wrong. Now, these are the facts of life, as I said. And because of this it is terribly distressing that we cannot make much progress in developing what is natural and, I think, inevitable between our two countries.

And yet, there is one more hopeful factor, and that is so far as the common people are concerned, in India and in Pakistan. I believe that the old feeling of bitterness and suspicion and fear is infinitely less than it was ten or eleven years ago. That trail of bitterness which followed partition and these huge migrations most terrible killings has died down. It is only in the political sphere that passions can be roused or with the help of religion, sometimes these communal feelings may be roused whether in Pakistan much more so, or to some extent in India also; let us remember; it is no good our pretending that our hands are lily-white all the time, and our minds are lily-white, because they are not. We have made errors.

I believe that the major difference between Pakistan and India is not because we are better folk than they are—I mean the common people. We are the same lot. We have the same type of virtues and the same type of weaknesses and failings. But I believe that the major difference has been that we as a Government—and not only as Government, but I would say, leaders of parties, all parties or nearly all parties—have deliberately aimed at avoidance of conflict, by creating better relations with the people of Pakistan, while in Pakistan the leadership has not done that. I am not criticising them. I do not wish to criticise them and have a

match of mutual criticism. But circumstances in Pakistan have been such that, the very creation of Pakistan, that is, on the communal basis and all that, and the way it has continued, have been such that, unfortunately, they have been driven, the leadership there has been driven, to lay stress on conflict with India, on hatred of India, on carrying on the old tradition of the Muslim League which they inherited. Therefore, while neither of us is free of blame as a people, as a Government, we have at least tried to go the right way. That attempt has been absent from the other side. Again, I am not criticising any individual but circumstances, the circumstances which led to this Partition, the policy of the Muslim League and all that.

When you consider this unfortunate fact of the strained relations between India and Pakistan, curious strained relations—because, when you and I meet or anybody meets, a group of people from India meets a group of people from Pakistan, we are friendly, we hardly meet as strangers, as people of two countries; we speak the same language; we have common friends, common memories and a hundred and one things, and yet there is this tremendous strain which does harm to both of us—when you think of this, people tell you—some people say—'Oh, you go and settle this Kashmir issue, and all would be well.'—this is the normal criticism or advice offered to us in foreign countries—or 'Settle this canal waters issue.' Well, obviously, if we settled any issue which is in conflict, it creates a good atmosphere naturally. But I do submit to this House that all this, that the strain and the feeling of conflict between India and Pakistan is not due to the Kashmir issue, is not due to the canal waters or any other issue, but that all these issues are due to another essential conflict, something else. These are the outcome of that, not the origin of the conflict; of course, they overlap, and it is rather

difficult to draw a line between the two. But it does mean this, that if this type of approach, this type of anti-India approach, hatred of India, bitter dislike of India which is propagated in the press, in the statements of leading people in Pakistan, continues, and if that is the basis of their foreign and internal policy, then it just does not matter what you settle and what you do not settle, because that is the basis of policy. If by any chance the Kashmir issue was out of the picture as a matter of conflict, it will have, no doubt, a very good effect; I have no doubt. But unless that basic approach is changed, the thing will continue in other forms. That is our difficulty, so that I feel very unhappy about this matter, and it is no pleasure for me, no desire of mine, to say words, any words which might accentuate our difficulties. I do not like much that is happening in Pakistan. I do not want to criticise it. It is none of my business unless it affects me.

I read only in yesterday's paper—or was it the day before—a former Prime Minister of Pakistan openly saying that 'We must march Pakistan troops into Kashmir'. Now, what is this? Is this reasonable, sensible? Even if it is a reaction just in an angry defiant way, it is not good; it creates that atmosphere of bitterness and hatred and fear and cold war which we want to get rid of.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):
It is meant for consumption within Pakistan only.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It may mean that. But that is an important point. It creates that atmosphere in Pakistan and abroad.

All these years, hon. Members know that there are noted personalities in Pakistan who have made it their business—openly proclaimed—to train people to commit sabotage in Jammu and Kashmir State. In fact, forget the number, but at least a

hundred bomb outrages have taken place in that State; many people have been killed, and all that. This has been deliberately done there. How can one go towards solving a problem when that is the attitude—when *jehad* and all that is talked about? I do not think that is the attitude of the people of Pakistan as a whole. And I would not even say this; for, who am I to go about criticising the leaders of other countries? But I would say, we have got into such a tangle that the only positive policy of theirs is a negative policy, which is a contradiction in terms,—that is, a negative policy of hatred of India. And they go about repeating—some of them—that India will crush them and swallow them up, and that India is out to undo Partition. For anyone to think of that is foolish; for anyone to do it or try to do it would be criminal folly. And looking at it, apart from the larger viewpoints, from the stand-point of India and India alone, from the narrowest opportunist point of view even, it would be criminal folly.

Nobody wants to undo Partition. It will be terrible; we will go down; everything that we try, whether it is our Five Year Plan or whatever it is, the whole thing will collapse; instead of doing any good to anybody, the whole structure of our economy, the political and economic structure would suffer. The only way is for each country to go its way, and I hope, come nearer to each other co-operatively in thinking and action, of its own free will. That is the way—and retaining its independence and freedom of action.

Now, there are these two major problems. One is the canal waters dispute, dragging on interminably. Some of our best engineers are practically spending their lives, sitting in Washington, discussing this matter with representatives of Pakistan and the World Bank. We have spent vast sums of money just in these discussions. I do not know the figure, but it runs into crores, I think.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

We would have built a fine scheme or project or canal here or in Pakistan by the amount of money we have spent merely in talking. Talking is sometimes useful; naturally, it serves some purpose; it is better than quarrelling. Anyhow, here is this problem of canal waters which, essentially, it not a political problem and should not be considered as such. It is a human problem. We do not want to deny Pakistan any water that it can have. We do not wish to make the Pakistan peasantry suffer for lack of water. Obviously, we are not going to deny our own people what they need so badly. We are not going to deny something for which we have been preparing almost for generations, not to mention the last ten years or so, something for which people in Rajasthan, in parts of East Punjab and other areas have been preparing for generations. We are not going to wipe all this out because some people do not like it. Mind you, all these schemes are pre-independence and pre-partition schemes and you can judge them.

Anyhow, our approach—and I want this approach to be carried out—is a friendly approach to Pakistan, is a human approach to this problem. Let us do our best. It is no good Pakistan telling us 'Give us Rs. 1,000 crores'. It is fantastic—such huge figures being thrown about, as if any country can do that. But we do not want Pakistan to suffer; at the same time, it is obvious that we do not want ourselves to suffer at all.

Finally, take this problem of the Jammu and Kashmir State. Recently there has been a report by Dr. Graham. Dr. Graham had been here previously and all of us who have had the privilege of meeting him, respect him. He is a man beaming goodwill and good intentions, and it is really a pleasure to meet a man like that. He came here on this occasion and he was our honoured guest, although we had informed the Security Council when they passed that resolution, that we could not

accept that resolution, nevertheless, if Dr. Graham came, he would be welcome. So he came and he had some talks with us. In this report, he himself has stated the nature of our talks. I am not at the present moment going into this Kashmir question. It is too big and too difficult, and apart from that, this House knows very well what our position in regard to this issue is—what we have said in great detail in the Security Council and in India. And in this matter, I believe there are no two opinions in this House or in the country. There might be slight variations about emphasis, but broadly speaking, there is none.

The trouble, according to us, in considering this matter has been that from the very beginning certain basic factors and basic aspects have not been considered by the Security Council, and because of that, the foundation of thinking and action has been unreal and artificial, and all this tremendous lapse of time has occurred without achieving any result.

When Dr. Jarring came here representing the Security Council—that was before Dr. Graham came—he presented a brief report. In that report, the House may remember, there was a recognition of certain factors, certain developments, certain facts of life which could not be ignored. He merely hinted at them; he did not go into that matter; it was difficult. Anyhow, this is the first glimmering that you see of what the problem is today. You can consider this problem in terms of 1948 and 1949 or in terms of today. You cannot consider it all the time, every little phase in between. I say 1948 and 1949 because it was in those years that certain resolutions of the Security Council were passed, which we accepted. The very first thing in those resolutions was that Pakistan and India should behave in a certain way, that is, peacefully and not curse each other, not create conditions of conflict. The second thing was that

Pakistan should withdraw from the occupied part of Kashmir and so on and so forth. Remember, the basis of those resolutions was the recognition of the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir State over the whole territory, that is to say, that the State was part of India and, therefore, Indian sovereignty. I am not going into that. Now, after that, much happened. A great deal has happened during these ten years, and even the papers that we have—I forget the exact number—run into 20, 25 or 30 volumes in connection with this Kashmir affair.

Now, we come to today. Keep—if you want to keep—those resolutions that we accepted, in mind; we do not want to go away from them. But remember that during all these ten years, the very first part of the thing has not been given effect to by Pakistan—neither the first, nor the second, nor the third—and all discussions begin in the Security Council ignoring all this, with something that is at the far end of the resolution, which was only to be thought of after everything else had been done.

Now, Dr. Graham has been good enough to put forward certain suggestions. One is that we should reiterate solemnly—‘we’ meaning India and Pakistan—what we had said previously: we should make a new declaration in favour of maintaining an atmosphere of peace. I was perfectly prepared to make it, and I will make it once, twice, three times, a number of times more. But with all humility—I submit again that I am prepared to make it—we drew Dr. Graham's attention to the type of declarations that were being made in Pakistan from day to day while he was there in Karachi. The declarations that were made there had no semblance of peace; there was the very opposite of it and all these bomb explosions organised from Pakistan are taking place in the Jammu and

Kashmir State. So nobody can object to what Dr. Graham has said. Let us have by all means declarations about maintaining an atmosphere of peace. But let us look at the facts, what is happening, what a former Prime Minister of Pakistan has just said, which is in yesterday's papers, and so on.

Then Dr. Graham said—the second thing—let us also declare that we shall observe the integrity of the cease-fire line. I do not think anybody has accused us during these ten years of a breach of that cease-fire line. There it is. We do not recognise Pakistan occupation on the other side as justified in any way, but we gave our word that we would not take any offensive action against it, and we have not done so. On the other hand, you see, what I have referred to several times, organised sabotage across the cease-fire line in Kashmir.

The third suggestion of Dr. Graham was about the withdrawal of Pakistan troops from the occupied part of Jammu and Kashmir State. Certainly, it is not up to us to withdraw; it is up to them to withdraw. It is not a question of our agreement to their withdrawal; we have been asking for their withdrawal all this time.

The fourth proposal was about the stationing of United Nations forces on the Pakistan border of Jammu and Kashmir State following the withdrawal of the Pakistan army from the State.

13 hrs.

Now, the proposal was or is for the stationing of U.N. troops, not in any part of Jammu and Kashmir territory, not in the part which is occupied by Pakistan now, but, these forces should be stationed in Pakistan territory proper. Obviously, Pakistan is an independent sovereign State. If it wants to have any foreign forces,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

we cannot say, 'No' to it. We cannot prevent that. We, for our part, do not like the idea of foreign forces anywhere. And more especially in this connection we felt we did not see any reason why the U.N. Forces should sit in Pakistan on the Kashmir border. But, that is our opinion. It does not carry us anywhere because what is proposed is to be done in the territory of Pakistan. It is for Pakistan to agree or not to agree; we have expressed our opinion.

Then, finally, Dr. Graham suggested that the two Prime Ministers, that is of India and Pakistan, should meet under his auspices. Now, it has been our practice or convention always to be prepared to meet not only as Prime Ministers, but anywhere in any conflict to meet our opponent, to meet our adversary, to meet, of course, our friends also. So, there can be no difficulty and no objection on our part, or for me, to meet the Prime Minister of Pakistan. But Dr. Graham says that we should meet under his auspices; that is to say, the three of us should meet. That produces an entirely different type of picture. I need not go into it. Obviously, that is there.

First of all, it places us in a position of, let us say, equality in this matter with Pakistan. We have always challenged that position. Pakistan is an aggressor country in Kashmir and we are the aggrieved party. We cannot be treated on level. That has been our case right from the beginning.

Secondly, for the two Prime Ministers who meet, it would almost appear as if they have to plead with Dr. Graham, under whose auspices they meet, as advocates for certain causes which they represent. This kind of thing does not lead to problems being considered properly or solved. So, we told Dr. Graham that while we are always prepared to meet, this way of meeting with a third party present, even though the

third party may be so eminent as Dr. Graham, was not a desirable way.

I have ventured to say something about Dr. Graham's report because there has been a good deal of talk about it, and a good deal of criticism, rather ill-informed criticism, in the foreign Press on the subject. Anyway, it is open to our friends or those who are not our friends to criticize us. I make no complaint. But I do wish that they would realise our position in this matter and what exactly of Dr. Graham's report we rejected.

I told you the first point, broadly speaking, is to make a declaration of good neighbourliness. Nobody can oppose that and there is no question of its rejection. Our submission is that this thing has been totally lacking from October 1947 onwards and, even after we had made this statement, Pakistan has not. In fact, it is our primary case that the old resolution of 1948 the very first part of it has not been given effect to by Pakistan.

The second point is about the cease-fire line. There is nothing to reject there.

The third was about the withdrawal of Pakistan troops. It is none of our concern. We want that to happen. We do not reject the withdrawal of Pakistan troops.

The fourth was the placing of UN troops in Pakistan territory. Well, I have told you it is up to Pakistan to agree or not to agree. If they want our opinion we can give it.

And, lastly, this question of the two Prime Ministers meeting. If my opinion is asked for I would say that a meeting should take place. Any meeting can take place when, if I may use the word, the omens are favourable, when the atmosphere is helpful. Otherwise, it is not likely to do much good. But, apart from that, I am prepared to meet whatever the

omens may be. But, as I said, I do not think it is the right way to approach this question, to meet in the manner suggested by Dr. Graham, that is, under his Chairmanship, discussing this matter between us. So, that is the position.

Now, I should like to say a sentence or two before finishing in regard generally to the Demands for External Affairs. In the past, during these debates and sometimes during questions, many points have been brought out and many criticisms have been made; and we have profited by these criticisms at any rate, we have tried to profit by them and we welcome them. We are not afraid of criticisms and we welcome those criticisms; but I would say only one thing.

Sometimes an approach is made which entails, without much obvious good, a great deal of labour. For instance, after 2 or 3 years of effort, labour and concentration we formed the Indian Foreign Service B. It involved tremendous labour, all kinds of committees of selection and consultation with Public Service Commission and all that. I do not know—I forget that now—but probably 7,000 or 8,000 persons applied. I get complaint after complaint that so and so has been improperly rejected or so and so has been improperly chosen. It is not possible for me as the Minister to consider 7,000 applications. Some impartial committee has to consider them. Most of these came from people in service; they were taken in or they remained where they were. I suppose some of the persons who did not happen to get it or who were not chosen go about from Member to Member with their complaints. Then, I get long letters, letters of 3, 4 or 5 typewritten foolscap pages. I have them examined, of course; I send them answers. But, I would submit that it is impossible, when we are following these procedures greatly—I cannot guarantee that—that

absolutely 100 per cent correct decision is always made. Who can guarantee that? But we make a certain procedure where the personal element does not count or counts very little and when we go through this procedure if any obvious error takes place, one tries to correct it. But it is quite impossible for us to go after these 6,000 or 7,000 people continuously and repeatedly because they go and complain of something that might have happened to them.

DEMAND No. 22—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,36,07,000 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, 1959, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'".

DEMAND No. 23—NAGA HILLS TUENSANG AREA

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,34,19,000 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, 1959, in respect of 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area'".

DEMAND No. 24—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,05,57,000 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, 1959, in respect of 'External Affairs'".

DEMAND No. 25—STATE OF PONDICHERY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,73,97,000 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, 1959, 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. 3,75,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'".

DEMAND No. 110—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 42,57,000 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, 1959, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'".

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Sir, the Prime Minister has begun his speech today in a somewhat unaccustomed fashion by referring to certain details of the administration and finances of his Ministry, I expect, Sir, this is on account perhaps of his recent tenure in the Finance Ministry. I do hope that as far as the economic conduct of the External Affairs of his Ministry is concerned, he has taken note of the observations

which were lately made by the Estimates Committee in regard to allegations of extravagance on the part of certain officials. But I do not make a special point of it. On the contrary, we do know that we have a core of very efficient officials in the External Affairs Ministry. I wish to pay my tribute along with the Prime Minister to the work that is done in such areas as the North East Frontier Agency, in the Naga Hills and the Tuensang territory.

It was more important that the Prime Minister emphasised the co-operative approach which is our policy in regard to our relationship with Pakistan. That is a matter on which I would like to make a few observations later on. But I am very happy that the Prime Minister has made it plain that our two countries are interdependent and that it hurts both of us if we persist in the policies of antagonism which appear to be pursued from the Pakistan side.

I hope I shall be forgiven for saying that if we take an overall view of the world situation today, we find that on the one hand the forces of peace are stronger perhaps than ever but the manouvres of imperialism, at bay but not yet defeated are also continuing in a certain fashion. This makes it more important for us to realise that we must do all we can to heighten the vital role which India has played in regard to the maintenance of peace in the world. It is known to everybody that fundamentally we are at one with the Prime Minister in his foreign policy. But we only wish that he pursues it in a more consistent and effective fashion. We have our grouses, sometimes serious grouses, to which we try to draw his attention.

We are not in terms of material strength a great power but on account of a certain moral weight and also of the endless potentiality even in terms of material strength that we have, we can pull our weight in world affairs to a larger extent than might be thought possible. Our country's

security and the plans for the welfare of our people depend upon the fate of the world struggle for peace, and therefore that struggle for peace in which India's contribution so far has been significant requires to be heightened.

It was good to hear the Prime Minister saying on the floor of this House that he expects that soon, before the year is out, there would be some kind of a summit conference or whatever you choose to call it and perhaps the preliminaries of that submit conference are very soon to get started. But I say that in regard to the step taken by the Soviet Union, which the Prime Minister has greeted, the step regarding the unilateral cessation of nuclear tests, it is incumbent upon us to try to mobilise opinion in this country and abroad so that there is universal following up of this gesture. The Prime Minister has said himself that if, for example, after sometime, the Soviet Union turns round and says that the other powers did not reciprocate and therefore, there was no alternative for it but to resume nuclear tests, then that would be a very serious proposition. But that is not the atmosphere which has been created by the gesture which has been made by the Soviet Union. Along with this, as the Prime Minister also pointed out, the Soviets had also indicated their readiness for an acceptable system of inspection which at one time had appeared to be the biggest hurdle of all. In this morning's paper we find how the Soviet Prime Minister has announced that the Soviet Government is ready here and now to withdraw the troops it has posted at the invitation of the respective Governments in Hungary and Rumania and Poland provided the Western Powers who have their troops posted in any number of countries do the same. There is a readiness on the part of at least one of the two greatest military powers in the world today to do all that is possible to bring about a comprehensive disarmament and if that is so, it is very important that we try to pull our weight in the direction of peace.

It is a very good thing that the Prime Minister has several times welcomed the Soviet decision but as Members of Parliament we recall that last year on the motion of the Defence Minister we passed a resolution calling upon the different powers to cease nuclear tests. Now recalling that Resolution I think it is only a proper gesture if Government associates Parliament with itself in order to declare its support of the Soviet action and in order to declare its proposal to all the world that this gesture should be reciprocated. That is the step which we want the Government to take because we know if there is no real response to the Soviet gesture, naturally the condition of things would be very undesirable.

I fear I have to refer to one matter which has been rather significantly not mentioned in the Prime Minister's speech and that is the question of Indonesia. I do not wish our Government to interfere in the affairs of Indonesia as sometimes it is said that if we make any observations about what is happening in Indonesia that might be tantamount to intervention but that is not the point at all. It is a pity that the Government has not come out sharply in condemnation of what is, to all intents and purposes, actual foreign intervention in the affairs of Indonesia. While naturally, we do not know all the facts certain things are very clear. Mr. Dulles has made no secret of his being on the side of the rebels and of his examining the question of the recognition of the rebel regime. United States Journals like *Time* are busy describing gleefully what is called civil war in Asia. Dr. Soekarno has told the world of foreign arms being supplied to the rebels. We have seen reports in the papers—even the Prime Minister's information perhaps is—that certain arms from Formosa were supplied to the rebels. The crime of Indonesia is that she has chosen not to commit herself to the West, not to accept the continuance of a colonial economy, not to function as a client State. Her attempt to complete and consolidate her national independence

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

by recovering West Irian and by repudiating the vested interests of Dutch exploiters is now being sought to be punished by the colonial powers. Being a country which has suffered under the heel of colonialism naturally I feel that we should send our greetings and good wishes to Indonesia for success in a struggle for the consolidation of her national independence. I would like to say that we here ought to imbibe to the happenings in Indonesia the warning we need, the warning that when private foreign interests are entrenched in a country's economy, as I fear to a certain extent they are in India, they tend corrode its sovereignty and try to overturn its freedom when its selfish objectives are imperilled by the national forces of that particular country.

Sir, we do not also appreciate the Prime Minister's hesitation or unwillingness to work for another conference to follow up the conference at Bandung. Now, all over the area from Indonesia to Algeria in the Middle East as well as in South-East Asia, this conspiracy of diehard imperialism is rampant. I know it might be said that if a second meeting of the Bandung type was to be held, then the failure of such a conference was a very great risk, and the effort had better not be made because that risk cannot be insured against. My feeling is that these doubts are idle and, perhaps, even somewhat perverse.

Sometime back, Ceylon welcomed the idea of a second Bandung Conference. China has wanted it and made unequivocal declarations to that effect. Indonesia and all the leading Arab countries have certainly been favourable. Actually, the moral balance is held by the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister took the initiative in this matter, he could do a great job of work for peace and for Asian freedom, and even at this stage the country will welcome it enthusiastically if he makes a move in this direction.

Sir, can it be, I sometimes wonder, if our dependence on aid from the western countries, including a country like France, for the sake of our Plans is inhibiting the Prime Minister's usual forthrightness in certain aspects of foreign policy? But, if the salt begins to lose its savour where-with shall it be salted? I hope, Sir, my apprehensions are wrong. But I note that, while the Prime Minister has not kept the world in the dark regarding our feelings over Algeria and the depredations of French colonialism in that area, we have not heard the ringing accents in which those feelings used at one time to be expressed. I know, he has told us that we should cultivate a kind of calmness, a kind of equilibrium, a kind of quietude and all the rest of it. That is all very right. But we are living in a disturbed world where the ache is in the heart of every sensitive person and, perhaps, occasionally it is necessary to come out of that contemplative shell of quietude and absolute equilibrium. I admire and envy those who can attain that kind of equilibrium of character and thought but, I am sure in a 'work-a-day' world we have sometimes to come out and express ourselves in a manner which is more in conformity with human frailty. Therefore, I suggest that it is not particularly palatable for us to behave in a very inhibited fashion in many instances.

For example, for more than three years now France is delaying *de jure* transfer to India of Pondicherry and other regions which she still has under *de jure* control. This is having an undesirable effect both on morale and on administration. Paradoxically, from that part of the Indian territory judicial appeals have still to be taken to Supreme Court in Paris. Certain economic problems consequent upon the transfer,—the position, for example, of the textile industry—continue to deteriorate. The peasantry of the Pondicherry area get

no advantage whatever of the agrarian reforms which have taken place in Madras State. And, in the atmosphere of demoralisation, faction fight goes on in the Pondicherry Assembly. Recently, a meeting to be addressed by the Chief Commissioner could not be held, for almost all the Members did not turn up and there was no quorum. Inside the Congress Party, which has a light majority, there are group quarrels about which communications have been sent to Delhi; perhaps, also to the Prime Minister. There is altogether an atmosphere of frustration and factionalism, and I suggest that this is largely because of the anomalous position which is created by French intransigence. If we could integrate Pondicherry into the rest of Indian Union that would bring almost a sea change as far as morale and administration is concerned.

Turning to the question of Portuguese possessions in India, I cannot appreciate the Government's unwillingness to integrate, for example, Nager Haveli, which has been liberated by the people of that area in 1954, into the Indian Union. Surely, we do not recognise Portugal's legal status in Nager Haveli, and the people have been asking persistently for integration. I do not see why we should not, in exercise of our undoubted sovereign rights, ask the World Court not to take any further cognizance of Portugal's claim to send troops across Indian territory to reconquer Nager Haveli.

I do not wish to be unduly disrespectful to the World Court, but the proceedings so far before that Court suggest very clearly that its presuppositions are absolutely anti India. There is nothing in international law to prevent us asking the World Court to take Portugal's complaint out of its file or, at any rate, we can intimate to the World Court that we do not propose to participate in the proceedings before it, which has gone in a fashion which speaks for itself.

Sir, on the 18th of December last year, we were told in answer to a Starred Question No. 1229 that in two months September and October, 1957—there were 22 violations of Indian territory by Portuguese troops in Goa and Daman. Unstarred Question No. 1537 asked on the 21st March this year elicited the information that in 1956 and 1957 we put in 67 protests for violations; but all of these protests lodged were simply turned down. It is time, indeed, to call a halt to this kind of nonsense. We should give Portugal notice to quit, but we cannot just wait till Goa gets involved in some kind of international entanglement.

Over Kashmir, Sir, it is good that the Prime Minister has taken a firm stand and has let it be known that Dr. Graham's call for a Prime Minister's meeting with himself as umpire or something is completely unacceptable. It is good also that he has expressed himself against Dr. Graham's proposal to station United Nations Troops in Pakistan's territory on India's border; if Pakistan choose to accept that humiliation we cannot help.

On this matter of Kashmir, however, it is more than time that our case before the Security Council, which enables these busy bodies to muddy the waters and bedevil Indo-Pakistan relations, is firmly and finally withdrawn. I submit that this can be done without the least little thought of our withdrawing from the United Nations which is a fantastic proposition and which, certainly, we do not want to do. But withdrawal of the case from the Security Council can be done in exercise of or inherent rights of sovereignty which are not taken away by any commitment which we may have made directly or by implication with the United Nations.

Sir, in the Rajya Sabha, on the 17th February this year the Home Minister answering the debate on the President's Address said in answer to a

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

suggestion that the case be withdrawn:

"I hope that it will not be necessary to withdraw it as it may fade off without any effort on our part to that effect."

I feel this is an important statement, and I cannot believe that this was made without thought. It certainly suggests that we can, if we wish, withdraw it. He says: "I hope that it will not be necessary to withdraw it . . ." It means that if we wish we can withdraw it, but that we expect it to die of inanition and to wither of itself. I would very much like the Prime Minister to give a clarification of this important statement in Rajya Sabha made by his colleague the Home Minister.

I shall now refer to a matter which might appear small but which has agitated this House often during the last five years or so, namely, the continuance still on Indian soil of the Gurkha recruitment camps for the British Army. Last year, on the 23rd of July, the Prime Minister said in answer to a question which I had asked that he was very distressed about it, but there are limits beyond which we cannot go. This session, I put in another question and I was told that the position was unchanged. It is some five years now that the British Government are promising early steps,—I am quoting the Prime Minister's words—"promising early steps", but they have continued much to our regret. I have a newspaper report here from the *Statesman* dated the 2nd July, 1957, which had stated that the camps in India would be shifted to Nepal by the end of 1958 or thereabouts. I wish Government finds out from the British Government which is not very obliging either in giving us information or taking any proper steps—I wish the Government asks the British Government to hurry up and be done with this kind of bad business on our territory.

Perhaps also, Sir, the Prime Minister will tell us that he will ask the British Government, which has not even answered our correspondence on the subject since 1956, to take steps for the restoration to us of our own property, the India Office Library. The late Maulana Azad had gone himself to London to ask for it but it has not been restored. It is a pity it is hanging fire for years and we have to trundle down to such a petty trucculence.

On the 13th March this year, in answer to an unstarred question, 1250, we were told that 82 out of 67 foreign applicants were permitted last year to cross the inner line of NEFA and Naga Hills-Tuensang area. I am not very happy about it, because our experience of these foreign penetrations in certain strategic areas is very unhappy. Maybe these are innocuous foreigners, but again, may be they are not, I wish the Prime Minister looks into the matter and make sure that undesirable foreign penetrations are not taking place in NEFA and Naga Hills-Tuensang area.

I refer now to a small matter which however has received some press publicity in this country and in Britain. It refers to the slander action brought in London by an Indian doctor against the warden of a hostel run by our High Commission. I have here a whole sheaf of papers, all sorts of cyclostyled things and photostat copies etc., etc. I must say that I am not at all happy with the attitude of the doctor concerned, but that is no reason why by the process of taking immunity which normally should not extend to a hostel warden, the doctor should be prevented from vindicating, as he says he wishes to do, his professional honour allegedly maligned by an official. Let us not lay ourselves open to the accusation which some British papers have made that by lavish use of the diplomatic immunity, the Indian High Commission protects its employees even where the law might well have taken its course

I refer to another matter and that has reference to a question which was answered in this House on the 10th March, 1958,—Starred Question No. 801, when it was said on behalf of the Prime Minister that Government have decided no longer to accept responsibility for extending rehabilitation benefits to future migrants from East Pakistan. I remember—if I remember aright—the Prime Minister has told the House last year that the changed policy would be followed only after a discussion of this issue in Parliament. The discussion, unfortunately,—a discussion properly so-called—has not taken place. I would ask the Prime Minister to see that a discussion takes place before the new policy re. the refusal of rehabilitation benefits to intending migrants from East Pakistan is finalised.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I shall finish in five minutes. With Pakistan our relations are not as they should be, but while we always take a firm stand in regard to such issues as Kashmir and the military pacts to which Pakistan has chosen to adhere, let us do all we can, and I am sure from what the Prime Minister said this morning he will do it. Let us do all we can to resume the cordiality and co-operation which our two countries should naturally practise. This is a job to which the Prime Minister in particular can give his mind in a manner that none else in India and Pakistan can. We hear mainly of more or less unsavoury border incidents. There were 36 protests which we had to make in 1957. We hear of queer political going-on in Pakistan and we hear of the unending trail of refugees coming over to India, but whenever our people of either country, meet either at pilgrim centres or at cricket or at liberty gatherings, there is cordiality. The rain-bow shows behind the rain. But often, when officials meet and discuss concrete things,— things like

trade or railway problems,—good results ensue. Cannot we take the problem by the horns, so to speak, and try to tackle it? They talk in Europe of a European common market and all that sort of thing, but cannot we offer that they had in the days of German unification in the 19th century—it played a great role—a Zollverein, a customs union which will help our inter-dependent economy. We can talk to the people of Pakistan over the heads of their rulers who sometimes behave in an impossible manner, but we can tell the people of Pakistan how in the mutual interest of our two countries and in the interests of our inter-dependent economy we can have a customs union, we can have a common market. I think we can have a Zollverein. I had mentioned this before, but I feel that after the observation made by the Prime Minister this morning, this is an issue which he can take up, and if perhaps the Prime Minister applies his mind to it and begins an earnest effort for friendship on concrete issues, whatever the psychological and political difficulties which are many and serious, perhaps we shall see the glimmer of a change for the better. This may appear to be a somewhat theoretical suggestion but I venture to submit that we have got to make that effort or reconcile ourselves to a hopeless discord. I have a feeling that it is in this kind of effort that the Prime Minister can freshen himself at the founts of popular enthusiasm which he can surely invoke. He has been talking about feeling stale; if he really does want to freshen himself, this kind of effort would appeal not only to his heart and soul but also to the heart and soul of the common people of both our countries.

The forces of reaction are as busy as ever in the international arena. They will yield only when they must. And there are ways and means of putting pressure on uncommitted countries like ours. We have, therefore, to be always alert and make sure

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

that through aid and the unspoken assumptions accompanying aid, they do not tie us down. Recently, a queer case happened—the disapproval by ruling circles in the United Kingdom and the United States of America of the India-wide celebrations to-day, the 9th April, of Paul Robeson's 60th birthday. The Prime Minister's statement on this occasion was frowned upon by the *London Times* and also in the United States. I do not know, but I have heard that the Prime Minister had issued an earlier statement which was later on somewhat altered,—I do not know for what reason,—but it seems that India's homage to a great artist is looked askance at only because Robeson happens to be also an active fighter for a new society rid of exploitation, a society of freedom and joy and creativity which freedom alone can bring.

Sir, I stress that it is in conformity with all the traditions of our country that we fight for peace, and for the new society. Our Vedic ancestors talked of a life of peace and good cheer:

मनु वाताः श्रतायते, मनु शान्तिं विववः

"When in the air you felt the touch of honey and when all the seas were overflowing with honey".

That was the kind of world which they had conceived of, and if today with all the apparatus of scientific achievement at our disposal we go ahead to build the world nearer the heart's desire of our people, then surely that is performance of those jobs which alone are worth doing. If, therefore, today, in the realm of foreign policy and in the realm of the reconstruction of our country and the consolidation of our freedom, we can follow an independent and effective policy, we shall bring succour and hope and joy to our people and we shall be acting in conformity with the traditions of our ancient land.

Shri Banga (Tenali): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with my hon. friend, Mr. Mukherjee, in the reference he has made to that great artist Paul Robeson. I can assure him that not only the Prime Minister, but also everyone of us on this side of the House and in this country is keen on associating himself with the celebrations that are being made in this country to express our tribute and our admiration for that great artist, that fighter for freedom and rights of equality for all those under-privileged people, especially those coloured peoples in the United States of America. At the same time, I do not think my hon. friend was justified in trying to weaken the tribute that our Prime Minister has sought to pay to Paul Robeson by bringing extraneous thoughts, hints and insinuations.

I am second to none in my passion for democracy or freedom or in my opposition to totalitarianism, wherever it may prevail. At the same time, I would like all those concerned to take notice of the fact that today in India, there is a general feeling, a relief and satisfaction over this declaration of the U.S.S.R. over the cessation of tests of hydrogen bombs. India has every right to feel gratified that the initiative that she has taken both from the Governmental platform as well as here in the Parliament itself in asking all these powers to put a stop to these tests has come to be accepted at long last at least by U.S.S.R. Certainly that great power deserves congratulations from all lovers of peace all over the world. I sincerely hope that the democratic powers also would take time by the forelock and make a similar declaration and in that way win the goodwill of all lovers of peace all over the world. It is said by some that if the democratic powers have also got to do the same thing, then U.S.S.R. might get a lead in the possession and the use of conventional arms. We do not know the comparative position in regard to the possession and also the

capacity to use these conventional arms as between these two great block of powers. But whatever might be the comparative position, we are certainly keen that the tests of hydrogen bombs should be stopped and stopped immediately. I sincerely hope that this declaration made by U.S.S.R. will pave the way not only for the convening of the summit conference before the end of the year, as our Prime Minister has hoped, but also to the success, partial or complete, of that disarmament conference which we are expecting to take place as early as possible.

I am not one of those who think that imperialism is to be found only on one side of the globe. The speech which is reported to have been made by the Prime Minister of U.S.S.R. only yesterday or day before and the remarks that he has made over the imperialistic intervention that U.S.S.R. has made into Hungary is positive proof of the fact that the devil of imperialism seems to be bedeviling the council not only on one side, but also on the other of these two great blocs in the world. My hon. friend was anxious that our Prime Minister should express himself in stronger terms against what he had considered to be a foreign intervention into Indonesia. We do not know the facts, as he himself suggested and until we know the facts for certain, it would certainly be wrong on our part to tread where angles fear to tread. What is happening in Indonesia is not yet known to us in full. Why they have gone into the civil war is not quite clear to us.

We know one thing anyhow that Indonesia is not faultless, that she without consulting her own nearest and dearest friends in the international world, had decided to expropriate on those Dutch properties—maybe companies and enterprises. It is quite possible that she was being exploited, that she had been exploited even when she was not free. But that is not the reason why she should have taken that kind of unilateral action without

consulting her own friends. Having done that, it can now be said by her enemies that she has provided the necessary provocation for others also to begin to take interest in her affairs. It is quite possible that some sections of the American Press have been jubilant over what is happening in Indonesia. We can let them do so because America is a free country. Merely because of that, we cannot freely expect our Prime Minister to come out with condemnation of certain things about which we do not know ourselves.

It is a pity that my hon. friend and the party with which he is associated the Communist Party—begin to talk of peace and peaceful co-existence in one breath and at the same time warn our country against inviting foreign capital to co-operate with us in the development of our own economy. I do not know what they mean by saying that foreign interests are likely to gain a foothold in this country and therefore they are likely to weaken our freedom. We are quite clear that we have no fears whatsoever that our freedom is likely to be weakened by foreign capital coming into this country either through private or public interests. That is one of the reasons why we have welcomed aid from all those countries which are capable of giving us aid. We welcome aid from Russia; we have welcomed it from America. Our complaint is not that we are getting too much support from these countries, but that we are getting only too little. Anyone who peruses the report of this Colombo Plan Committee which has been supplied to us would be struck by the partial attitude that has been shown till now by the western countries towards South-east Asian countries. When postwar Europe was in trouble, especially western countries, America went out of her way through that Marshal Plan to offer aid at the rate of 4 billion dollars every year over a period of five years. On the other hand, during the last five years, under this Colombo Plan, all the support that all the western countries

(Shri Ranga)

have been able to give to all these countries—not merely India, but all the South-east Asia Countries—which have been brought under this Colombo Plan has not come up to even 4 billion dollars, i.e. not even as much as what was offered to West European countries within one year alone. Therefore, if Soviet Russia is willing to give more and more support, we would only be too glad to have it. We have seen this morning to what length we are prepared to go in order to accommodate these creditors, even when their experts are prepared to inflict losses upon us by their own bad planning. I refer to the demurrage that we have had to pay at Vizag port because of the bad advice or bad decision taken by some of the Russian experts in regard to the arrival of the various Soviet ships and steamers which brought materials for us.

Having said that, I would like to assure the hon. Prime Minister that we are entirely with him in his efforts to achieve peace in the world. We have been one with him all these ten years. But it has not been the case with the Communist Party during all this period. We are, nevertheless, glad that at long last, for the last two years, they have come to see wisdom in the policy and, therefore, they have begun their approval as well as support to the policy that the Prime Minister has been pursuing.

Coming to Pakistan, I do not think that my hon. friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee's optimism is well justified. I do not think that Zollverein has not been achieved merely because of want of will, want of good wishes and want of planning on the part of our own Government. As our Prime Minister has said, it has come to be an endemic, running sore in our international affairs. The very birth of Pakistan has somehow or other given such a twist and turn to the mind—not to the individual mind of the Pakistani people but to the collective

mind of Pakistani—that even since they have made it a political mission only to espouse their hatred of India, to breeze it, fan it and excite it. Should they not be ashamed of indulging in this kind of international politics against their neighbourly country? But that has not been the case with Pakistan. India has survived in spite of the visitations of so many floods, famines and other natural calamities. The separation or division of this sub-continent into India was one such disaster just as India has survived in spite of so many natural disasters, India will have to learn to survive—and I am confident that India will continue to survive—in spite of this political disaster that has been inflicted upon us as an incident of the very achievement of our freedom.

Therefore, I do not want our hon. Prime Minister to be too much worried over this. We have our defence forces and we would certainly continue to strengthen our defence forces for our own defence purposes. Having done that, we have been concentrating on the reconstruction of our country, rebuilding of our economy during all these of our country, rebuilding of our economy during all these ten years and we shall continue to do so without being deflected from our efforts by whatever Pakistani's statesmen, press and various politicians and even their Legislators might be doing, might be saying and might be intriguing against India.

Unfortunately the question of Kashmir has come to be a very great trouble indeed. I do not know when it is going to be settled. I am not quite sure whether it is going to be settled at all, so far as Pakistan and India are concerned, because Pakistan is not in a mood for any reasonable settlement. We need not be worried about it. But nevertheless we should make up our mind to go ahead with whatever plans we have for the development of Kashmir irrespective of the attitude of Pakistan and also of the United Nations.

So far as Kashmir's internal politics is concerned, I would like some thought to be given by the hon. Prime Minister and also by the Government as to whether we cannot possibly do something in order to bring into existence a kind of organised party or leadership which would be co-operative, which would be able to win the co-operation of all the groups and all the parties. Well, I do not know whether there is any such possibility, but an effort ought to be made, because otherwise we hear only of one party and we do not hear of any other party. Is the State going to be run by one party alone or is it going to be a real democracy? Whether there is democracy there today or not, we do not know. For reasons best known to himself and to the Government, Sheikh Abdullah was released. Why he was detained, we do not know. After having detained him for these four or five years, we released him. Now he begins to embarrass us in the most inconvenient manner and there is news this morning in the press that he is thinking of having a political stunt or political game to be released on the Id day in order to embarrass not only the Government of Kashmir but also the Government of India and our interests all over the world. It is difficult to know how to deal with this gentleman, this erstwhile leader of Kashmir. It is difficult enough for the Government and I do not wish to say anything more lest it might make it more difficult for them to deal with him and also the forces that are supposed to be behind him.

Algeria is worrying us. I am worried of Algeria. Our Prime Minister is also worried of it. Shri Hiren Mukerjee was not quite charitable in the remarks that he has made in this connection. It is not because of any kind of loan or anything else that might be coming, or expected to come, in the form of assistance from France that the Prime Minister has not said anything. He has himself associated with it not once, but many

times and publicly too. The Prime Minister has referred to the struggle for freedom by the people of Algeria. I am sure he would take the House into confidence at a later stage as to the steps that he has taken in order to make the French Government aware of the public opinion prevailing in this country. We are all in favour of the achievement of freedom at the earliest possible moment by the people of Algeria. We are also in favour of the freedom of the press in South East European countries and in so many other feudal countries. But there are limitations to the Government acting in these directions. To the extent that he could possibly go beyond these limitations, without in any way upsetting the international relations of India with other countries, I am sure the Prime Minister has been exerting himself in favour of the freedom movements in all these countries, and more especially in Algeria.

I do not know whether what we say here is really reaching the peoples of those countries either in South Africa or in France or even in Pakistan. I was there in Pakistan only last November and I found that there is a kind of iron wall between Pakistan and India, so far as the press goes. They do not know what happens here. They do not hear what we say. It is so in some other countries also. But certainly it is terrible in Pakistan. Therefore, my hon. friend, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee wants us to make a kind of appeal, wants our Prime Minister also to make an appeal to the peoples of Pakistan over the heads of their Ministers. How it is possible, it is impossible for anybody to imagine. Possibly, his party is there on the other side and, therefore, between these two parties they have some kind of communication. But, somehow, the Congress party and the various other parties in this country do not have their opposite numbers in Pakistan. Therefore, it is not possible for us to reach the people of Pakistan. But, to the extent that our words can possibly reach the people in France, I would

[Shri Ranga]

like to say on behalf of the non-officials here in this House that we are against the unusual reactionary attitude of France. She seems to be ignoring the writings on the wall. What has happened in Morocco, in Tunisia and in Indo-China should be taken as a lesson to give freedom to the people of Algeria.

Lastly, there is South Africa. It is true that South Africa has placed herself beyond the pale of civilised life and civilised notions anywhere in this world. How are we going to deal with this problem? There are so many other problems also. Possibly, only war may solve it; we do not know. Short of war, possibly either God or somebody else might know their minds. Short of all these things, I do not see any possibility of the solution of this particular problem except through the Gandhian means. That is to say, the people of South Africa themselves, especially those who are sufferers from this colour bar, would have to organise a *satyagraha* and oppose all the horrors of the repression from their Government and in that way achieve their own freedom, human, national as well as racial.

14 hrs.

In conclusion I would like to congratulate our Prime Minister and our country—and the whole world also—upon this new move made by the U.S.S.R. It opens up a new page in history. It is a kind of a new era just as the atomic era that started in August, 1945, which had blighted all our hopes and had cast a terrible cloud of depression and unhappiness over the whole of the world. This move seems to be a kind of rainbow which may possibly result in the advent of effective and worldwide peace.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, ten years seem to be a fairly good period to appraise the results of our foreign policy. The hon. Prime Minister has referred to his stewardship and we can look back

with some kind of satisfaction that there is a silver lining in the cloud after a struggle of nearly ten years. People had their hopes and disappointments during this decade. There were whispers around the chancelleries of Europe and there were whippers in the big business houses of this land that we had landed in the Communist camp. Others said that we had not got enough friends to back our cause and that America could have given us any amount of support in the shape of dollars. Be that as it may, the objectives and principles of our foreign policy have been fully justified and have vindicated our stand. We stand on the foundation of a firm secular State. We had internal law and order in a degree far greater than many countries of the world. We had effects of the partition and we solved the refugee problem in a more humane and more equitable manner than many countries of the globe.

What is this policy based on? This policy is first and foremost based on the spirit of peace and non-violence. We want to reduce the areas of tension and violence and also spread the number of areas of peace. The second foundation of our foreign policy has been non-alignment with power blocs. These two have justified our policy.

14-03 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

It is a matter of gratification to note the heart-searching near at home in the camps of our friends and neighbours. There has been a very big heart-search.

The Dawn, which has been known as the most aggressive communal journal of this land across, has published two leading editorials on the 30th March and 31st March entitled "At the Cross-roads" They may follow us in many other things may be good or bad, but how they have done very deep heart-searching indeed! The editorial starts like this:

"The West is now talking to Pakistan in a new voice. It is not

the voice of a friend, nor of an ally. It sounds like that of a hostile stranger. It is not a prelude to a big let-down; it seems as if this is the let-down.

.

To put it bluntly in the American English, our American "allies" are now telling us where we get off. They are telling us that they have played us for suckers, that they could not care less what we feel, and that we can lump it if we do not like it.

.

Now that we are about to be left high and dry by our dear friends of the West in whose professions we had believed, we certainly have to think afresh and salvage what is left of our prestige and our interests.

.

It will take a great deal of courage, determination and wisdom to think out a new policy and switch over to it.

.

Let our minds work hard so that every man and woman may realise the mistakes we have made as a result of which, after nearly eleven years of our existence we are still without any real friends among the bigger nations of the world.

.

Therefore, it is only plain commonsense that we should cut our losses and withdraw from our present position of complete identification with the anti-Soviet policies and plans of the West, to the more honourable, rational and even profitable policy of judicious neutrality in the East-West cold war, and also in a shooting war if it breaks out."

As I said, we see a silver lining in the cloud and perhaps when they have solved their constitutional difficulties and a new Government comes in

Pakistan offer their first General Elections, they may hold out the hand of peace by which we may be able to solve many of our problems. The hon. Prime Minister has not withdrawn the hand of peace. He says that there are ominous signs yet and we should have better conditions of peace. We all recollect how the late hon. Liaquat Ali Khan came to India in Easter 1950-51 and thereafter Mr. Mohammed Ali, the other Prime Minister, also came and we had a succession of peace parleys. Nothing came out of it in the end. Now Dr. Graham says that there shall be a truce and parleys between the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan. India has enough experience of such parleys. We had two friends from the West, the late Ramsay MacDonald, who had come here decades before Dr. Graham, who had been to Indonesia, and we know to what great stress we were put by this Communal Award when the British judge sat between both the communities which led to the final partition of the country. Now we do not want this seat of power or this seat of judgment to be transferred to the U. N. Headquarters, where instead of the British, the Americans will sit in judgment and decide the cleavage between two brothers and two neighbouring countries. We are, warned by past experience not to walk into this trap of the U. N. sitting in judgment over two parties—India and Pakistan—though it may be the old historic problem of the Hindu and Muslim communities.

The hon. Prime Minister's policy of non-violence has not merely been justified right on our border but even in Britain where today there is a very fierce controversy raging in regard to nuclear defence. Sir Stephen King-Hall, one of their great military authorities, has laid down that it would be wiser for Britain if the Soviets occupied Britain than to allow Britain to be destroyed by nuclear war. He further goes to lay down that they shall even adopt the technique of India and Ireland, namely, the technique of Mahatma Gandhi that the peo-

[Shri Joachim Alva]

ple of Britain shall be trained in the art of non-violence so that Britain can stand up and even fight the Soviet Russia if they came to occupy Britain. That, I think, is a great indirect tribute to Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence. If I may recall, Mahatma Gandhi had advised India that in case the Japanese walked into India, we should by the spirit of non-violence fight their occupation. Sir Stephen King-Hall has laid down that Britain must abandon the Hydrogen Bomb unilaterally. Britain along with her political allies must prepare for active political warfare. This business of persuading the enemies—the occupation of Britain would not at all be pleasant. The people in the United Kingdom must be prepared for non-violent resistance in the event of enemy occupation.

Such is the policy of some of the thinkers and military strategists of the West today. Their line of reasoning and ideology almost touched the neighbourhood of non-violence as preached by Mahatma Gandhi and practised by us in the last ten years of our foreign and internal policy.

We welcome the declaration of the Soviet leaders in regard to their being willing to abandon nuclear tests. It is one great positive advance in the cause of peace and it is a great pity that neither the U.K. nor the U.S.A. has risen to the occasion by responding to such a gesture. We do hope, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, that during the course of this year the world will witness a Summit Conference and the result of the Summit Conference will be beneficial and will not be like that of the Geneva Conference. By the time the ink was dry on the pad of the Geneva Conference, we had the SEATO. In the SEATO, as you know, three countries of South East Asia were bound together—Philippines, Thailand and South Vietnam and Mr. John Foster Dulles flourished them as against seven countries of South-East Asia. Those seven countries, i.e., India, Indonesia, Burma,

Ceylon, Cambodia, Laos and Malaya, refused to join the military alliance of the SEATO. So, while the Geneva Conference was conceived in a high spirit, the dragon's teeth were sown by the SEATO in South East Asia. We had the terrible spectacle of Indo-China being partitioned and the elections between the north and the south not being held in accordance with the terms of the Geneva protocol.

What will conduce to peace? How is peace threatened now? These are two important points that I should like to lay before the House. In regard to what will conduce to peace, I will say that first requisite is the recognition of China, second is the release of American prisoners by China and third is the recognition of the position of U.S.S.R. in the Middle East. The next is about the aggressive French occupation of Algeria and Madagascar, nearer to us; fifth, recognition of the fear of German militarism; sixth the Rapacki Plan of Poland and last, cultivation of freedom in African-Asian territories.

Coming to the first point, though it embraces an old demand, it has not lost its strength or toughness vitality. Unless China is recognised and takes its place amongst the galaxy of nations, there can be no final peace on this side of the land. There are only three American prisoners in China. We do hope and hope earnestly that China will release these three prisoners who are due to be released only in 1975. A great power like China will not lose anything by releasing three American prisoners if it can help us to have peace established in this world.

In regard to the recognition of the position of the U.S.S.R. in the Middle East, it is a very strong point. Unless we recognise that the U.S.S.R. has a stake in the Middle East, we cannot establish peace in the Middle East. We do know that Britain waged three wars, one against Russia on the Mediterranean side in the last century and the two Afghan wars to keep off Russia

from the affairs of the globe. That policy, thereafter the Truman doctrine and the Eisenhower doctrine have all collapsed. We have to see that the position of Russia is recognised in the Middle East. I would like to quote the authority of an American, Mr. John Badeau, the Principal of the American University in Cairo, who has contributed an article in the latest number of *Foreign Affairs*, January 1958, where he says as follows.

"Both in Government circles and popular opinion, Russia is not seen as posing a threat as representing an opportunity. She offers the Middle East what appears to be a new chance of sharing in the benefits of the Western world..

"This is especially true of the United States which is now the chief representative of the Western world in the Middle East. Many Arabs including intelligent and educated ones, feel that it is the United States, not Russia, that is trying to take over the Middle East. And they feel that we are trying to divide the Arab world in cases where we cannot oppose Russia successfully."

In the Rapacki Plan, I would say that Poland has been actuated by a sense of genuine fear. Poland, today, is wedged between Germany on one side and Russia on the other side. Mr. Adam Rapacki, the Polish Foreign Minister made an announcement in the 12th session of the U.N. Assembly that they would like to have a de-nuclearised zone where nuclear weapons will not be utilised either by Germany—Federal or the Democratic States—or by Czechoslovakia or by Poland. Even Yugoslavia has approved of this de-nuclearised Entente. The people who have intensely suffered from the terrible effects of the last war, the Poles and other people around them all have realised how, though it may be a partial plan for peace, it would help them all ultimately in establishing peace. Whosoever offers to make his country and the neighbouring countries free from nuclear weapons is

welcome as an additional factor for peace in the sense that the areas of peace will be strengthened and lengthened so that, perhaps, the final problem may come nearer solution and small and gallant nations like Poland may be spared from aggression. Among the Asian-African countries, we have Ghana, Ethiopia, Algeria, Sudan, Uganda. These are the territories in Africa to which we must pay particular attention. They are coming of age soon in the matter of self-government. We must send out our missions—the missions must be very effective—so that they may join the self-governing world, so that these territories which have been under the heel of the foreign powers may welcome the new ideas of peace and freedom in the continent of Africa.

Where is peace threatened now? I have already referred to the S.E.A.T.O. region. I was the first one in this Parliament in 1953 to warn about Napalm bombing in Indo-China. That area is still combustible. The U.S. 7th Fleet is stationed with jurisdiction from Malaya to Hawaii, from Siberia into China. That is the largest, most powerful fleet assembled on a permanent basis in peace time in the history of the world. That fleet even threatens the security of Indonesia. The problem of Indonesia cannot be ignored by us. Indonesia is the largest Muslim country in the world. Indonesia claims to be a secular democracy. Dr. Soekarno has emphatically declared hardly 10 days ago that he is not a Communist. We have to be warned about the conditions in Indonesia. We have the Kashmir, Goa and other problems. We cannot allow these forces of disintegration which are appearing in Indonesia, to come one day on the face of our own country. Thanks, we have a stabilised country and our problems are better than elsewhere. But, what can happen in Indonesia today may also happen in India after a few years. Today's papers report that Admiral Stump, the U.S. Pacific Commander has made the following statement that he would like the anti-communist forces to get together in Indonesia" This is the state-

[Shri Joachim Alva]

ment of the American Fleet Commander before the House of Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. I have already rung the bell twice.

Shri Joachim Alva: I know. You will have to give me three or four minutes and I will finish.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is very good that he knew them and ignored them!

Shri Joachim Alva: I heard them. Sometimes I wink over bells like my other friends. I got the contagion from them.

Coming to Kashmir, I find that our publicity is very very weak. Britain is spending—I would not like to compare their figures and our figures—this year £15 million on publicity. It has increased by 2 million pounds. Perhaps, all the money that we are spending on the External Affairs Ministry does not amount to what Britain is spending. The publicity on Kashmir is very weak. People seem to have forgotten the horrible massacres that took place in Baramula. They have not been sufficiently publicised. When people talk about Kashmir, when the West wants to ignore that it was Pakistan that committed aggression, what should be recalled is the crowning point in that aggression, the horrible murders which took place in Baramula where even foreign nuns were maltreated and assaulted. It will be very useful if what has been written by some of our foremost journalists, especially by Shri Frank Moraes, who, as Editor of the Times of India wrote a series of articles spotlighting the Baramula tragedy, is widely published. When they want to forget and gloss over these facts, it is time that we focus our attention about the attack on Baramula and how India, within 24 hours, had walked into Kashmir and improved the position, and how India made up its mind when it heard of the terrible atrocities of Baramula.

Before I sit down, I will make one point. South America should not be neglected by us. The 16 or 21 States in South America command a large number of votes in the U.N. Assembly. We have very few missions there. We should do everything to send out people there and especially in regard to Goa, to give a good account of what we have done so that South America may be won over to our cause. The Government's final declaration that they are throwing open the borders of Goa and that people can go to and fro is the right policy in the spirit of our non-violence. The hardships which the Goans felt and which their representatives represented, will now become less. Goans should feel better indeed and hopeful that India has declared this policy out of strength and not out of weakness.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The following are the selected cut motions relating to Demands under the Ministry of External Affairs which may be moved by the hon. Members subject to their being otherwise admissible:

Demand No. No. of Cut Motion

24	124, 1550, 1292, 1293, 1294, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1298, 1299, 1300, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1492, 1493, 1494, 1495, 1527, 1528, 1529, 1530, 1531, 1551, 1552, 1553, 1554, 1555, 1556, 1557, 1558, 1559, 1560.
----	---

Failure to formulate a proper frontier policy so far as the neighbouring States like Nepal etc. are concerned which are situated in the Himalayan Border.

Shri Panigrahi: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

Admission of East Bengal citizens to India

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1."

Failure to adhere to a policy of strict non-involvement in inter-national controversies.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Inefficiency of our publicity set-up in foreign countries and failure to convince foreigners of the Justice of our stand on Kashmir, Goa etc.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Failure to liberate Goa and other Portuguese colonies

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Need for taking over effectively the liberated areas of Dadra and Nagar Haveli integral parts of the Indian Union.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Failure to bring pressure upon the Pakistan Government to provide conditions of security and peaceful living for the Hindus in East Bengal.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Need to establish full-fledged diplomatic relations with Israel

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Failure to secure for Indian Nationals in Burma Facilities for remitting Money to their dependents in India.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Need for taking further steps for bettering the lot and protecting the interest of Indian Nationals Abroad.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Extravagance in Administration

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Delay in finalisation of de jure transfer of Pondicherry to the Indian Union.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Selection of participants for the World Youth Festival recently held in Moscow.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Policy with regard to the issue of migration certificates to intending migrants of the minority Community in East Pakistan.

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

Need to replace the British Commonwealth by a French Shila Commonwealth of Nations.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

Graham Report

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

Need to take steps to persuade the great powers to agree to a summit conference.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

Failure to give moral support to Indonesia in her fight against the rebellion.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

Repeated firing by Pakistan Police and Armed Forces across the East Pakistan-Assam Border.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

Failure to take steps for the liberation of Goa and other Portuguese occupied territory in this country.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

Failure to support Oman and Muscat against British attack.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

Need for evolution of a new positive attitude towards Pakistan to solve outstanding problems.

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:

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

Need to reject Graham Report on Kashmir

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:

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

Need to thank U.S.S.R. for unilateral suspension of nuclear tests.

Shri Naubir Bharucha: I beg to move:

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

Need to take steps to move U.N. for control of outer-space and to restrict its use for peaceful scientific research.

Shri Naubir Bharucha: I beg to move:

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

Need to take more energetic and effective steps for liberation of Goa and other Portuguese enclaves.

Shri Naubir Bharucha: I beg to move:

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

Failure to economic expenses of Embassies

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to stick to our policy of neutrality effectively

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Need to establish diplomatic relations with Israel

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure in finalisation of de jure transfer of Pondicherry to the Indian Union.

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to stop Pakistani violations of Indian Border

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to Government not to be able to stop harassment of political prisoners in Goa-Jails

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to our publicity in foreign countries about our stand on Kashmir and Goa.

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to liberate all Portuguese Colonies

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to stop migration of East-Bengal Hindus taking assurance about their security from Pakistan.

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to stop harassment of Indians in Africa, Ceylon and Burma.

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Speaker: All these cut motions are now before the House.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has spoken about our efforts towards peace and our efforts towards relaxation of tensions in the world. A summary of the report of the activities of the External Affairs Ministry for 1957-58 has given us an account of them. We congratulate the Prime Minister on his efforts towards the promotion of peace, and it is this that has shed a lustre over our country and over our people, and it is because of this mission of peace that the foreign policy pursued by the hon. Prime Minister is having support not only in this House but outside this House in the wide arena of our nation.

I just remember what Shri Rajagopalachari wrote to Mr. Khrushchev about the unilateral banning of bombs, nuclear tests and disarmament. Let me read out from what he wrote to Mr. Khrushchev. I am

[Shri Hem Barua]

enamoured of this sentence written by Shri Rajagopalachari:

"The unqualified declaration will give the start for the moral law to work the chain reactions in the field of human spirit even as the broken atoms does in your atomic plants."

We congratulate Mr. Khrushchev on his unilateral decision to ban nuclear tests. It marks a step towards progress, towards peace, and I think the foreign policy that is pursued by our Prime Minister should be more energetic, in keeping with its spirit, so that we might tear off tension and tone up the mansion of peace, so that we root out fear and apprehension and replant goodwill and understanding in the soil of international politics.

We generally hear of Panch Shila and when any dignitary comes from outside and whenever there is a point statement made, there is reference to Panch Shila but then I have thought of this, and we find that indirectly this help also in perpetuating racial discrimination and perpetuation of imperialism. I can understand Communism and capitalism existing side by side, because Stalin also said that it was possible for them to exist side by side, but I cannot understand how exploitation and imperialism on the one side and peace and progress on the other side can co-exist. Now, we have failed miserably to tone up or to do anything substantial so far as the political and racial imperialism that is pursued in countries like Kenya, South Africa and Algeria is concerned.

There is a liberation movement in Algeria, and except expressing our deep concern, which we did when the King of Afghanistan visited this country, and we issued a joint communique,—except expressing our deep concern over this matter, we have not been able to rouse the conscience of the world in favour of the people of Algeria. The people of Algeria have bled white. There have been

atrocities. There has been unabashed gangsterism let loose in that country by the French forces and we have been silent, and even if we have raised our voice, it is only a subdued voice.

One girl Djamila was sentenced to death, a girl of 22, and we did not raise the voice of protest; that we ought to have raised. Our voice was a subdued voice, and it sounded like a penny whistle against the rich baritone of protests coming from other quarters of the world. I will read out what she said before the military court. This is what Djamila said:

"The truth is that I love my country, I want to see it free, and it is for this and this alone that you have tortured me and are going to condemn me to death, but when you kill us do not forget that you are killing your country's tradition of liberty, staining its honour and endangering its future."

A village was bombed in Tunisia because that village was suspected to harbour Algerian rebels. That is the state of affairs there. Yet we are in the Commonwealth, and France and Britain are close friends.

Our association with the Commonwealth is very often justified by the Prime Minister, but when I listen to him justifying our association with the Commonwealth, I see only a negative approach to it. He puts a question to us: have we sustained any losses by associating ourselves with the Commonwealth? I want to ask him point blank: have we gained by our association with the Commonwealth? We have not. Now, we gave a pledge to the country in 1930 and that pledge has yet to be redeemed. When Egypt was attacked by the Anglo-French troops, were we consulted, were we informed, were we taken into confidence? We were not. When there was a series of hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific, were we consulted, were we informed?

We were not. What about the Commonwealth? Has the Commonwealth pronounced anything or said anything about our problems like the problem of Goa, the problem of Kashmir? They have not.

This is a pet argument put forward by the Prime Minister that when Egypt was attacked, we raised our voice of protest and our association with the Commonwealth did not stand in the way. It is true, but then if we think that Egypt was saved because of us, we will be living in a world of illusion. Egypt was not saved because of us but because of the compulsion of the forces of reality, and there is no doubt about it.

Then comes South Africa. What About South Africa? There are people of Indian origin, born and brought up in that area. They are having a nefarious Act called the Group Areas Act of 1950. They are isolating the Indians. And what about the Indians? There was an earlier legislation. By thousands were deprived of their legitimate professions. They had to live in small streets. Now they are isolated from the centres of trade in Durban, Johannesburg and Cape Town. They are isolated in places like Ryland and Goodwood, and these people are facing starvation and economic misery. I quote what Mr. Fenner Brockway said in the British Parliament about 3,000 Indians who belonged to the Indian States before we became free. In South Africa there are 3,000 Indians from the Princely States of India, and he says about them:

"They were Stateless and suffered many humiliations."

Besides the Group Areas Act, there are two other very nefarious Acts as well. One is the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949. There can be marriage between the White population in South Africa and the non-Whites. The other is the Immorality (Amendment) Act of 1950. There can be no sexual relations

between White or European people in South Africa and the non-Whites. These are nefarious Acts, and the process that was started through this Group Areas Act, the process of *apartheid* or the concept of *apartheid* is complete. That is what has happened there. Now I want to quote John Gunther, what he has said about these two Acts:

"These two Acts embody legislation unparalleled in the world except by the Nuremburg laws of Nazi Germany."

Then let us come to Ceylon. What about Ceylon? During the course of a hundred years people from our country migrated to Ceylon. They worked on the estates of Ceylon, and there was a gentlemen's agreement between the British Government of that island, and the Government of our country, the British Government, that justice would be done to them, and gentlemanly treatment would be meted out to them, but what about us? Since we have become free and since Ceylon has become free, that gentlemen's agreement is broken. At the same time, what about the Indians there? The Indians there are envied and suspected as the Chinese in South East Asia.

When the Prime Minister met Mr. Dudley Senanayaka in 1953 he gave an assurance that he would accept four lakhs of Indians as citizens of that island and 250,000 as permanent residents in that Island. But what about the promise? That promise is evaporating. Now Mr. Bandarnaike comes and says that the problem of nationalisation of the tea estates is interlinked with the problem of citizenship there. That is what he says. I know Mr. Bandarnaike, and it is also a fact that in England there is a belief that Oxford and Cambridge, the twain shall never meet, but here this has been falsified. Mr. Bandarnaike from Oxford and Shri Nehru from Cambridge are very good friends on personal level. That gives me an inspiration to think that this problem will be solved. At the same

[Shri Hem Barua]

time, there is another redeeming feature. It is this, that our relations with Ceylon are not as tempestuous as our relations, or lack of relations, with South Africa. We belong to the same. Commonwealth—Ceylon and India. We are common partners in the Colombo Plan. At the same time we are working as soldiers of peace and for a regenerated Asia. These are the forces there. These are the factors there. Let us hope that this problem is amicably settled, since the two Prime Ministers are fast friends and since they co-operate in so many other things.

It is a fact that the high winds of distrust and discrimination have, because of these factors, not succeeded in ruffling the deep-set surface of our relations, the relations between Ceylon and India.

About Pakistan the less said the better. Pakistan is constructing a dam at Mangla with the assistance of American engineers. While conferences in connection with the Canal Waters dispute are going on in Washington, Pakistan is contracting British and American firms for the construction of this dam, which would affect more than one lakh of people there. At the same time it infringes on our sovereign rights in that part of the country.

In the meanwhile Dr. Graham has come and has submitted a report. I am sorry Dr. Graham was caught in the backwash of history. He has written off not only Dr. Jarring's report, but he has written off his own findings of 1953. That is what he has done. The Prime Minister has said a lot of things on this issue. I do not want to say anything more, except about Sheikh Abdullah.

It is we—and I hold the Prime Minister responsible for that—who made Sheikh Abdullah a virtual dictator in Kashmir. Abdullah was not even a provincial leader, much less a national or international leader. It is the Prime Minister who fed this lamb—

which bit the hand that fed it—and made a growling lion out of a lamb. Now we have to pay for it.

Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed has referred to the apprehended coupe, which has appeared in this morning's papers. When there was the question of dismissal of Sheikh Abdullah, the hon. Prime Minister said in this House that he knew nothing about it. I only wish that when this coupe, which has been made mention of by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed materialises, our Prime Minister will not say on the floor of the House that he knew nothing about it.

Now, Sir, I only plead for one thing in Kashmir: democratic rights. Somehow or other we have a feeling that people there do not enjoy democratic rights, and that is why the people of Kashmir, as those of Sikkim and Bhutan, are alienated from our affections. If it is true, I would only request the Prime Minister to enquire into it.

Then I come to the question of border incidents. There was an adjournment motion in this House and we had a statement from Mrs. Menon. But what has happened about this? During these ten years of our independence, we have not been able to demarcate our boundary. The boundary is 3,400 miles with 280 riverine boundaries. We have not been able to demarcate this. It is because of this that there has been encroachments on the Indo-Pakistan border. In Assam lands are steadily encroached upon from the Pakistan side. Now, it is reported that people are encroaching not only in the plain areas, but also in the hill areas of Khasi-Jaintia hills. That is what is happening on the Indo-Pakistan border. There is shooting; there is looting, and people from across Pakistan border come and reap the harvest on our border and that under the protection of their troops, I read this morning in the newspapers that the officials there, the Government there have lost control of the troops. If

it is a fact, then it is a very sad fact and a miserable fact for our country.

They say that these border incidents have taken place because of the ambiguities of the Radcliffe and Bagge awards. If there are ambiguities in the Radcliffe and Bagge awards, I would request the Prime Minister to see if it would be possible to call a conference of India and Pakistan and evolve some formula, or appoint another Commission for the determination of the boundaries. These incidents cannot be allowed to go on like this eternally, because they bring about loss of life and property on our side of the border.

Now, Sir, there is NEFA about which I wish to say a few words. The Prime Minister has made a reference to NEFA, the Naga Hills and Tuensang area. In Naga Hills—Tuensang Area, peace is not yet completely restored. As our Home Minister said the other day, the hard core of the Naga rebellion is not broken. That is a fact. That is why we find so many raids in the Manipur plains. These raids are undertaken by the Naga hostiles. There have been raids, but at the same time we have extended the amnesty indefinitely. I want to know from the Government if any of the Naga hostile leaders have so far surrendered. Is it not a fact that most of the supplies that we give to the Naga people, go to the Naga hostiles? Is it also not a fact that even a child of ten in the Naga Hills would say he is for freedom and this is only a stop-gap arrangement? If we have to restore peace we have to do certain things. At the same time I want to know from the Prime Minister—it would be cruel if we ask the Home Minister to climb the hills—how many of the Ministers have visited the Naga Hills—Tuensang area after it has been constituted? None so far. I do not know if they are afraid that the Naga hostiles would put a bullet in their chests.

Shri Geray (Poona): They go to Australia and New Zealand, not to Naga Hills!

Shri Hem Barua: About NEFA there is some trouble there. A Selection Board was appointed for the selection of officers to the cadre of Indian Frontier Administrative Service. The Prime Minister made a reference to that this morning. The Board met in 1956. It was constituted under the orders of the President of India. The members who constituted that Selection Board did not attend the meeting of the Board and delegated their powers to junior officers. Men who were not eligible to become officials of this cadre were selected by this illegally constituted Selection Board in 1956. There are cases of corruption also. It was in 1954 that the Governor of Assam brought to the notice of the Government certain cases of corruption in which are involved certain officials as well. That went up to more than four lakhs of rupees. I do not know what is the fate of that case; at what stage that case is. But I know that no action has been taken as yet. That is what has happened there. Things are in a chaotic state. I would, therefore, request the Prime Minister to see that conditions are improved in NEFA, conditions are improved in the Naga Hills, because on the strength and solidarity of our frontier depends the security of this country.

Dr. P. Subbarayan (Tiruchengode): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is really gratifying that on the whole our policy of non-alignment is appreciated by all Members in this House. Not only is it being recognised as a wise policy that has been followed by this country, but I think people outside also, including people in the United States, are beginning to realise that India's influence in the affairs of the world by the policy of non-alignment has really helped the world in many ways, for instance, first in Korea then in Indo-China and again in the Egyptian tangle.

As the Prime Minister said, we must welcome the announcement of the USSR of stopping atomic weapon tests for the present, though there is

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

a further statement in the USSR policy that if the other powers, namely, the United States and the United Kingdom, do not stop such tests, they will be free to resume them. That is where the difficulty really arises. As the Prime Minister explained, the U.S.S.R. have had quite a number of tests during the last three months, and as many as nine during the last month itself, whereas the United States and the United Kingdom have not yet completed their tests which they were planning. Naturally, Mr. Dulles turns round and asks: 'What about that? When we have not completed our tests, you come in and say that you will stop your tests because you have completed them, and you have the material with which to produce further weapons which may be stock-piled.' And the further question was asked, 'What about inspection?'. Fortunately, Mr. Khrushchev has now said that he is prepared for some agreement on inspection. This is really a step in the right direction. At the same time, there ought to be some adjustment between these three great nuclear powers—because no one else possesses either the secret or the method of making these nuclear weapons—by which they could say to themselves that because of inspection and the right kind of inspection, they will be able to trust each other.

What is really needed in international relations today is that trust and the absence of the fear complex. But there is this fear complex which we cannot get rid of. There are the two giants, as the Prime Minister himself said, whose presence at an international meeting is absolutely necessary if any agreement is to become possible, because if either the one or the other is absent, there is always a danger because the other powers do not count as much especially in the matter of manufacture of atomic weapons. What has really happened is that these two big powers have talked at each other through third

persons. Mr. Bertrand Russell writes a letter to Mr. Dulles on the stoppage of nuclear tests. He also writes a letter to the Soviet Government on the stoppage of nuclear tests. And there are replies both from Mr. Dulles and from Mr. Khrushchev. They are really replies to each other from Mr. Dulles to Mr. Khrushchev, but the instrument through which they reply is Mr. Bertrand Russell. I do not think that any problem in this world could be solved by this sort of indirect correspondence, if I might put it that way. It will be much better if these two big giants at least met each other,—which is the idea of the summit conference which has now been mooted—and talked with each other and came to conclusions and began to trust each other. It is really a matter of trust between nations. But what is happening is that there is suspicion all round, and nobody wishes to meet anybody else because of the fear complex, so nothing happens, and the world is therefore in danger of an atomic war.

As far as we are concerned, I think it has been made pretty clear that we are in favour of a summit conference, not that we want to attend it—unless we are wanted—but I believe that our presence may be useful because we have not taken sides. It is always useful to have a person who will be able to intervene and bring peace between two contending parties, and I hope eventually when the summit conference takes place, we shall also have a place at that summit conference, because I feel we have a necessary place at such a summit conference.

There was a lot of talk about Ceylon by my hon. friend Shri Hem Barua. I am more concerned with the problem in Ceylon than Shri Hem Barua can be, because most of the people who went out into the labour plantations are Tamils from South India. There are as many as eight lakhs of them.

Shri Hem Barua: Does my hon. friend want to drive a wedge between south India and east India?

Dr. P. Subbarayan: I am not trying to drive a wedge at all. What I am trying to say is that it is a problem which concerns us most, because it is nearer my home than it is to his. That is all that I am mentioning. There are eight lakhs of labourers today who are really Ceylonese having been born and bred in Ceylon; and for about three years, citizenship applications have been before the Ceylon authorities and have been considered, but hardly ten per cent of them have been accepted as Ceylon nationals. So, really 90 per cent of these eight lakhs are still Stateless, because of the fact that they are not Indian nationals. But, fortunately, for us, there is a Prime Minister today in Ceylon who, I think, understands the problem better than most people did. For instance, his gesture with regard to the Provident Fund Act in Ceylon by which he included all labour working in plantations for such purposes, in spite of opposition from some of the prominent members of his own party, shows that he at least feels that this is a problem which has to be solved, and I think this is an opportune time for a conference to take place at the highest level between India and Ceylon. This problem is capable of solution and should be solved. We do not want to apply any coercive methods to Ceylon in this matter, but at the same time we could point out the situation in which these eight lakhs of people are placed.

No doubt, the language trouble comes in, as is usually the case, in most places. If these eight lakhs are accepted as citizens, the Tamil population of Ceylon goes up, and naturally, there is a slight fear. I can assure the Ceylon Government that this is not going to complicate their situation, because these labour people who are settled in Ceylon and who are really Ceylonese citizens are not

really concerned with any language problem; they are concerned naturally, if I may put it crudely, with bread and butter. If they are all to be evacuated and they are to become Stateless, their position would obviously become difficult. Therefore, some urgent solution has got to be found. It is not that we want to interfere with the internal policy of any independent Government, but at the same time, we owe a certain duty to these people who went from our shores and who have since settled in Ceylon.

I hope, therefore, that a high level conference will soon be held, and some solution will be found for this tangled problem, which has existed, not today, but for nearly a quarter of a century.

The same thing has happened in South Africa. There again, I hope Shri Hem Barua will not object to this that the South Indian population is concerned, because most of the indentured labour that went to Natal in the old days were from the south. It may be that because our economic conditions are bad, or because we have not got enough to live on in our own part of the country, we have a tendency of emigration and so we emigrate when we find an opportunity to emigrate.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (West Dinajpur): Or because the south is more adventurous.

Dr. P. Subbarayan: I am also prepared to take the compliment that the south is more adventurous, because in the old days, we did go as far as Bali, Indonesia and Indo-China where you see signs of South Indian architecture.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: In that matter, Bengal has also a claim.

Shri Narayanankntty Menon (Mukandapuram): In the prehistoric days.

Dr. F. Sahasrayan: I do not claim anything because of these monuments that exist because of our emigration to these parts. What I claim is that the people who have gone to South Africa and who are South African nationals today should be treated on a par with other nationals, especially when they made the country what it is today. The sugar plantations in Natal were really the creation of the indentured labour that went to South Africa at the time. Therefore, at least they should be treated as people who brought about better economic conditions, who made the country better, and therefore, should have the rights of citizenship. That is all I claim.

This is the problem of the Indians overseas which I know gets the attention of the External Affairs Ministry. But what I do feel is that something has got to be done. We cannot go on facing this problem and thinking that nothing can be done. Short of war, we should do whatever lies in our power to make the position of the people overseas better than it is today. I hope some steps will be taken at least with regard to Ceylon because I think the problem is ripe for solution and could be solved without delay.

श्री कौरटकर (हैदराबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सन् १९५७-५८ का साल हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय की सफलता के सम्बन्ध में स्वर्णक्षरों में लिखने लायक रहेगा। पिछले दस सालों से हम ने एक स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति का अनुसरण किया था और हम उस के अन्तर्गत चल रहे थे। इस के लिये देश में और विदेशों में बहुत बार हम को कई प्रकार की झालोचनायें सुननी पड़ीं। लेकिन हमारा देश इस पर स्थिर रहा और सन् १९५७-५८ का वह साल है जिस में हमारी इस नीति की सफलतायें हम को नजर आ रही हैं।

सब से पहले तो मैं इस तरफ ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस के पूर्व दुनियाँ के जो दो ब्लाक्स हैं उन में से किसी में भी हमारे बारे में बहुत भरोसा नहीं था। रूस का ब्लाक हर वक्त यह समझता था कि भारत कामनवेल्थ में सम्मिलित है और उस के साथ ही साथ वह अपने को डिमान्-क्रेटिक देश कहता है, इस वजह से जब कभी चीका आयेगा तब वह उस डिमान्क्रेसी के साथ ही मिलेगा और वह जो स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति जाहिर कर रहा है, वह उस का एक इकोसला है। इसी तरह से अमरीका में इस बात की भावना थी कि हिन्दुस्तान के उत्तर की तरफ एक बहुत बड़ा कम्युनिस्ट मुल्क बनी खड़ा है जिस के दबाव में हर वक्त हिन्दुस्तान रहेगा और उस को भी हमारी स्वतंत्र विदेश नीति एक प्रकार का इकोसला जालूम हो रही थी। परन्तु दुनियाँ में घटना के बाद घटना होती गई। कोरिया का वाकया हुआ, इन्डो चाइना के वाकयात हुए, इसी से इजिप्ट का बहुत बड़ा कांड हुआ। हंगरी में बहुत सी और बातें हुईं। उन सारी घटनाओं में यह नजर आया कि भारत बिल्कुल सीधी तरह से खड़ा रहा, न इधर झुका न उधर झुका। इस का स्पष्ट यह नतीजा हुआ कि आखिर उन मुल्कों को, इन दो ब्लाक्स को, एक प्रकार से भरोसा होने लगा कि जो पालिसी हिन्दुस्तान ने अख्यार की है वह बिल्कुल निष्पक्ष है और उसी के कारण जो हमारी सन् १९५६-६१ की पंचवर्षीय योजना बनाई गई थी, जिस के लिये हमें बहुत तशवीश थी, उस के लिये चारों तरफ से, दोनों ब्लाक्स की तरफ से और जो दोनों ब्लाक्स के साथी हैं, उन की तरफ से, मुक्त हस्त से हम को मदद मिला है। यह एक ही चीज जो हुई है, मेरी राय में वह हमारी विदेश नीति की बड़ी भारी विजय है और उस के लिये मैं विदेश मंत्रालय को तहे दिल से धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

इस के साथ ही साथ जो हास ही की घटना हुई है, वह भी एक प्रकार के हमारी

विदेश नीति की विषय है। हाल में ही, जैसाकि बहुत से वक्ताओं ने जाहिर किया है, रूस ने एक तरफा तौर पर इस बात की घोषणा कर दी है कि वह एटैमिक टेस्ट बन्द करने के लिये तैयार है। इस के लिये दुनिया में सब से पहले भारतवर्ष में ही हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने आवाज उठाई थी। उस आवाज के उत्तर में, एक तरफा ही क्यों न हो, भ्रगर किसी देश ने यह घोषणा की है तो इस के लिये हम को उस देश को बन्धुवाद देना चाहिये। यह चीज हमारे ऊपर एकाएक आ कर पड़ी है। हम ने आवाज उठाई थी और उस आवाज का एक ने उत्तर दिया है। ऐसी सूरत में मेरी यह राय है कि हम को उस का अनुमोदन सामुहिक करना चाहिये, इस से हम बच नहीं सकते हैं।

वैसे मेरी यह भी राय है कि अब रूस या कम्युनिज्म वह रूस या कम्युनिज्म नहीं रहे हैं जोकि स्टैलिन के जमाने में थे। इन पिछले चार पांच सत्रों में कम्युनिज्म और रूस बहुत कुछ दूसरी तरफ झुक चुके हैं। पूर्व और पश्चिम के बीच जो बड़ी भारी लोहे की दीवार खड़ी थी, वह इस वक्त टूट चुकी है। साथ ही मुझे इस बात के कहने में भी बहुत प्रसन्नता है कि इस दीवार के तोड़ने में बहुत बड़ा हाथ हमारे देश का भी रहा है। कुछ वर्ष पूर्व जबकि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री रूस की यात्रा पर गये थे उसी के बाद से और खास कर जबकि बुल्गानिन और कुशेव हिन्दुस्तान की यात्रा पर भाये थे, उस के बाद से पूर्व और पश्चिम के बीच बहुत सी आपसी बात चीतें वगैरह हो ही रही हैं। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि जिस आवाज को हम ने उठाया था, जिस लोहे की दीवार को गिराने के लिये हम ने बहुत बड़ा काम किया था, उस के जवाब में जब एक देश ने यह कहा है कि हम एटैमिक टेस्ट बन्द करने के लिये तैयार हैं तो इस बात को भागे बढ़ाने का उत्तरदायित्व, हम चाहें या न चाहें, हमारे कंधों पर पड़

गया है। हम को उसे पूरा करना होगा। आज भ्रगर भ्रमरीका में रूस के बारे में किसी तरह के सन्देह हैं कि अभी जो यह एलान किया गया है वह खाली दिखावादी है, और यह सन्देह सच है तो हम को दूसरा प्रयत्न कर के रूस से यह बात करवानी होगी कि उन सन्देहों को दूर किया जाय और भ्रगर वे सच नहीं हैं तो हम को बीच में पड़ कर भ्रमरीका को भी यह विश्वास दिलाना होगा कि उस का हाथ भागे बढ़ना चाहिये, और भ्रगर सन्देह है तो थोड़ी देर के लिये हमें उन सन्देहों को भ्रपने दिल में ही रख कर भागे बढ़ना चाहिये, उन को प्रकट करने की कोशिश न करनी चाहिये। लेकिन सन्देह हैं इसलिये भागे बातचीत नहीं हो सकती ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। मैं फिर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि न चाहे हुये हो क्यों न हों क्योंकि इस आवाज को हमने सबसे पहले उठाया था और अब यह आवाज दुनिया में गूँजने लगी है हमारे देश के ऊपर यह उत्तरदायित्व है कि वह किसी न किसी तरह इसे सफल उद्देश्य तक पहुँचा दे और इसके लिये अब हमको कुछ न कुछ प्रयत्न जरूर करना चाहिये। खाली बैठने से काम नहीं चलेगा। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को इसमें भागे इनीशिएटिव लेना चाहिये इस चीज को भागे बढ़ाना चाहिये। भ्रगर हो सके तो मैं तो यहाँ तक कहने को तैयार हूँ कि समिट कांफेंस जो बुलाई जा रही है और जो डांबा-डोल हो रही है उसके लिये हमारी गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से यह दावत दे दी जाय कि दिल्ली की यह जगह समिट कांफेंस के लिये हम तैयार करते हैं और यहाँ पर समिट कांफेंस बुला कर कार्रवाई की जाय।

तोसरो चीज यह कि यहाँ यह बात कही गई कि काश्मीर केस को सिबयोरेटो कौंसिल से निकाल दिया जाय। इसके बारे में मेरा कहना इतना ही है कि यह साल इस बात के लिये भी हमारी विदेश नीति की विषय का रहा है। इस साल जैसा कि प्राइम

[श्री कोरटकर]

मिनिस्टर साहब ने अभी आपके सामने रक्सा, ग्राहम रिपोर्ट घायी हुई थीर उसमें इस बात को भी मान लिया गया है कि पाकिस्तान की चीजें जो काश्मीर में हैं वे वहां से हटा ली जायें।

15 hrs.

मलबता एक शर्त है कि यू० एन० थो० को चीजें पाकिस्तान में रक्सी जायें यह बिलकुल एक भ्रमण चीज है। एक के बाद दूसरे प्रतिनिधि आते रहे और हर प्रतिनिधि अपनी अपनी राय देता रहा लेकिन इस दस साल की हिस्ट्री और इतिहास को देखें तो आपको यह नजर आयेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान हर कदम पर अपना कुछ न कुछ उद्देश्य पूरा ही करता गया है। इन दस सालों में देश को भी कि मजबूरी थीर पर ऐसा नजर आता रहा कि रिपोर्ट हमारे विरुद्ध होती रही है लेकिन ताहम हम देखेंगे कि एक न एक प्वाइंट उसमें हम जीतते गये हैं जिससे कि अब हमारा केस बहुत अच्छे तरीके से सारे संसार के सामने आ रहा है। अभी अभी जैसे कि एक भ्रमणवार को कटिंग यहां हाउस के सामने पढ़ कर सुनाई गई उससे यह साफ़ बाहिर हो रहा है कि पाकिस्तान खुद अपने दोस्तों के सामने एक्सपोज़ हो रहा है और दोस्त भी उसके सामने एक्सपोज़ हो रहे हैं और मुझे इस बात की पूरी उम्मीद है कि एक दिन ऐसा आयेगा कि पाकिस्तान की सीडरशिप अपने ही देश के लोगों के सामने एक्सपोज़ होगी और यह मसला बहुत अच्छे तरीके से तसक्रिया पाता चला जायेगा। यह तीन चार चीजें खास कर विदेश नीति के बारे में मैंने यहां पर कही।

अब दो तीन छोटी छोटी चीजों की सरकार में हाउस का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ और सरकार का भी ध्यान आकषित करना चाहता हूँ। वैदेशिक मंत्रालय सम्बन्धी विवरण के पढ़ने से मुझे मामूम हुआ कि

यह सचिवालय चार सेक्रेटरीज में बंटा हुआ है। इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ निवेदन करने से पहले मैं सचिवालय को इस बात के विषे धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने सिर्फ़ इसी सचिवालय की रिपोर्ट में यह चीज देखी कि खर्च को कमी की जाने की भी कोशिश की गई है और उस सम्बन्ध में इसमें विस्तार-पूर्वक बताया गया है। उस खर्च में कमी करने की दिशा में मैं एक सुझाव यह रखना चाहता हूँ कि चौथा सेक्रेटरी जो स्पेशल सेक्रेटरी के थीर पर रक्सा गया है और जो सिर्फ़ एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन और स्टाफ़ की बातों को देखता है उसको भगर हटा दिया जाय और उसका काम भगर सेक्रेटरी जनरल जो कि फस्ट सेक्रेटरी है उसको वह काम भी दे दिया जाय तो कोई बहुत बड़ा नुकसान नहीं होने वाला है।

दूसरी चीज जो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ वह नागा हिल्स और दुएनसांग प्रदेश के बारे में है। मेरी यह समझ में नहीं आया कि नागा हिल्स और दुएनसांग यह दोनों प्रदेश विदेश मंत्रालय के तहत कैसे आ सकते हैं। बाखिर यह हमारे प्रदेश ही तो हैं कोई विदेश तो हैं नहीं। यहां किमी तरह का विद्रोह ज़रूर है और इन प्रदेशों में विद्रोही ज़रूर हैं लेकिन वे हमारे प्रदेश हैं और यह दोनों प्रान्त विदेश मंत्रालय के तहत न रक्से जा कर भगर गृह मंत्रालय के तहत कर दिये जायें तो सही चीज होगी। पुराने जमाने में यह फ्रंटियर प्राविसेज ज़रूर विदेश मंत्रालय के तहत रहा करते थे। उनको अब होम मिनिस्ट्री के अधीन कर दिया जाय तो सही चीज होगी।

तीसरी एक छोटी सी बात कह कर मैं अपना कथन पूर्ण करूंगा और वह यह है कि आउकल का जमाना प्रोपेनेंडा का जमाना है। कोई भी मनुष्य जब तक कि वह अपने बारे में भी प्रोपेनेंडा न करे और दूसरे के सिधे भी प्रोपेनेंडा न करे अर्थात् मैं यह करता हूँ

धीरे से वह करता हूँ या मेरा केश ऐसा है वह तरह न बोलता कि रे तब तक उसे इस बुनिया में प्रागे बढ़ने का बहुत कम मौका मिलता है। एक्सटरनल पब्लिसिटी और प्रोपेगेंडा के लिये दूसरे देश बहुत काफ़ी खर्च करते हैं। हाउस के मेम्बरों के सामने रूस और अमरीका का जो लिटरेचर घाता है उससे वे झण्डी तरह से झन्दाबा लगा सकते हैं कि दूसरे देश एक्सटरनल पब्लिसिटी पर और प्रोपेगेंडा पर कितना अधिक खर्च करते हैं। इतना ही नहीं छोटे छोटे देश जैसे इजरायल वगैरह भी प्रोपेगेंडा के लिये बहुत अधिक खर्चा खर्च करते हैं। मेरा खयाल है कि हमारे देश ने इस दिशा में बहुत कम काम किया है। विवरण में बतलाया गया है कि ६१ लाख रुपये खर्च हुआ है लेकिन उसके लिये मेरा कहना है कि जो चीजें प्रोपेगेंडा के लिये विदेशों में भेजी जाती हैं और जिस तादाद में भेजी जाती हैं वह बहुत ही कम और नाकाफी हैं। "योजना" "कृषेत्र" और "भाजकल" यह जो हमारे पीरियाडिकल्स हैं वे ऐसे नहीं हैं कि जिनकी वजह से हम विदेशों में कोई ज्यादा प्रचार कर सकें। मेरा सचिवालय के सामने यह प्रस्ताव है कि ज्ञास कर इस जमाने में गोवा और काश्मीर के बारे में बहुत ज्यादा लिटरेचर छपना चाहिये बहुत सी जवातों में छपना चाहिये और लाखों की तादाद में यह लिटरेचर बाहर बंटवाना चाहिये। यह तीन चार चीजें हाउस और मन्त्रालय के सामने विचार के लिये रख कर मैं प्रपना बंधन समाप्त करता हूँ।

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this morning the Prime Minister spoke on the broad problems of our foreign policy and it is my purpose this afternoon to deal with certain specific matters that have been raised in the House by hon. Members opposite and on our side also.

Firstly, there has been, sometimes, a feeling in this House that our exter-

nal publicity is not quite up to the mark. It has been said that we have failed in many ways to convince the people living in the far-flung areas of the world about the justice of our case in Kashmir and in Goa. It has also been said that we do not use effective methods to publicise our viewpoint. All this is, perhaps, true and we welcome criticism, especially criticism of a constructive kind. But, in all humility, I should like to point out to hon. Members that the problem of foreign publicity is technical in one sense, because you have to tackle people living in areas which differ from us and which are conditioned differently and you have to approach them in a constructive and unobtrusive manner. In order to do this, you have to make some distinction between what is known as political publicity and what is called long-term publicity.

Political publicity may, on occasions, owing to various causes, fall for the moment. But there is the continuous work of constructive propaganda which is ever flowing and which yields results. We have been for the last 9 years functioning in the matter of publicity abroad and in spite of many disadvantages, I submit, we have achieved our aim to a great extent. If you consider that during the 9 years the activities of this Government abroad—our foreign policy—have extended over vast areas, and not only that, our obligations have also increased and our part in the United Nations and elsewhere has been greatly appreciated, then, in this light, if you look at the publicity work, you will be able to assess it better.

At present we have 41 Information Posts abroad and with the exception of London, Washington, Djakarta and Cairo, the vast majority of these posts are manned by one man and he is, naturally, over-burdened with work. The task of these Publicity Officers is really stupendous. They have to counter the propaganda which had been for the past several years

[Shri Sadath Ali Khan]

perpetrated by a foreign government giving erroneous and wrong impressions about this country and about our way of life. People's minds have to be disabused and, naturally, this process takes time. Besides the day to day propaganda, you have to deal with specific problems like Kashmir and Goa.

In such cases, it happens sometimes that people are not really interested in specific issues. They imagine India to be a great country of Gautama Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi; and they sometimes imagine that Kashmir and Goa are after all territorial issues and not so important. Therefore, if I may say so, to re-educate and inform the public opinion in these countries, one has to explain the entire background of our own struggle against a foreign power and in fact the struggle of the Asian people against colonialism. It is a serious task. Keeping all this in mind, I think that our publicity work has on the whole been extremely successful. In West Germany and in Thailand, for instance, our publicity officers have been able to inform the public opinion usefully to a large extent. I may add that in the USA our information officers have been concentrating on long term and positive aspects of our publicity. For instance, the maximum publicity has been given to the two Five Year Plans and to the general elections which were held in this country twice. Stress on these matters is of greater importance than any kind of violent, harsh and sledgehammer propaganda which may pay some dividend at the moment but which in the long run is utterly useless.

It is also not correct to say that India's publicity set up had failed to convince the foreigners of the justice of our stand in Kashmir and Goa. In fact during the last year, there has been a change in our favour as far as these two issues were concerned. There is a marked decrease in hostility in these matters. The House

will recall that in January 1957, the United Press published a faked photograph in an American paper showing some refugees fleeing from Kashmir. Such publicity had its effect probably but when we countered this and when we told the truth, our voice was heard with respect. Since then the editors of various papers thought twice before they paid heed to Pakistani propaganda and publicity.

India's external publicity on Kashmir issue has the following objectives before it. It is our policy to pinpoint the fact that Pakistan had committed aggression in Kashmir and has so far failed to vacate that aggression. We expose the propaganda of Pakistan which emanates from very highly placed persons, even the Prime Minister of that country. Because the Prime Ministers change so often, I cannot mention names. I know for instance, that Mr. Noon has been guilty of exaggerations hardly worthy of a Prime Minister. Then we draw the attention of the people to the statements made by leaders in Pakistan to conclusively prove that Pakistan's persistence in military pacts is mainly directed against this country. The House knows that very openly, in every speech they say that they are buying arms because they are afraid of this country for some reason. All these facts are publicised. An idea of our attitude towards Pakistan can be had from our publicity in this respect. Lastly, it is not our policy to indulge in any violent and high pressure propaganda. What we have done so far is an endeavour to follow a consistent and continuous policy of explaining the justness of our attitude.

Next, I would like to say a few words about Pondicherry. My friend, Mr. Mukerjee referred to the delay in the *de jure* transfer of this French territory this morning. The House knows that we have been making sustained efforts in trying to persuade the French Government to ratify this

Treaty but owing to various preoccupations of the French Government at home, they have not been able to carry this through. However, we hope that this will be done soon. The treaty marks a successful end of the friendly negotiations and therefore, it is a matter of great regret to us that the final ratification had been delayed.

Mr. Mukerjee also referred to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in that area. It appears that the extension of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has not taken place because the *de jure* transfer has not been given effect to. We are waiting for the ratification of this treaty. At present the conseil d'état looks after the work. Under the terms of the *de facto* transfer, the French laws and orders which were in existence prior to the transfer are, generally speaking, applied in Pondicherry. For the purpose of administrative convenience, however, a few laws have been extended to the State under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act of 1947. This situation creates certain difficulties but we hope that the early ratification of the treaty will provide a solution to all these problems.

With regard to Nager Haveli and Dadra, the people there had liberated themselves some years ago. The matter is under the constant review of Government. We want to see an early amalgamation of these territories. Then there was a cut motion about the status of Indian political prisoners. Out of 41 Indian political prisoners in Goa in January 1957, 35 had been released on the basis of a general amnesty. Six, including Mrs. Joshi, are not considered Indian nationals. Their cases are pending. Mr. Khalil of the Egyptian Embassy had visited Goa and had a talk with the Governor and he was told that once their nationality was established, their cases would again be reviewed. Even if they are Indian nationals and if they have committed any breach of law, they will be punished but then they would be regarded as Indian

nationals. The whole matter is pending and I believe there would be a tribunal set up in Portugal to review these cases.

Shri Khadlikar (Ahmednagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, while endorsing in general terms the present direction of our External Affairs Ministry, I would like to submit some aspects of it for a critical review because in my opinion there is a certain sense of unreality regarding the present world situation. If I were to borrow the historical perspective presented by the world historian, Mr. Arnold Toynbee. I would put it, broadly speaking, that there is a world encounter. On the one side, the world after the Second War has emerged anew and freed itself from the old imperialist yoke. On the other side, there are the western imperialist powers. Of course when we look at this scene, in a broad sense, the spiritual initiative is with us. In a way, in the course of events, the world communist leadership has helped this course of liberation in the world that was dominated by the imperialist powers. But, at the same time, in this world encounter the position is that this world is not yet consolidated, and we naturally fear that if there is a conflagration we will lose whatever we have gained, or our chances of reconstruction and consolidation would be more or less postponed. Therefore, very naturally, the world scene today as we see it affects us.

In the western world we see that the two "Potent-Sirs", who were addressed by the great philosopher Bertrand Russel, are talking to each other from a distance. And, as a result, perhaps, of his letter or of world opinion we have heard that unilaterally the atom tests have been abandoned by Soviet Russia, and there is a further offer, as suggested by George Kennan in his lectures, of withdrawal of Soviet forces from the eastern region. So it gives a picture that something is coming, and it may bring greater pressure on American opinion to act in the same line, to follow the Soviet Union. By this act,

[Shri Khadilkar]

naturally, the Soviet Union has gained great moral prestige in the world. That we must admit. But, as George Kennan has pointed out, there is a real danger of accidental war. While we talk of cessation of tests, we should not forget the real danger of accidental war in this world. And, what the danger is I shall just point out.

For instance, when the Suez affair flared up, as you all know, the American Command SAC, as it is known—what they call, Strategic Airforce Command—having 3,000 bombers and air tankers was being alerted. Apart from the other aspects of the preparation, these things are kept in a semi-mobilised condition on the one side, as well as on the Soviet Russian side in a different way.

There is another danger—as I read in the Press—and that is the possibility of underground tests. It is a real possibility. Today, underground tests are taking place, and hydrogen weapons are developed in such a way that they can be delivered on ordinary bombers. Therefore, we should not just take the view—that would be a very unrealistic view, a very superficial view—that at the top one party has stopped tests unilaterally, the other party is likely to stop it and Britain cannot sustain for long its position in the subordinate role that she is playing today in a demoralised condition of local opinion on this issue.

At the same time, in this correspondence that took place we find that the main question has been that no party, whether they meet at the summit or not, is prepared to see the balance of advantage, the military balance of advantage gained by one party or the other being altered in any way. That is the real position so far as international situation is concerned.

Therefore, as a corollary of this, there is another attempt. A new world has emerged and stood up. In that new world where the nationalist

forces are trying to consolidate and reconstruct there is an attempt to disrupt. What do we find in Indonesia? Indonesia is a pointer. What do we find in Pakistan regarding the military aid to Pakistan? That is also a pointer. There is an attempt in Indonesia,—I do not want to apportion blame between this power bloc or that power bloc; but the situation is there, the reality is there—in that newly freed country, to foment civil war on a big scale.

Therefore, I would first suggest it is proper that we concentrate on demanding ban of nuclear weapons in the larger interests. But, at the same time, as we Indians supplied in some measure the leadership to the Asiatic people in their struggle for freedom—after we became free and during the course of the struggle—we should demand of the big powers “hands off all these Asiatic nations who are now engaged in social reconstruction of their country”. Unless we do this, this is the real danger which is going to hit us. Unless we achieve some results on this plane I am afraid, whatever is being done, whatever moral pressure we exert, it is very difficult to measure that moral pressure and its effect. We can function, perhaps, as we did in the past, as an “International Fire Brigade”. If there is an alarm our foreign emissary, Shri Krishna Menon, would go with a fire-fighting machinery and try to see that it does not spread. This sort of thing we shall do and take comfort on our foreign affairs and say that so far as our freedom is concerned there is no danger. But I am afraid, as I said, this is an illusion.

In order to consolidate our position after freedom, we must look to the Indian Ocean. As I said last year, we have never considered our defence problem in our own way. In the technical field we are backward, I do recognise that. But have we as an Indian Ocean nation, where formerly a certain colonial system was established, where there was a colonial

system of defence, colonial system of economic institution and exploitation which has disappeared and a certain vacuum has been created, tried to find out how we are going to fill the vacuum that has been created? That is the question. If we blur that vision before us, I think that we are not capable of playing the historical role that is assigned to us in the present day world affairs.

Therefore, I submit that an attempt should be made to integrate the nations on the Indian Ocean. Take Ceylon, take Malaya, take Burma, take Indonesia. For the time being, as it is said, Pakistan is not willing to join, but our approach to Pakistan also needs a little change. Our approach is a bit ambivalent, to put it very mildly. Let me say this. On the one side we harbour a certain amount of bitterness. We feel that our country is divided because of these people. At the same time, we are unhappy that our neighbour is not in a condition where we can sleep in peace. After all, if your neighbour is mentally a little violent you cannot enjoy peace; that is the experience in common life. Therefore, I would suggest, let us try to isolate the points of conflict and try to establish a certain amount of good friendly relations on other matters. That is very essential. If we try to isolate these issues, one issue is very big and that is Kashmir, and another issue is canal waters. Try to understand the democratic forces in Pakistan. Who had imagined—none here, none of the world statesmen or diplomats ever imagined—that Syria and Egypt would join hands and a new united Arab Republic would be formed? Certain forces which are beyond the ken are working and similar forces are also working in a democratic way, in Pakistan. They suppress them because of the American aid; they suppress for Pakistan has become blind because of hatred towards India. These forces cannot remain suppressed for very long. Therefore, we should approach Pakistan; we should approach the citizens of Pakistan in the right spirit and I am confident that

Pakistan cannot remain in an isolated way. Whether in the SEATO or in the Baghdad Pact, in the final analysis, their judgment has to be surrendered to the judgment of the military commanders of foreign powers. This position cannot last for very long. At the same time, I would like to say a word regarding Kashmir. We are talking about Kashmir in international aspects of it. After the Jarring Report, when it is clearly stated that the situation has changed, completely altered, in the new context the old solutions have no meaning. We cannot revert back. That is the position. But our approach to the internal situation also needs a little change. We have seen in this House, when a Minister is removed from office and he has got to sit not in the office but just somewhere near, how he loses his temper. So, when we have seen this,—these are daily experiences here in this House—if Sheikh Abdullah loses his temper, we must try to understand him. Instead of understanding him, we try to apportion blame. If we do that I think we will complicate matters, both for international solution as well as internal solution. Therefore, my suggestion is this. Let a small representative delegation of this House go to Kashmir and without apportioning blame try to consolidate the forces which are really nationalist, and those who have no treacherous intentions and who are prepared to work in a co-operative spirit, and take stock of the situation in a realistic manner and find out how to stabilise the situation. No part of the country can remain for long in a state of emergency. This is a wrong approach, and apportioning blame and trying to stamp one of our countryman or another in a particular way is not going to bring solution nearer so far as Kashmir issue is concerned.

Regarding Indonesia also, we must take an objective view. What has happened in Indonesia? Two issues are very important. One is Dr. Soekarno very rightly insists that in a new, developing backward country, there should be a national Govern-

[Shri Khadilkar]

ment and on that issue a certain party broke away from the Government. How the issue started, we must understand it. There is another thing in this newly-won freedom. The nations that have emerged just now have among them forces working for cohesion and reconstruction and also forces working for a certain amount of regional autonomy. That aspect also has come in the way. I wish that our Ministers take stock of the situation in our country and see the writing on the wall and try to settle issues inside with a broad vision, taking lessons from what has happened or happening in Indonesia.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to make a few observations on minor points. The question of publicity was raised and one of the Ministers just now in a formal way replied. I do not think that questions of publicity can be tackled in this way. I would like to know what are the international news agencies which dole out news to our newspapers. Unless we have our sources of news in different countries, a parallel news agency from which we get a real picture of world events, whatever we get through Reuters or from the American Press or from the French Press and news agencies will not be real. Therefore, our external publicity problem cannot be solved in this narrow manner nor our Indian people, our countrymen, would be kept properly informed in an objective way unless we have got our own sources of information. Today, our Government perhaps partly and the press are almost entirely dependent on news sources which are tainted, which are biased. Particularly some diversion or colouring is made at the very source on which we are dependent and we form the so-called objective judgments about the world situation on such news. This is the position.

Regarding Goa, there is a mention of a pious wish that soon it will be solved. Let us hope it will be solved, but are we to sit with hands folded?

Have we come anything in that direction? Have we approached the people there in some way and created stronger forces within, so that ultimately they will be enthused and that at the hour of trial they will rise and they will have their freedom? We are doing nothing of the sort. This pious expression so far as I feel it, has very little meaning. Therefore, in conclusion, I would say only one word. When we see the world as it is, on the one side, there is an impending recession and if it engulfs it will have worldwide repercussions. On the other side, there is a race for outer space going on between two big powers. The third thing, as I said, is the possibility of accidental break of war, as Kennan has pointed out. When these things are kept before the mind, I would urge that our country, our defence, and our future reconstruction plans must be consolidated, as I indicated at the beginning, by building up a sort of relationship, a closer integration with the nations roundabout the Indian Ocean. That is a necessity. With these words, I close.

सेठ गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह सभी जानते हैं कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का मैं शुरू से ही सब से बड़ा समर्थक रहा हूँ ।

जो अनुदान हमारे सामने भरी रखे गये, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बताया कि उनमें से आधे अनुदान तो ऐसे हैं कि जो यथार्थ में हमें अपने पड़ोस में खर्च कर देना पड़ते हैं। शेष रकम के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने यहां कुछ बातें कहीं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत छोटी बात है, और मुझे तो कुछ ताज्जुब हुआ है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को इस छोटे से खर्च के लिये अपने भाषण में इतना अधिक कहना पड़ा ।

मैं ने दुनिया के करीब करीब सब देशों को देखा है। मैंने देखा है कि हमारे दूतावासों में कितना कम खर्च होता है, और

दूसरे जो दूतावास हैं, हमारे पड़ोसी राज्य पाकिस्तान तक के जो दूतावास हैं, उनमें से भी धनैक में हमसे कितना ज्यादा खर्च होता है। तो जैसी इस समय दुनिया की स्थिति है उसमें अगर हम वैदेशिक विभागों पर इतना खर्च करते हैं मेरा तो यह मत है कि वह खर्च बहुत कम है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि कहीं पर भी रुपया किंग्डम खर्च नहीं हो रहा है, थोड़ा बहुत होता होगा, लेकिन उस थोड़े बहुत खर्च पर हम अगर गिद्ध दृष्टि लगाये बैठे रहें और हमेशा इन छोटी छोटी बातों को देखा करें तो फिर समय तो उतना ही होता है, उसमें चाहे बड़ी बातें सोची जायें चाहे छोटी बातें सोची जायें। इतिहास का भी, एक छोटा सा साहित्यिक होने के कारण, मेरा थोड़ा सा अध्ययन रहा है। और मैं इस बात को मुक्त कंठ से कहना चाहता हूँ कि सम्राट अशोक के बाद हमारे देश का इतना बड़ा व्यापक स्थान इतिहास में इन बाइस नेहरू मी वर्षों में कभी नहीं रहा कि जैसा हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नेहरू के नेतृत्व में रहा है। जैसा कि मैंने अभी निवेदन किया, इस खर्च के मामले को मैं बहुत छोटी चीज समझता हूँ और इसे थोड़ा वैदेशिक नीति के सम्बन्ध में जरा ऊंचे स्तर पर विचार करना चाहना हूँ।

दुनिया इन यातायात के शीघ्रगामी साधनों के कारण बहुत छोटी हो गई है और इस छोटी सी दुनिया के नाश के लिये बड़े बड़े आयोजन हो रहे हैं। जितने बड़े आयोजन इस छोटी सी दुनिया के नाश के लिये इस समय हो रहे हैं, वे इतिहास में अमूल्यपूर्वक हैं। इस के पहले शायद नाश का इतना बड़ा आयोजन कभी भी नहीं हुआ कि जितना इस समय हो रहा है और इस नाश के आयोजन के कारण दुनिया भावी युद्ध के भय से बरबरा रही है। मैंने इस भय को भी अपनी धनैक वैदेशिक यात्राओं में देखा है। इस युद्ध का जिस तरह का भय दूसरे

देशों में है उस का सबलेश मात्र हम को अपने देश में नहीं दिखाई देता। हमारे यहां के वायु-मंडल में और अन्य देशों के वायु-मंडल में आकाश पाताल का अन्तर है। तमाम दुनिया दो टुकड़ों में विभक्त हो गई है—एक का नजुल रूस करता है और दूसरे का नजुल अमरीका करता है। इतनी घोर घृणा है इन दोनों टुकड़ों को एक दूसरे से कि उस घृणा की हम यहां कल्पना नहीं कर सकते अगर इतने पर भी युद्ध नहीं होता है, तो इस का यह कारण नहीं है कि शान्ति की किसी को उपासना है, परन्तु इस का प्रधान कारण यह है कि इन दोनों टुकड़ों में से एक टुकड़े को भी यह विश्वास नहीं है कि उस की जीत हो जायगी। यदि यह विश्वास किसी एक टुकड़े को हो जाय, तो युद्ध पलों में हो सकता है। इस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति में केवल हमारा देश एसा है—महत्वपूर्ण देश, में कहना चाहता हूँ, छोटे मोटे देश और भी होंगे, परन्तु महत्वपूर्ण देश की दृष्टि में केवल हमारा देश एसा है कि जो शान्ति का उपासक है। अब तक कभी हम को अमरीका शलत समझना रहा, कभी हम को रूस शलत समझना रहा, परन्तु सत्य की सदा विजय होती है। "सत्यमेव जयते" हमारा आदर्श-वाक्य ही है। अब दुनिया के सब देश इस बात को मानने लगे हैं कि भारतवर्ष सच्चमुच में शान्ति का उपासक है। हमारी यह उपासना कोई नहीं है। महात्मा गांधी का अहिंसावाद और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की वैदेशिक नीति हमारी सांस्कृतिक परम्परा से हम को प्राप्त हुई है। संसार की सब से पुरानी पुस्तक ऋग्वेद में एक सूत्र है "सर्वे खलु विद्मः ब्रह्मम्", अर्थात् सब कुछ ब्रह्म है। उस के बाद अन्य कुछ सूत्र हैं "सर्वं ब्रह्मास्मि"—मैं ब्रह्म हूँ, "तत्त्वमसि"—तू ब्रह्म है, और उसके बाद कहा गया है "वसुदेव कुटुम्बकम्"। तो यदि मैं बही हूँ, उपास्यक जी, जो आप हैं और आप बही हैं, जो मैं

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

है, और तमाम दुनिया वही है, जो मैं और आप हैं, तो फिर बैर-भाव, घृणा, कलह, प्रशान्ति, युद्ध, इन का कौन सा स्थान इस दुनिया में हो सकता है? जैसा कि मैं ने आप से कहा, महात्मा गांधी का वर्तमान अहिंसावाद, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की वर्तमान वैदेशिक नीति हमारी सांस्कृतिक परम्परा से हम को प्राप्त हुई है। इस में हमें सफलता भी मिली है। कोरिया का युद्ध हमारे सामने है, स्वयं का युद्ध हमारे सामने है, अभी रूस ने अणु-शस्त्रों के प्रयोग को बन्द किया है, उस की मांग सब से पहले हमारे देश में हुई थी।

आवश्यकता इस बात की है, जैसा कि अभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा, कि हम किसी देश को भी उस की एक विशिष्ट प्रकार की नीति के कारण कोसने की वृत्ति न रखें बुरा भला न कहें। उन्होंने बिल्कुल ठीक कहा कि हम को तो सब से प्रेम है, हम तो दुनिया को एक दूसरों के समीप ला कर इस बात की कल्पना करते हैं, कि एक दिन तमाम दुनिया का मानव समाज एक समाज हो जायगा, एक दिन तमाम दुनिया में एक सरकार की स्थापना हो सकेगी। इस के प्रयत्न भी हो रहे हैं, वह नहीं कि इस के प्रयत्न न हो रहे हों। १९१४ के युद्ध के बाद लीग फ़ॉर नेशन्स का निर्माण हुआ। वह अपने कार्य में सफल नहीं हुई, यह सत्य है। परन्तु उसके बाद जो दूसरा युद्ध हुआ, उस के बाद यू० एन० भी की सृष्टि हुई। उस के एक कदम हम आगे गये। हजारों वर्षों के जो आपसी संघर्ष चला आ रहा है इस दुनिया में, वह एक दिन में, या कुछ वर्षों में समाप्त नहीं हो सकता—उस के समाप्त होने में कुछ समय लगेगा और उस घोर कड़वे का रास्ता वही है, जो हम को प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बताया। हम किसी कब कीबारीयत न करें, किसी को कोसे

नहीं, किसी को बुरा भला न कहें, सब को प्रेम पूर्वक समीप जाने की कोशिश करें। यह कार्य उन पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर हो सकता है, जिन की अब काफ़ी चर्चा हो चुकी है, जिन को दुनिया भी समझने लगी है। इस के सम्बन्ध में मुझे कुछ अधिक कहने की जरूरत नहीं है।

फिर यह तो सिद्धान्त की बात हुई। इस को व्यवहार में जाने के लिये भी हमें कुछ तरीके सोचने पड़ेंगे। एक बहुत बड़ा काम अभी हो रहा है—कम से कम उस का विचार हो रहा है और हम यह धारा करते हैं कि वह होगा। वह है उच्च-स्तरीय नेताओं की वार्ता का सम्मेलन। वह कहाँ होता है, यह भलग बात है, लेकिन हमें धारा है कि यह सम्मेलन शायद हो सकेगा। इस सम्मेलन में एक अग्रप्रापन जरूर रहेगा, वह यह कि चीन को अब तक सुरक्षा परिषद् में स्थान नहीं मिला है। एशिया के प्रश्नों को हल करने के लिये अगर चीन को सुरक्षा परिषद् से भलग रखा कर इस प्रकार के सम्मेलन किये जाते हैं, तो उन में वह कामयाबी हासिल नहीं हो सकती, जिस की धारा हम को है। इस पर भी हम बहुत वर्षों से जोर देते आ रहे हैं और मुझे तो इस बात का विश्वास है कि आज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परसों, यदि दुनिया की समस्याओं का हल होगा है तो चीन को उस का उचित स्थान अवश्य प्राप्त हो कर रहेगा।

हमें यह प्रयत्न करना है—और हमें ही क्या प्रयत्न करना है दुनिया के बहुत से देश इस बात का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं कि जिस तरह रूस ने घोषणा की है कि अब इन आणविक शस्त्रों का अनुभव के लिये प्रयोग न करेगा उस प्रकार की घोषणा अमरीका और इंग्लैंड भी करें वे दो ऐसे प्रधान देशों में जहाँ आणविक शस्त्रों का

काफ़ी उत्पादन हुआ है और यदि इन दोनों में भी इस प्रकार की घोषणा कर दी तो कम से कम हमें इन प्राणविक शक्तों से घाने कोई भय नहीं रहेगा। ये बातें मेने धाप से आन्तराष्ट्रीय परिस्थिति के सम्बन्ध में कही हैं कुछ हमारी समस्यायें हैं जिन से हम प्राण नहीं बूंद सकते। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण के काफ़ी ध्यान को पाकिस्तान और काश्मीर की समस्या पर खर्च किया है। मैं धाप के कहना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर की समस्या तब तक हल नहीं हो सकती कि जब तक काश्मीर को नो मैकड लैंड माना जायगा। वह एक वृत्ति अब तक चली आ रही है। जो ठीक परिस्थिति है उस ठीक परिस्थिति का भवलोकन न कर उस ठीक परिस्थिति को न समझ, यदि काश्मीर में डा० ग्राहम के सदृश एक पर एक मिशन आते रहे तो उन से समस्या का हल होने वाला नहीं है। काश्मीर भारत का एक अविभाज्य भाग है। इस बात को मानने के बाद ही काश्मीर के बारे में जो दूसरी बातें हैं उनका कोई हल सोचा जा सकता है। जब तक काश्मीर को नो-मैकड लैंड माना जायेगा तब तक काश्मीर की समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती।

दूसरा प्रश्न गोष्ठा का है। यदि हम अपने सिद्धान्तों को व्यवहार में न लायें उन्हें कार्य रूप में परिणत न करें तो गोष्ठा का प्रश्न जिस तरह से हमने हैदराबाद में पुलिस एकेशन करके वहाँ का प्रश्न हल किया था २४ बंटों के अन्दर अन्दर हल हो सकता है। पर बात यह हो जायेगी कि मीठा मीठा गप और कड़वा कड़वा धू। हम जो बात हमारे स्वार्थ की है उसको हल करने में अहिंसा की बल न करें उसको हल करने से किसी भी उपाय को काम में लायें किसी भी सिद्धान्त का प्रयोजन न करें और जो स्वार्थ की बात नहीं है उस सम्बन्ध में हल बड़े बड़े सिद्धान्त बचाने की बँटी इस से काम नहीं चलेगा।

जिस अहिंसा और हृदय-परिवर्तन पर हमारा विश्वास है, उस अहिंसा और उस हृदय-परिवर्तन से ही हम गोष्ठा का प्रश्न भी हल कर सकते हैं। गोष्ठा के प्रश्न पर हमको इतना धीर होने की जरूरत नहीं है। जब हमने इतने बड़े भारतवर्ष को हृदय-परिवर्तन से ले लिया और यहाँ पर स्वराज्य स्थापित कर लिया तब गोष्ठा का प्रश्न भी इन्हीं सिद्धान्तों के आधारे पर हल हो कर रहेगा।

अब मैं भारत की बढ़ती हुई आवादी के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ मैंने कल एक प्रश्न के दौरान से प्रधान मंत्री जी से एक बात पूछी थी कि जब आस्ट्रेलिया में और न्यूजीलैंड में एक बर्ग मील के ऊपर चार या छः आदमी रहते हैं और हमारे देश में ३०० के ऊपर तब क्या हम इस विषय में कुछ नहीं कर सकते? मेने कामनवेल्थ देशों का जिक्र तो उस प्रश्न में केवल इसलिए कर दिया था कि हम सब देश कामनवेल्थ में हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी की इस बात को स्वीकार करता हूँ कि कामनवेल्थ से इस प्रश्न का सम्बन्ध नहीं है। लेकिन कामनवेल्थ से इस प्रश्न का सम्बन्ध न होते हुए भी हिन्दुस्तान से टाई गुने बड़े बड़े आस्ट्रेलिया में केवल ६० या ७० लाख आदमी रहते हैं और सारा देश बीरान पड़ा हुआ है। जब आस्ट्रेलिया के कुछ हिस्सों की आबादीवा भारतवर्ष के सदृश्य है, जब हम सबके मित्र हैं तो न्यूजीलैंड तो छोटा देश है लेकिन आस्ट्रेलिया के लोगों से, वहाँ की सरकार से क्या हम इस प्रकार का कोई समझौता नहीं कर सकते कि वहाँ काफ़ी तादाद में भारतीय जनता भी चली जाए? सन् १९५० में जब मैं भारतीय शिष्टमंडल में न्यूजीलैंड गया था तब से लेकर इन आठ वर्षों में मैं अनेक बार अपने वैदेशिक नीति सम्बन्धी भाषणों में तथा अन्य स्थानों पर भी कहता रहा हूँ कि बढ़ती हुई आबादी हमारे देश की एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या है और इस समस्या का हल मेरे मतानुसार अब तक नहीं हो सकता जब

[सिद्ध गोविन्द दास]

तक कि भारतवर्ष के बाहर भी हम को कुछ स्थान न मिलें। हम भारतवर्ष के बाहर वहाँ के मूल निवासियों को किसी प्रकार का भी कष्ट देना नहीं चाहते, उनके हकों पर हम किसी प्रकार का कुठाराघात करने जाना नहीं चाहते वक्षिण अफ्रीका के सम्बन्ध में जहाँ मैं हो भाया हूँ मैं हमेशा कहता रहा हूँ कि भारतीयवासियों को अपने विशिष्ट हकों के लिए वहाँ पर कोई लड़ाई नहीं लड़नी चाहिये, वहाँ के मूल निवासियों और हमारे एक एक स्तर के हैं, उन पर हम कुछ कह और कर सकते हैं। आस्ट्रेलिया या इस प्रकार के जो दूसरे देश हैं उनके मूल निवासियों को किसी प्रकार का कष्ट पहुँचा कर वहाँ की जमीन हमें दी जाए, यह हमारा कहना नहीं है। लेकिन हमारा कथन यह अवश्य है कि यहाँ की बढ़ती हुई आबादी को देखकर और हमारे जो मैत्री सम्बन्ध दुनिया के देशों के साथ हैं, उसको देखकर इस सम्बन्ध में यदि कुछ किया जा सकता हो तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को करना चाहिये। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का आज सारे संसार में इतना बड़ा हतवा है, उनको इतना बड़ा स्थान प्राप्त है कि उनके प्रधान मंत्री रहते हुए इस पर भी शायद विचार हो सकता है।

अन्त में मेरा यह कहना है कि या तो हम विकासपथ से उन्नति की ओर जायेंगे या एक न एक दिन इस समस्त संसार का नाश हो जाएगा। जिस समय बारूद पहले पहल विस्फोटक पदार्थ रूप में निकला था किसी ने इसको नहीं सोचा था कि एक दिन वह भी आएगा जब वह विस्फोटक पदार्थ अणु बम का स्वरूप ले लेगा। ऐसा भी समय आ सकता है कि जब यदि प्रेमपूर्वक इस संसार की सबव्याधियों का हल न हुआ और ग्रहिसा का राज्य इस संसार पर न हुआ तो कोई ऐसा बम भी निकल आए कि जिस से हमारा भूमंडल, हमारा प्लेनेट ही टुकड़े हो जाए। मैं आत्मावादी व्यक्ति हूँ। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हम विकास के पथ से उन्नति की ओर जा रहे हैं

और वह पथ बही है कि जो हमें भारतीय संस्कृति से प्राप्त हुआ है, जिस पर गांधी जी चले जिस पर आज नेहरू जी चल रहे हैं।

अपने इस भाषण को समाप्त करते हुए इतना और कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ प्रश्न ऐसे हैं कि जिन में हम भिन्न भिन्न दलों में रहते हुए भी मिल कर काम कर सकते हैं। वैदेशिक नीति का सवाल एक ऐसा सवाल है जिस सवाल पर हम सब को मिलकर एक मत होकर काम करना चाहिये और जैसे मैं सदा से इस नीति का समर्थक रहा हूँ उसी तरह आज भी मैं इस नीति का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I suggest there should be a Summit meeting of the Prime Ministers of India, China and Russia at Lhasa or any other place which may appear suitable to our Prime Minister. But, since he is going to Tibet, I thought that advantage can be taken of it.

There are three alternatives left open to the United States of America in the sphere of foreign policy. The first alternative is to fight against Russia and communism, either by war or by diplomacy. If Russia is weakened either by war or by diplomacy. American hegemony will be established over the globe. Hence, India cannot support any American policy which is against either Russia or communism. The United States of America cannot wage war against Russia, for war will lead to mutual destruction. Nor can Russia be weakened by diplomacy for, barring a handful of people here and there, the vast majority of the peoples of Asia and Africa stand in support of the Soviet Union in the conflict that is going on between the two giants.

The second alternative before the United States of America is to collaborate with the Soviet Union. This policy too will prove detrimental to our interests. Any collaboration between Russia and America will lead

to the integration of the white races into one political unit and the establishment of white hegemony over the black and coloured peoples of Asia and Africa. Hence, I am opposed to any summit meeting.

16 hrs.

The third alternative left open to the United States of America is to withdraw from the old world, to pursue a policy of isolationism. This policy will be acceptable to us for it will lead to peace, democracy and the integration of the Afro-Eurasian land mass into one political unit. The plea for the establishment of a federal union between India, China and Russia springs from my desire that there should be a World State. There is no danger of the establishment of the hegemony of the black and the coloured races over Europe and the United States of America because mere numbers cannot tilt the balance. No power on earth can subjugate the peoples of Western Europe and the United States of America for they are far advanced in all respects.

How to compel America to pursue a policy of isolationism? This is the central problem of the age. It is a problem that confronts not only India but all the countries of Africa and Asia. All the nation states of Africa and Asia will make an offer of a federal union to Russia if India takes a lead in this matter and makes an offer of a federal union to Russia. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that all the nations of Asia and Africa will make an offer. This is the only way of driving out America from the old world. I have said that it is only by integrating the old world that peace can be established. It is only by driving out America from the old world that there can be democracy on a global scale.

An Hon. Member: Which world?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The condition precedent to the establishment of a world state and the political integration of the old world into one political unit is that America be driven out from the old world.

A question was asked some time back on the floor of the House whether Russia will accept an offer of federal union. I think that Russia is keen to establish a world state. The Communist goal of a world revolution still haunts the imagination of the rulers in the Kremlin. The Socialist Commonwealth of Nations will not jeopardise their power and position in the Middle-East and South-East Asia by rejecting the offer of a federal union, India's pull over South-East Asia and the Middle-East will become stronger than that of China and Russia if the offer of a federal union is rejected. Our strength lies in our weakness.

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

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: What are the courses left open? What are the alternatives possible in the modern age? The political integration of the world is inevitable unless nuclear war destroys all humanity. Political integration can be of two kinds—hegemony or federal union. There is no third alternative. Any opposition to the scheme of a federal union will lead either to nuclear destruction or to the establishment of hegemony either by Russia or by America or by both acting together, over the dark and coloured races of Africa and Asia. The upholders of the status quo will lead humanity to a global destruction for it is the institution of nation states that leads to war and not capitalism, imperialism, totalitarianism or Bolshevism. Russia has to be integrated either by the United States of America or by the Afro-Asian land mass. There is no third alternative left open to Russia.

What are the problems of international politics? Does the present plan of a summit meeting in any way give an indication that these problems are likely to be solved? The time for a summit meeting will come only after the integration of the Afro-Eurasian land mass into one political unit. The Afro-Eurasian land mass can never become one political unit if the problems of Europe are solved before the

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

problems of Asia and Africa are solved. All the white powers must withdraw from Africa. The United States of America, Holland and France must withdraw from Okinawa, Formosa, West Irian and Algeria. The SEATO, the Baghdad Pact and all the American bases throughout the Afro-Asian land mass must be liquidated, lock, stock and barrel.

Now I come to the kind of world in which we are fast entering. The bi-polar world is one step nearer to the world state than a world fragmented into a large number of autonomous centres of power. There is more danger of war in a world fragmented into a large number of autonomous centres of power than in a bi-polar world. This is the lesson of history. Nuclear stalemate by itself, which is alleged to have broken up the bi-polar world, cannot lead to the establishment of a world fragmented into a large number of autonomous centres of power. The driving force which led to the break up of the bi-polar world has been our policy of non-alignment. We are running counter to history. We have become obstacles in the way of history.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would the hon. Minister like to intervene?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, she might speak first. I will call Shri Rameshwar Rao next.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The occasion for a debate on external affairs always gives expression to the paranoic tendencies of our country. Mention has been made of the great destiny of India in settling world affairs. The hon. Prime Minister has been asked to initiate conferences to bring about settlement of issues which have been outstanding for a number of years. But do hon. Members realise that the world of today is not the creation of India nor has India, as one of the countries in the modern world, got a special destiny to bring to bear

its weight on international affairs? It is this grand illusion that we and we alone can lead the world that has produced some of the magnificent speeches that were delivered on this Demand for Grants this morning.

My task is rendered very easy because the broad outlines of policy have already been specified by the hon. Prime Minister and some of the points raised by the later speakers were also answered by our Parliamentary Secretary. Some of the items that have been left out by these two speakers, I would like to deal with in a very brief way as the time at my disposal is very limited.

Mention has been made this morning that we have not raised our voice in the matter of Indonesia and that we have not said anything or perhaps we have not spoken loud enough about incidents that are happening in Algeria. Special mention was made that very little was done by us in the reprieve granted to Djamilia, the young patriot. It is not the custom of the External Affairs Ministry to blow its own trumpet. The things that the Government of India does in order to lessen tensions and to interfere in special items, which need its interference, are done in a quiet way and they do not form the subject of big speeches of the Government spokesmen in the House.

It has been pointed out by a Member who, I presume, must know better about external publicity—that one of the best ways of strengthening external publicity is to have our own news agency to gather news in other countries. The Member has forgotten a statement made by the Prime Minister this morning that we have over 100 Missions abroad of various categories. Did he imagine that these Missions were staying there in order to watch the stars? Certainly, we get reports from these Missions and it is on the basis of the intimate information that we get from our own agents that we do our external publicity. It is quite true that our external publicity has not been very effective.

tive. As has been very ably pointed out by the Parliamentary Secretary, you do not convert a nation by means of speeches or by means of propaganda literature. As we know it, it has been tried and it is being tried by many countries. There are countries which snow us under heaps of propaganda. That has not converted us to their way of belief. The same holds good as far as our propaganda is concerned. As has been pointed out, we have to counter the misapprehensions and misinformation that has been spread about us for centuries. All that we can do to counter this is not by false propaganda, not by exaggerated accounts of what is happening in our country, but by simple truth. Truth takes a long time to succeed. Let us hope that it will succeed as it must succeed. As was pointed out by the Parliamentary Secretary again there are the recent changes in the attitude of the big countries towards the various questions which are international problems. All these changes indicate that those countries which were hostile to us are seeing light. I hope they will see light well and the scales will fall from their eyes and they will understand our problems in the way they should be understood.

Then, I come to certain definite questions raised by some of the speakers. A question was asked, I think by the Leader of the Communist Party, why we did not say that we will not take any cognisance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. I am sure he knows as well as the Members of the House that we did contest the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. We have at no time said that the Portuguese have any right of passage to Dadra and Nagarhaveli. We do not think it is proper at this stage to take unilateral action for the integration of Nagarhaveli and Dadra. We would wait since the matter is *sub judice* till some decision is arrived at.

The next thing is about the India Office Library. It is the duty of the Opposition to say that all our policies

have been failures and that we are not taking adequate steps to fulfil the pledges that we have given to our country. The question of the transfer of the India Office Library has been taken up and hon. Members know that the late Education Minister actually took a trip to London for that. In the course of his negotiations he had suggested that a fact-finding committee should be appointed to find out and settle the claims of Pakistan and India with regard to the Library. The U.K. Government have made it a legal issue and they said that according to their Legal Advisers they have a legal claim to the Library. We want to insist that it is not a legal claim. It is a political question: a question of transferring assets which belong to us, to our country. A fact-finding committee has not been appointed. The U.K. Government does not seem to be in any mood to hasten the proceedings by which a final settlement can be effected. To say that we have failed or that we have not been enthusiastic in pursuing these matters is really to misrepresent the efforts of the Government.

Another point is about boundary demarcation. I am rather disappointed, because, almost every week, in both the Houses we are answering questions on boundary demarcation. The difficulties in boundary demarcation and the progress made in the matter are all reported to the House. Still Members want to raise that issue, maybe, because they do not have any other issues which they can raise in the House.

Shri Hem Barua: Not because of that, but because they are keen about it and very little is done.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Only a couple of weeks ago, the progress in demarcation was stated in this House and with your permission, I will read out once again what has been said many times in both the Houses.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Every day in the papers there are reports about boundary troubles. That is why we are asking questions.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: This deals with boundary demarcation, not boundary disputes, as such.

On the Punjab-West Pakistan border, we have got 318 miles of boundary; 160 miles have been demarcated. In West Bengal-East Pakistan, we have an undisputed boundary of 1,350 miles out of which 1,017 miles have been demarcated. Tripura-East Pakistan—522 miles; 55 miles demarcated. Assam-East Pakistan, 609 miles; 200 miles demarcated.

Only the other day, a statement was made in this House explaining why the progress has been slow. Every yard of the boundary has to be measured, land records referred to and agreement reached as to whether work should proceed. Then, work is undertaken by representatives, and workers from both sides of the boundary. Invariably we find that any small incident or lack of protection or anything that interferes with the proper demarcation of the country would mean a suspension of the work not for a few days or weeks, but months. Boundary demarcation cannot be done throughout the year. There are only limited seasons during which this can be done. If hon. Members realise all these difficulties, I am sure they would appreciate the efforts made by the Government in order to get the boundary demarcated. After all, it is not the Opposition Members only who are concerned with the security of our country. I think, more than the Opposition, it is the Government that is concerned with the security and safety of the country. It is no fun for the Government to detail police forces into the border lands and to be compelled to answer questions and to feel aggrieved over questions over which we have no control. Let me assure the House that all efforts are being made—all efforts within the possibility of a Government most interested and most concerned about the welfare of the people—in order to see that these things are solved properly and quickly. But, the circumstances that have been mentioned will convince hon. Members that these tasks are not

easily accomplished because they involve two Governments, one of which is not at all anxious to come to any kind of settlement with us.

One of the speakers,—I think it was Shri Hem Barua,—made a statement which is *prima facie* wrong. He said that it was an illegal committee that looked to the appointment of personnel for the IFAS. I would like to read out to him what happened in the meeting at Shillong. It may convince him about the legality or illegality of the Board. This is the composition of the Special Selection Board: "A Special Selection Board shall be constituted by the Central Government and it shall consist of (1) a representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, who shall be the Chairman of the Board, (2) the Adviser to the Governor of Assam, (3) a representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, (4) a representative of the Ministry of Defence and (5) one or more anthropologists and experts on Tribal affairs. A meeting was held first in Delhi and all these people attended. The next meeting was held in Shillong. It was contended that this Board consisted only of junior members and therefore, according to Shri Hem Barua, it was an illegal Board. Let me read out the names of the Members who attended the Shillong meeting. Before that, let me say that in the note that I read just now, it is said, representatives. It is left to the Ministry to appoint anybody as its representative and the Board can still be legal whatever the status of the representative appointed by the Ministry concerned. However, I will read the names of the people who attended the meeting in Shillong. Shri Viswanathan, I.C.S., Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs—is a junior officer I ask Shri Hem Barua? Shri S. J. Dalton, Member, Assam Public Service Commission—another junior officer; Shri H. C. Sarin, I.C.S., Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Defence; Shri K. L. Mehta, I.C.S., Adviser to the Governor—all Members. These are the

junior officers who are said to have made the committee or the Board illegal.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Minister is not yielding.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I just want to ask how these things can be misrepresented.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Minister is not yielding, and therefore the hon. Member has to yield.

An Hon. Member: It is a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No point of order. Point of information.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am only giving the information so that the House may have the correct knowledge and will be able to judge whether the board was illegally constituted. I am only using the word used by the hon. Member.

Shri Hem Barua: I have a word to say.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am not yielding. What I want to say is that speaker after speaker can come forward and say this which they think will not be refuted, and therefore there will be wide acceptance and belief that we are doing all sorts of illegal things in order to put people in, without being guided by any of the principles laid down for the constitution of these boards.

Now I want to say something about the question of emigration policy. One of the hon. speakers asked: If we are Members of the Commonwealth, why do we not negotiate with Australia because we have too many people and Australia has too much land? It does not conform to our ideas of national dignity that we should go round asking other countries, because they happen to be members of the Commonwealth, to settle our people. The problem of population in India is a problem which we should solve ourselves. No policy of emigration is going to help us to solve this problem.

Seth Govind Das: On a point of personal explanation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Minister has already told the House that she is not yielding. The Members will have to yield.

Seth Govind Das: I think she will give me way for one minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The hon. Member who made the suggestion has himself visited Australia. I have also been able to visit Australia recently. If he had any idea of the country he would not have pressed this demand, because it is a country which is barren in most of the places and the population is concentrated on the sea board. The rest of the country needs a lot of physical effort to develop it, and if our people could only put in that physical effort, we can make our country a richer and better country than Australia.

Then, the usual things about the manoeuvres of imperialist powers and moral strength, the endless potentialities to be used for the promotion of peace etc., were mentioned. I think nobody can say that we have failed in our task of promoting world peace, but the task of promoting world peace does not mean that we should interfere in the internal affairs of all the other countries and help them to toe the line, so to speak, of our policies. As it is, the House is aware that most of the countries of the world, including the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, have publicly supported the five principles of international policy which we had laid down, which go by the name of Panchsheel. That itself is an achievement. Not only that. One of the Members has even suggested that the Commonwealth should be changed into a Panchsheel Commonwealth. One does not exclude the other. Now that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom himself has subscribed to the Panchsheel as many other Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth countries have also done, it is quite likely that we are really on the way to that Panchsheel! Common-

wealth if you like to call it by that name.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): Will the Pakistan Prime Minister accept that?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Then it was said that we should have a customs union between Pakistan and India, a Zollverein, and it was a most fantastic suggestion from a Member of the Communist Party that it should be over the heads of the Government, that it should be a customs union of two countries having nothing to do with the two Governments. I have also read a little history, and I have never come across a proposal like that where you could have a customs union of two countries over the heads of the Governments. Customs unions are formed by the Governments and in full agreement as to what their policies should be. So, the idea by a Communist Member that we should approach the people over the heads of the Governments is really fantastic.

Then we were asked why we did not indulge in a sharp condemnation of the Big Powers' intervention in Indonesia. We have said on many occasions that we do not like interference of foreign countries in the internal affairs of other countries, nor do we believe in what is called the vacuum theory in politics. We say the vacuum will be filled by the people themselves. Regarding this particular point the Prime Minister himself has stated in a press conference that we have no direct information as to the interference of other countries in the internal affairs of Indonesia. There is a rebellion. It is a purely domestic affair. We have our sympathy with the established Government of Indonesia because we are for stability, because the head of the Indonesian Government has been long associated with us. We have sympathised with their freedom struggle, we have helped them to solve their difficulties, but this is a purely domestic matter, and we cannot go by newspaper reports. The Opposition Members can go by newspaper reports, but a Government cannot take

any action on purely newspaper reports. Therefore, if we have not condemned Western interference or the interference of Western Powers, in Indonesian affairs, it is purely because we think that we have no correct or authoritative information about the kind of interference except that they received some arms from Taiwan. We do not know who has sent it, whether it was sent by the Western Powers, by the Chinese or by some other agency. We do not know anything about it. It is not proper for a Government to come forward with a sharp condemnation of a thing which they do not know themselves.

Then something was said about our refusal to help intending migrants from East Pakistan. This is also not correct. Every effort is being made to help the migrants, but our own policy is the result of an agreement between our Government and the Pakistan Government. We do not want to embarrass the Pakistan Government, nor induce these people to leave Pakistan to come to India and add to their worries and our worries. All that we want to do is this: where there is a real case of hardship, we have established certain priorities, and according to these priorities migration is allowed, visas are given and nothing is done to increase their hardships. On the other hand, everything is done to make their hardships less.

Then there is a cut motion about prospective immigrants. This also has been discussed in the House. We do not know what is the number or what is the nature of prospective immigrants, and no Government can lay down a policy that this is what they are going to do in case so many thousands of people come from Pakistan. On the other hand, the policies that are followed today do make provision for difficult cases when they come from Pakistan.

We were told that we have by our policies alienated Bhutan and Sikkim and various other things which are absolutely wrong. The hon. Members must have read the annual report of

the External Affairs Ministry and I do not want to waste any more of the time of the House by repeating what is already in print and is in the hands of hon. Members. They know by reading it that our relationships with these Governments has been most friendly, and that we have not spared anything to help them and to develop their resources so that we can have our policy of good neighbourliness not only in theory but also in practice.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of information.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Rameshwar Rao.

Shri Hem Barua: May I clarify my position, because I have been misinterpreted?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, he may say a few words.

Shri Hem Barua: About the selection board for the recruitment of officers to the IFAS. I said the selection board was constituted under the orders of the President of India, and these were the Members: The Foreign Secretary (Chairman of the Board), one or two anthropologists, one from the Ministry of Defence, one from the Home Ministry and the Adviser to the Governor of Assam. But in 1956, when this board met at Shillong, some of the members of the board did not attend it, and delegated their powers to their junior members. For instance, it was Lt. Col. Yusuf Ali, who was the Deputy Adviser to the Governor of Assam, not the Adviser, who was allowed to sit in the board. I say this board for selection of officers was constituted under the orders of the President, and these were being violated because these people did not enjoy the right to delegate powers; they either attend or they do not attend. That was what I said.

Shri Rameshwar Rao (Mahbubnagar): There will be hardly anyone in this House who does not support the broad lines of our foreign policy. There may be a difference of emphasis, or there may be minor marginal

details in which one may want some alteration, but basically everyone of us do support the foreign policy that we have been pursuing in the last nine years.

There are just one or two aspects which I would like to draw your attention to. One of them to which repeatedly attention is drawn to both on the floor of this House and outside is the question of Indians abroad, Indians in South Africa, Indians in East Africa, Indians in Malaya, in Ceylon and so on. This is a very old story. It goes back to the days when the British were ruling this country, to the late years of the last century; when they were trying to develop various colonial territories, the British took labour from this country—it was called indentured labour in those days—to South Africa, to Fiji, to West Indies, to British Guiana and various other places. Most of them settled there, and the Indians living in those territories today are their children or grandchildren. And confusion arises because we are unable to distinguish between Indian citizens and these people who have settled there. The Indians in South Africa are South Africans of Indian origin. They are not Indian citizens. Very often, questions are asked, as my hon. friend Shri Hem Barua so eloquently did, about the Group Areas Act, about the treatment of Indians in South Africa and so on.

Shri Hem Barua: Did I mistake that they were Indian nationals? I did not make that mistake.

Shri Rameshwar Rao: I am just clarifying it. If they are not Indian citizens, then what does my hon. friend Shri Hem Barua want this Government to do?

Shri Hem Barua: Leave them in the lurch!

Shri Rameshwar Rao: We are not going to take up cudgels on behalf of those who are not citizens of this country. We certainly have sympathy towards these Indians resident in

[Shri Rameshwar Rao]

other countries, as much sympathy as we have towards the nationals of those territories, the indigenous population of those territories, like the Africans and others. Our sympathy towards the Indians who are discriminated against in South Africa is no less than the sympathy that we have towards the Africans in South Africa who are discriminated against. This problem of discrimination that crops up every now and then in various territories is partly because we are not quite sure or we do not appreciate very clearly that we do not desire any special treatment for Indians resident in those territories. They should not ask for any preferential treatment as against the people in those territories, like the Indians in the Rhodesia, for instance. If the Africans in Rhodesia are being discriminated against, then the problem is a common problem, a common problem of discrimination against coloured people. It is in that perspective that these problems must be understood and appreciated.

The Indians in these various territories are in two or three categories. The first category is of those who are permanent residents of those territories, who are citizens of those countries and are only of Indian origin. Our relationship with them is cultural. We are interested in them because they have gone from our country. We would like to retain cultural contacts with them. But beyond that I do not think the Government of India can take any extraordinary, special interest. There is the other class of people who are visitors, who are Indian citizens, who might have gone there on short visits or who may have been there for business, but who have retained their Indian nationality and Indian citizenship. In their case, certainly the Government of India look after their interests, and even the slightest discrimination against them or any wrong treatment given them is taken up by the Government of India through the proper channels.

The second point, to which I would like with all humility to draw your attention and the attention of the Members of the House, is about our Northern Frontier. There has been some discussion today and previously about NEFA. The Prime Minister has also mentioned about the officers whom we are recruiting for a cadre for NEFA, the special problems of NEFA and what is being done there. I feel that this aspect of our administration should not be confined only to NEFA which is only a part of our Frontier area. Our whole frontier right up from Laddakh down into Assam and further down to the seaboard is similar. The terrain is difficult. The people who inhabit this area are backward. Most of them are tribal people. They have hardly any education. There are hardly any roads in this area. It is time that the Government of India, either through the Ministry of External Affairs or through the respective Ministries concerned, paid greater attention to this area. We should develop a more positive policy in this area, of education, of communication and of cultural contacts. For various reasons, this area is being neglected. One of our colleagues has suggested today that NEFA should not be under the Ministry of External Affairs but should be administered as part of the Ministry of Home Affairs etc. I do not know if at this stage it would be a wise thing to do, but some emphasis, either through the State Governments, such as the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab or Kashmir, or directly by the Government of India through a special agency, should be given to the development of this whole frontier area in education, communication and so on.

I am aware that I should not take much time of the House. I would like to refer only to one other aspect, to which attention has been drawn today, especially by Dr. P. Subbarayan, who feels that we should find a place at the summit conference because we have an important part to play. Sure-

ly, it is not for us to say that we have an important part to play. It is for other people to feel whether we have to play a part at all. And if other people feel that there is some part that we have to play, we will be asked. It will be presumptuous indeed for us to feel that we should go around advising other people or asking for places at various conferences. I hope my esteemed friend and elder statesman, Dr. Subbarayan, will forgive me for differing from him.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीदेवी बाई (सागर-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय क्या हमें भी समय मिलेगा ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आज तो नहीं मिल सकता ।

If Shri Mahanty can squeeze his observations in six or seven minutes, he may speak now, because I have to call the hon. Prime Minister after that. I intend to call him at 4.45 P.M.

श्री बजरंग सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ । आज जितने सदन का सेशन था उसमें से पांच बंटे में मैं विरोधी दलों को मुश्किल में एक घंटा मिला होगा । वैसे प्रधान मंत्री भी सबूरे एक घंटे तक बोल चुके हैं और उनके प्रतिरिक्त पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी और डिप्टी मिनिस्टर भी बोले हैं । इसलिये समय कुछ बढ़ा दिया जाये और प्रधान मंत्री साहब कल जवाब दें ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के लिये भी १५ या २० मिनट ही रह गये हैं । और अगर १५ मिनट समय बढ़ा भी दिया जाये तो क्या होगा । एक घादमी और बोल सकेगा ।

श्री बजरंग सिंह : प्रधान मंत्री भी कल बोल सकेंगे ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो मुश्किल होगा क्योंकि इसके बाद भी जो काम रखा गया है वह भी तो करना होगा

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं समझता हूँ कि कल तक हमें मुस्तबो करना तो मूनासिब नहीं होगा । लेकिन अगर प्राप्त चाहें तो मेरे बोलने के बाद दस पन्द्रह मिनट का वक़्त और दें ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने ५ बजे के लिये कीबीनट की मीटिंग रक़ी हुई है । इसलिये यह काम पांच बजे के बाद नहीं चल सकता । उनका रिपलाई उसके बाद नहीं हो सकता । लेकिन अगर बाद में कोई मेम्बर साहब बोलना चाहें तो बोल सकते हैं ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उन के जवान के बाद कोर्ट क्या बोलना चाहेगा ।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : हाउस की इजाजत में सब बातें हो सकती हैं ।

श्री बजरंग सिंह : अगर ध्यानको मुविधा हो तो कल बोल सकते हैं ।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : कल तो मुविधा नहीं है । एटामिक इनरजी का काम है और अगर कल पर हमें मुस्तबी किया गया तो दिवकते पेश धाजायेंगी । मिर्फ १५ मिनट का ही तो सवाल है । अगर हाउस चाहें तो इतना टाइम मेरे बोलने के बाद दे सकता है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I shall deal very briefly with the few points. I am really surprised at the persistence of Shri Barua about this question of the selection of officers for the NEFA. Here I have the official paper, the orders issued by the President, that is the rules framed under the orders of the President, which says: The Special Selection Board shall be constituted by the Central Government and shall consist of a representative of the Ministry of External Affairs who shall be the Chairman of the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Board, the Adviser to the Governor of Assam, a representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, a representative of the Ministry of Defence, an Anthropologist and others. The point is they are representatives and the Ministry can send any representative. It so happened that when the meeting was held here, the representative was the Foreign Secretary; and it so happened that when the meeting was held at Shillong the Joint Secretary in special charge of this Department was there. He was a fairly senior officer who deals with these matters mostly. There can be no question about the legality of it. But, as I said in the course of my address this morning, the results show that the selections made were excellent. The officers we have got are good selections, people who have proved by their work and worth that it was a good selection.

Then, Sir, here is one hon. Member, Shri Brajeshwar Prasad who often intervenes in debates on Foreign Affairs and who in spite of belonging to a large party in this House really forms a party, a single-Member party of his own.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Is he not a Member of the Congress Party?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: . . . with whom I am not aware that any other Member is in agreement on the various subjects that he talks about. He has allowed us today again to have some glimpses into the obscure corners of his mind. But, they were remarkable glimpses about driving away this country from this continent, pushing in some other continent, about really having an elemental scope, hardly politics. (Laughter.) But, I merely refer to him because it is not merely a matter for amusement for us although it is amusing I must say. But, often lightly to give extraordinary impressions to people outside who may read about this as to what the quality of thinking in this House is on such matters, is likely to

delude them. Therefore, I have referred to this matter. (Interruption.)

An Hon. Member: To which Party does he belong?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is Member of the House all right.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member, Seth Govind Das, referred to the problem of migration. My colleague had said something about it. Obviously, the question of population in the world is important now and it is going to be terribly important, maybe, 10, 20 or 30 years later. How is it going to be solved? I do not know. One obvious way talked about more and more now is of restricting the growth of population by methods of birth control. So far as we are concerned, it is of high importance that we should try to do so and succeed in that. Other countries are also thinking on these lines. It would be completely wrong and improper for us to say that because Australia or other countries happen to be sparsely populated we should raise this question and try to send our people there. It will be improper from a variety of ways and it is raising a hornet's nest without achieving anything in the near future. Even if there is such a thing in the future, it will be a tremendous thing for us. This is not a question of people disappearing here and appearing there. We have to face some problem here in connection with the refugee rehabilitation. People are disinclined to go from one State to another. Imagine thinking in terms of taking large numbers of people? Presumably Seth Govind Das thinks in terms of a few thousands. But you have to think in terms of millions, scores of millions, to make a difference.

Probably, among the States of India—I am not quite sure—Madhya Pradesh is the most sparsely populated. It may well be that Seth Govind Das may try this to some extent in relation to his own State . . . (Interruptions.)

There are grave difficulties. I say this because unless there is something definite, feasible and practicable, it is not worthwhile our saying things which frighten people. There is no such intention on our part.

Then again, the population of India is a big one. It is no doubt a growing one. But the population of China is far bigger and the rate of growth is even bigger. Whatever birth control may do in the future, it is calculated that there are about 600 millions in China. It will be a thousand millions before very long—in 20 years or 25 years. Imagine a thousand millions in China. Then take Indonesia. It is also a very heavily populated country with 70, 80 or 90 millions—I think. I am told it is 85 millions. It is also growing rapidly. The whole of the South-East Asia is a tremendously heavily populated area.

Shri Hem Barua: But about China, the population there per square mile is less than ours. The pressure of population per square mile is less than ours.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But there is the Gobi desert too—and various other things. The population of the whole of the Chinese State, including Tibet, Gobi desert and that, and Mongolia—if you spread it out, it is not so great. But the really heavily populated area is China proper. It is terribly populated. What is more, as I have said, the rate of increase is two per cent. per annum. This rate of increase is bound to go up because of health measures and the rest as in India. Actually, our rate of increase in population, in population growth, is a little less than it was before; it is actually going down. But because the death rate is going down fast, in the result, more people remain alive.

The hon. Member, **Shri Mukerjee**, referred to a number of matters. One he referred to was about an Indian

doctor in London, and that diplomatic immunity had been claimed by the warden of a hostel. This matter came up before me some time ago. I think the hon. Member was pleased to draw my attention to it and I enquired into the details. I do not think whether it will be right or proper for me to say anything much here about this case, because it will be very much to the disadvantage of that Indian doctor if I say anything much here. He was a gentleman who was sent from India with the help of advance, loans etc. from the West Bengal Government, and later he received more loans. He has not returned them. He has refused to abide by any directions. In fact, some suits are pending against him for various purposes. And, he failed, in other words, with the people who had sent him, who had given him money, and refused to come back. He has been there for a long time. The dispute arose about his insisting on treating Indian students in the hostel which is connected or run by the High Commission. It was stated that he was trying to induce the students to ask for him whenever they wanted a doctor. It was not considered proper for any doctor to do so, and he was asked not to do so, but if any student wanted him he could go. This is the beginning. It is not a very big matter, but since it was referred to I thought I should say something about it.

16.52 hrs.

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

Then, Sir, he sued the lady warden of the hostel for defamation, defamation presumably because she said he was trying to get students to engage him, which was supposed to be defamatory. And, the Commonwealth Relations Office in London, it appears, informed them that this lady had diplomatic immunity. I do not myself like anyone claiming diplomatic immunity unless in some very very special case; but normally diplomatic

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

immunity is given on a reciprocal basis between two countries. This was, finally, the action of the Commonwealth Relations Office; I do not know the details. But, having gone through much of the correspondence with this doctor, I cannot say that my sympathies went to him at all. His record was not at all a pleasing and satisfactory one so far as his relations with those who had sent him or those with whom he was dealing there was concerned. And, surprisingly enough he has found a champion in England, a champion whom, well, many of us would prefer not to have—the champion is the *Daily Express*.

Shri Mukerjee made some suggestions, some of which seem to me completely beyond our power. He said something about Nagerhaveli; we should apparently take some steps to put an end to this case going on in the International Court, we should incorporate it with the Indian Union and so on. Of course, this Parliament could incorporate it. There is no difficulty about incorporation. But you can consider the advisability of it, the advisability of such an action when a case is going on in an international plane in the Hague Court. We have deliberately—and I think rightly—ever since Nagerhaveli became a liberated area through the efforts of its own inhabitants, avoided any formal contact with it, any governmental contact with it, because we do not wish it to appear, what was not a fact, that it was not the people of Nagerhaveli but outsiders who had gone and pushed out the Portuguese authorities from there. The fact is that the people of Nagerhaveli and some Goans did that without the slightest help from any governmental authority. And we wanted to leave it at that and not to confuse the issue by any step that we might take.

Then, he also said something about our firmly and finally withdrawing the case, of Kashmir issue, from the Security Council. There again, it was

not quite clear to me how a case is withdrawn from the Security Council. So far as I know, a case goes there, it remains there and if somebody intends to withdraw it, suppose we want to withdraw a complaint we made, we cannot withdraw somebody else's complaint. We might withdraw our own complaint but the other complaint would remain. But there was one thing that Shri H. N. Mukerjee said. He seemed to think that because I did not mention in my earlier speech Indonesia and Algeria are suffering from some kind of inhibition lest I might offend somebody. That of course was not the case. I was not dealing, this morning, with the entire field of foreign affairs. So far as Algeria is concerned, it is a matter, well, of tragedy which really can be measured only in almost elemental terms. It is a terribly bad thing, but I do not understand yet how I can serve the cause of Algeria or the Algerian people by merely shouting about it all the time. We have in our own way drawn attention to this fact repeatedly. Maybe sometimes what we have stated has had some effect. We have in our own way done it. We refused to shout and we refused to go about merely condemning when all kinds of stories came to us, and facts, a year and a half ago or more, about Hungary. We did not think it was right to do that but we did try to draw the attention of the Governments concerned to various matters and sometimes with success. We did serve a cause we had at heart. We would not have been able to do that if we had merely performed in public, with vigour, without any results.

Then, Shri H. N. Mukerjee referred also to the possibility of holding a Bandung Conference. It can be held; but I still think that a Bandung Conference at the present stage, of the type that was held, would not be feasible because it was a Governmental Conference. This House knows what is happening in Western Asia—separate groups of nations struggling

away in different directions. There are internal troubles in Indonesia. I should have thought this was not at all a suitable time for such a conference, and this is not my view only. This was the view of most of the people concerned with the sponsoring of the first Bandung Conference, because we consulted each other sometime back.

Now, Shri H. N. Mukerjee made a suggestion which I fear is not feasible, but I would welcome it if it was feasible. It was about a customs union, but clearly, when the position is what it is today, to talk about customs union is not to talk in terms of reality.

17 hrs.

Only today I was told of the kind of thing that happens. Only today a newspaper quoted a speech delivered in Lahore. I shall make it clear that so far as I know it is not delivered by any high government functionary, but still by a prominent citizen. He said, "Oh, Kashmir, the question of Kashmir is there of course. But that is not enough. We must now strive for a complete rectification of the boundary between India and Pakistan, the area in that northern boundary. The Quid-e-Azam said so and we must try that." This supports what I ventured to say to this House this morning that we are up against something in a sense very solid and in another sense very insubstantial. It is not Kashmir, though Kashmir, of course, is a very important issue. It is not canal waters. It is something basic derived from that intense communal attitude, bitterness, etc., anti-Indian attitude, which has been the inheritance of Pakistan unfortunately from the old Muslim League and then after the time of the partition. Claims grow, demands grow and nothing is satisfied. Therefore, how we are to attack—I mean, attack that basic attitude—and convert it and make it a friendly one is a problem very difficult for us, but there is no other way to do it.

There is one thing else. It is quite extraordinary at the present moment, what the Pakistan Radio is saying from day to day about India, about Kashmir, about individuals here, the Government and everybody—the Pakistan Radio functioning not only from Karachi, but Lahore, Rawalpindi, Peshawar or whatever it is. And I am not referring to what is called the Azad Radio, that is, of course, a class by itself and its virulence nobody can reach. The Pakistan Radio's constant attacks on India, constant preaching of hatred and violence is something amazing. That is the attitude we have to face all the time. I said this morning that I do not claim that we are blameless, that we are guiltless, that we go with lilly-white hands and all that. We have made mistakes; we have made errors. Sometimes some speech is delivered, some writing is done here, which is not either in good taste or is otherwise proper. But the fact is that our major effort, the effort of this Parliament, of this Government and even I say of our Press generally speaking, is towards a lessening of tensions, though individuals go sometimes astray while there is nobody to check that. In fact, all efforts are made to increase the tension, bitterness and hatred. All that we can do is not to be led away by that into wrong courses ourselves and to remember always that the final objective between India and Pakistan can only be friendship and co-operation.

We are neighbours and our conflicts—they may appear big today—are really small compared to the innumerable points of contact that we have and are bound to have. As a matter of fact, these conflicts have not only injured us, even in economic and financial terms but if we had co-operated economically in trade, this, that and the other, it would have been far more advantageous to us both.

Lastly, my colleague, Shri Rameshwar Rao, referred to our frontier areas

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

meaning by that not the east frontier, not NEFA or the Naga Hills or Assam—that of course is there—but rather the whole stretch of the frontier—Punjab, U. P., etc. These areas have been totally neglected in the past; they have been completely neglected. There is one hon. Member in this House—maybe there are others, but there is certainly one, Mr. Bhakt Darshan—who is constantly reminding us about those areas by putting questions and writing to me quite rightly, because they are important. I am not for the moment thinking in terms of strategy, etc., but they are rich areas and there are fine people living in those areas. It is difficult to do much for them till at least communications are developed. The primary thing is communications. We are doing something towards that end and I hope more will be done.

Mr. Speaker: The Question is

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I request that more time may be allotted. Some people were not allowed to express their views.

Mr. Speaker: We are now closing the debate. I will now put the cut motions to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatives.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands

Nos. 22 to 26 and 110 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

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

Demand No. 22—Tribal Areas

That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,36,07,000 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, 1959, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

Demand No. 23—Naga Hills—Tuensang Area

That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,34,19,000 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, 1959, in respect of 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area'."

Demand No. 24—External Affairs

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,05,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

Demand No. 25—State of Pondicherry

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2, 73, 97,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of pay-

ment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'."

Demand No. 26—Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,75,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

Demand No. 110—Capital outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 42,57,000 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, 1959, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

17.06 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 10th April, 1958.