

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

(ii) A copy of each of the following papers:—

(a) Report of the Hotel Standards and Rate Structure Committee.

(b) Government Resolution No. 2-TT.II(1)/58, dated the 27th July, 1959 containing decisions on certain recommendations of the above Committee.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2339|60.]

CONVICTION OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following communication dated the 29th August, 1960, from the Judge, Third Tribunal, Alipore:—

"I am to inform you that the judgment of the Tribunal Case No. 1 of 1953 (Supplementary) State Vs. Kansari Halder and Jogen Guria has been delivered this day (29-8-60) and the accused Kansari Halder, Member, Lok Sabha, has been found guilty of the offence of criminal conspiracy to commit arson and murder under Sections 120B|302|436, Indian Penal Code and convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for life. He has been remanded to Alipore Central Jail and recommended to be treated as a Division I Prisoner."

APPROPRIATION (No. 4) BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1960-61, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1960-61 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 2, 3, the Schedule, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2, 3, the Schedule, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the title were added to the Bill.

Shri Morarji Desai: I move:

"That the Bill be passed".

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

12-20 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I beg to move:

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

It has been my privilege to move a resolution of this kind almost in every session of Parliament. It is right that these matters should be brought up before the House and yet I have a

*Moved with the recommendations of the President.

feeling that this might not become some mere act of routine where I repeat more or less what I have said previously and many hon. Members repeat what they have said previously. To some extent, I suppose that is inevitable and cannot be avoided. Nevertheless it is rather odd that in this rapidly changing world where all kinds of developments are taking place we should perhaps tend into practising this routine. I propose to say briefly something about some important developments and then await the opinions and the comments of hon. Members of this House.

Taking the broad view of the world today and of international affairs I suppose that the biggest thing is the tensions that exist there which have existed and grown worse. They have existed, of course, for a long time but they have grown worse for the last three or four months. How is one to deal with this matter? How is the world to deal with it? Somehow they have got wrapped round the question of disarmament which is the only effective way perhaps to deal with these international tensions. It is not a subject in which we, in India, can do very much. I mean to say that we are not among those countries who have got very large armaments. It is a matter essentially for those countries that have them, more particularly for the two or three, or four or five countries which are supposed to be nuclear powers. But, nevertheless, it is obvious that every country, certainly India, is deeply interested in this question of disarmament because of the consequences of not finding a solution. They are terrible.

Today we may discuss a multitude of subjects and events. But the fact is that all our schemes and planning and all the other subjects, important or unimportant that come up before Parliament, sink rather into insignificance when put in this background of this tremendous growing tension and all the world living on the brink of this chasm or precipice when even the slightest movement, even by acci-

dent, might make the world topple over. Therefore, I think, the most vital question in the world as it is today is that of disarmament.

Unfortunately, as with everything however important, a tendency arises to get into ruts and routines. The committees and the commissions that have considered this question have tended to get into these routine ways and therefore the progress has not been very considerable. Still, there was much progress in regard to nuclear weapons. There was a very great deal of progress and we were all hoping that the final result would be achieved in a large measure. That too somehow stopped some three or four months ago.

Again there is a good deal of talk about considering this matter, maybe in the United Nations Assembly session that is coming or otherwise. Partly because of this talk the next session of the United Nations General Assembly may well be a very important one—important because of this disarmament question. It is said—hon. Members may have seen reports in the newspapers—that possibly the important heads of States or heads of Governments may even go there to attend this session because of this question of disarmament. Anything that speeds up the process of consideration of this issue and leads to some steps towards its solution will be welcomed by us.

This UN session is going to be unusual also because a number of new countries from Africa will be represented in it. The African representation has grown considerably and will grow in the course of this year and next year even more. That has an effect not only on Africa but also on the general world situation and on the United Nations. In a sense, leaving out this question of disarmament, the most significant feature of the world today are these developments in Africa. We welcome the freeing of a large number of nations and yet lately there has been a measure of anxiety in our

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

mind on various conflicts that have been arising there more especially in the Congo.

As soon as the Congo became independent we naturally recognised it, congratulated this new free country and arranged and we are arranging for our proper representation there on the diplomatic level. We looked upon the Congo as a single entity not to be split up. That is our approach to the Congo question, namely, that the integrity and the sovereignty of the Congo should be maintained. I do not propose to enter into the internal disputes in the Congo except to say that we still adhere to this approach of the integrity of the Congo.

When these troubles arose in the Congo the United Nations was appealed to and the United Nations responded—and responded with speed and efficiency. The United Nations has taken part in a way in other places in the world too in various ways, but this particular action that it took in the Congo is rather unique, a bit unusual and in a sense marked a new phase in the activities of the UN. Taking it all in all, I think it is a good phase, a desirable phase and the manner in which it has functioned in Congo has, I think, been commendable. I do not quite know what would happen in the Congo if the UN was not there. Apart from the possibility of a great deal of internal conflict there would be a possibility of intervention by other countries, big and small. If that happened, in reality the independence of the Congo would not last very long apart from the misery caused. Therefore, it is better that the United Nations should go. The U.N. may occasionally or its representatives may occasionally make mistakes. But, nevertheless, there is the whole force of world opinion and all the world community is represented in the United Nations to check them and keep them in the right path. I would, therefore, like to express on behalf of our Government, our appreciation of

the steps that have been taken broadly by the U.N. there.

Some countries have been called upon to send their armed forces under U.N. colours. We have not been called upon to send our armed forces in that way. But, we have rendered them a good deal of assistance, rather high class assistance, if I may say so. In numbers, I suppose, we have sent—I cannot exactly remember—may be about 200 to 250 persons from here. A number of them are of the Officer class or medical teams or others. That is to say, whoever we have sent there is not meant to fight there in that sense, but to aid. Of the principal officers that we have sent, one is a kind of an Adviser, Military Adviser to Mr. Hammarskjöld and another is going to be very soon his personal representative in the Congo. Both are very responsible posts. Even in the few days that they have functioned there, they have elicited a great deal of admiration from the people there.

We have now very recently had another demand, rather a heavy demand, apart from individual officers, something like three Colonels, two this and two that, for setting up there immediately a 400 bed hospital. We have agreed to it. That is to say, this kind of thing can only be done, of course, on a military basis. We are lifting all the apparatus, medicine and all men right to the Congo to put it up there within a fortnight. We have done this on the understanding that the United Nations will replace these things in India. Naturally. That is to say, our normal method of helping is that we continue to pay our normal salaries of anybody who goes there. Every extra expenditure involved comes from the U.N. funds. All our people who go there get their salaries, etc. from us and the allowances, etc., and other expenditure comes from the U.N. That is, I believe, the normal way; in regard to this hospital too. The whole point was the speed with which this could be established there and under competent management. They came to us to do

it, partly because some countries are ruled out and in the circumstances in the Congo, it has to be what is called an acceptable country, and we are one of the very few acceptable countries. But, also it has to be obviously a country which could do the job efficiently. So, they came to us. We were pressed very earnestly that we should agree. We have intimated to them that we can do so and send everything. Probably, the first batch will go within a few days, followed up by another batch.

In Africa, thus, you will see that barring a few areas, chiefly I think the Portuguese areas there, practically the rest of Africa has attained its freedom or is going to attain it soon. There is, of course, Algeria, that country which has lived under tragic conditions for many years and has suffered enormous loss and sorrow during these years in its fight for independence. We all of us here have expressed ourselves strongly in favour of Algerian freedom. Unfortunately, while on the one side all these territories in Africa which were under French domination have been freed, Algeria still continues. I do hope that the solution can be found of that too soon and that can only be in terms of Algerian freedom.

Apart from this, we come to perhaps what might be called the darkest parts of dark Africa, the Portuguese colonies there, from which during these many years, hardly a ray of light or information has come. To some extent it comes now: not very much. Still, it does come and it shows that things in these Portuguese colonies are also on the move. Anyhow, even apart from having facts, one can hardly expect that when the whole of Africa is aflame, the Portuguese colonies can live in cold storage. Apart from our direct interest in the question of Goa, obviously, that has an indirect effect on that too.

I should now come to India and refer briefly to some of the matters involving foreign affairs. One is Pakistan. The House knows probably that after

many years of painful effort and argument and discussion here and even more so in Washington and New York under the auspices of the World Bank, the dispute in regard to the division of the canal waters is gradually coming to an end. It may be said to have been resolved though there have been so many slips. But, I would not like to give a very definite assurance till actually it is finalised. But, I think one may with some confidence say that it is going to be finalised soon. In fact, the actual terms of the dispute were settled some time back. But, for many months, discussion has been in regard to the arrangements during the interim period, the interim period being 10 years. During these 10 years, various payments have to be made by us to Pakistan. Various steps have to be taken by Pakistan in the erection of canals and waterways. They are going to receive large sums of money from other countries. That, of course, is not our concern. That is a matter between them and the other countries and the World Bank. Anyhow, because we have been and we are always anxious to settle these things peacefully, we agreed to pay in instalments during these 10 years a considerable sum of money.

Then came the question, during this interim period of 10 years, what share of the waters should be given to them, that is to say, while they are building their canal system. This took some time, but it has been resolved I believe and now the final verbal touches are being given to this projected treaty, the canal waters treaty. Indeed, in the expectation of this being settled finally, I have accepted the invitation of the Pakistan Government to go to Karachi in about three weeks time, on the 19th September, for the purpose of signing this document.

Then, the other international question that affects us in India is that of our border with China or Tibet. Some few days back I stated in this House, probably in answer to a question, that an incursion had taken place in the North-east frontier,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

NEFA, that corner, where some Chinese soldiers had come, as we were informed, about four miles inside and then had gone away. I informed the House then that we had protested to the Chinese Government. Their reply is that the fact was that nine working personnel went out to fell bamboos in the forest. They lost their way owing to low clouds and thick fog and crossed over the border by mistake, and as soon as they discovered it, they returned. I am placing this reply of the Chinese Government before the House. We are naturally further enquiring into this matter.

There is another small matter. An hon. Member once referred to it in this House, and I believe he even attempted to move a motion for adjournment which you, Sir, were pleased not to allow. That was about the Shipki La, one of the passes to Tibet. Another hon. Member who comes from that part of the world had made some statement in the press that the Shipki La village which had been founded by Indians was now in the occupation of the Chinese or Tibetans. I should like to remove a certain misunderstanding that has arisen. Our frontier there, according to us, is the pass, the watershed, the Shipki La, "La" meaning the pass. That is the frontier and we have stood by it, and if you read many of the documents exchanged between us and the Chinese Government which have been printed as White Papers, it is clearly mentioned; that is our case. The Shipki village is on the other side of the pass. Therefore, even according to us it is not an Indian territory, although Indians may have crossed there for grazing purposes or others. It has not been claimed by us at any time. Therefore, we must keep this clear—the Shipki pass which is the dividing line, which has been and is the dividing line, and the village that is on the other side, a small village.

Then I should make some reference to certain broad features in this

world, because I do feel that unless we keep them in mind, we are apt to form wrong impressions of what is happening. We all realise that when we talk about disarmament, this matter has become of the most urgent consequence because of nuclear weapons and other like weapons. It was important before, but now it has assumed an importance which is quite different from the previous way we looked upon it. Now, nuclear weapons, of course, are a symbol of modern technological development, scientific and technological development, in the wrong way if you like, there you are. The fact is that we live in an era of quite extraordinary change. The world is changing. People talk about space travel and going to the moon and all that. Presumably most people sitting here will in their life time see all these things happening or hear about them. That is only a symbol of the tremendous internal revolutions that are taking place in the technological basis which affect human lives, which are going to affect human lives. And if they affect human lives, they affect human thinking, they affect the social structures we live in. Everything is affected by them. It may take a little time or more time. They affect in the final analysis the ideologies which we proclaim or others proclaim and the slogans we shout. That, as a logical argument, appears to me simple enough. If we live in an age where there are railway trains, our social lives are affected. They become different from what they were in the age when only the bullock cart was the means of travel. If we live in an age of air travel, telegraphs and telephones, our social structure is affected. Everything is affected thereby, apart from the means of production and distribution and all that.

These changes are happening with extreme rapidity. We are relatively backward in it. We are less backward than many other countries in

Asia, but we are naturally relatively backward, and it becomes really a question, if you test these things, how mature a country is in its technological advance. That is the real test, of course other things follow from it.

I am not discussing technology now, I am merely referring to it as affecting and governing international affairs. Of course, in terms of war, war depends on technology. It governs it in regard to so many other matters, it governs it in terms of ideologies that have often powerfully influenced groups and countries. That I should like this House to remember, because we as other countries are apt naturally to function in rather narrow grooves of thought because we have to deal with our day-to-day problems, and so we do not quite realise the astonishing things that are happening all round us which will affect us, which indirectly are affecting us.

I have referred to ideologies and the like. It is not my intention to go into that matter, but it is obvious that even those of us who thought that we had seen the final light and been illumined thereby in whatever sphere it might be, whether in the economic sphere, social sphere or any other sphere, are being affected by these changes. No ideology, no approach, if you look at it from a scientific point of view, can ever be a final approach, because new things come into your ken, new thoughts, new ways, new things which change our minds. We see that happening even in the realm of communism which is supposed to be a very firm and fixed ideology. And that is why I think that much of it has powerfully influenced the world because it represents new thoughts, new approaches in the social and economic sphere. At the same time, it tends to become as rigid in its approach as the old rigidities, whether you call them religious or political or economic. Even just as, nowadays, a new machine which is made, of the latest pattern which is made, by the time it is ready, is slightly out of

date, because something newer has been evolved, so in the realm of thought too which is governed after all by the conditions we live in, by all these developments,—the whole of communist ideology etc. after all is basically a development of the Industrial Revolution; it came afterwards—other things happen. So, these rigidities are going; although all of us may go on using the old rhetorics, the old phrases, the old slogans, the content of it is changing and must change, because if it does not, it does not catch up with the changing world.

Now, look at this thing. There are arguments and there are some discussions. These discussions go on in the minds of people, not in India so much perhaps, but elsewhere, perhaps in India also. What is this peaceful coexistence? What is *Panchsheel*? What is this policy of non-alignment and the like?

So far as non-alignment is concerned, I have talked about it so much, and with the approval of this House, that I do not wish to refer to it much except to say that in spite of this talk and discussion, some people's minds are so closed that they do not understand something that they should understand very easily. That is to say, they imagine that non-alignment is an acrobatic feat, of balancing between two sides, of sitting on a kind of spiked fence, and balancing yourself there. That is a fundamentally wrong way to understand it. It is not a question of balancing; it is not a question of sitting on a fence; it is a question of doing that we consider right, whether it is on this side of the fence or that side of the fence. In fact, it is an attempt to uproot the fence and throw it away. Now, that is a different approach entirely. And I should like this House to appreciate that; it may agree or not; that is another matter, but I should like this House to appreciate that basic thing, that it is not a question of balancing between two groups of Powers or two Powers or two policies or two ideologies. It is a question of trying to do

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

what we think right, and in the process of doing it—and that is a part of doing it—trying to be friendly and co-operative with countries, even though we may disagree with them, because that is the basis of our approach, a freindly and co-operative approach; but then we may express our disagreement, but always in friendly terms. Normally, we avoid condemnation simply because in the world as it is today or in any world, condemnation does not convince; it makes people angry. And there is far too much of anger, and violence and hatred in the world for us to add to it.

Therefore, it should be remembered that non-alignment is a positive policy, not neutrality, not a balancing feat. That positive policy may be sometimes wrong; it might go wrong; that is a different matter; and we can set it right; but we must realise that it is a positive policy. And for somebody to say that you must be on this side or that—that may be his opinion—is against this conception of following an independent policy.

I personally do not understand why a country, any country, should be asked to be on this side or on that side of warring factions, when we do not want war, when we do not agree with those approaches, much less any country like India which is a big enough country, which need not be pushed about. And why should we be pushed about?

Now, take this question of peaceful coexistence. I see arguments, I see it from the newspapers and from other sources that arguments go on as to whether war is inevitable or not, on the theoretical plane and others. Now, if any person or any group thinks that war is inevitable, then, it obviously follows from that that disarmament is nonsense in its view or in the other country's view, because if war is inevitable, then disarmament has no meaning; obviously then,

coexistence has no meaning, peaceful coexistence, because you are inevitably going towards war, and to have peaceful coexistence would push you away from that mentality which prepares for war.

So, this question has intrigued me, when this argument takes place; it does not take place in India, I mean, but elsewhere. That idea of war being inevitable, therefore, has been and is being rejected progressively by a very large number of countries, almost all, you might say. I mention this not because it is a kind of a theoretical approach but because that governs action, that governs the activities of a country which may believe that war is inevitable theoretically; it covers all its activities. And it can never be.....

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): The country which believes that war is inevitable and is arguing about it is a party to peaceful coexistence.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is what I have ventured to point out that the two are incompatible. I am pointing out that. If in theory, at the back of your mind, you believe that war is inevitable and is arguing inevitable conflict between different types of society and systems, then you cannot believe really in peaceful coexistence. You can only believe in that, if you think that war is not inevitable; what I mean is that war is a thing which may come about by accident or by device; that is a different matter, but to think that it is inevitable does shut your mind to the activities fully to prevent it, and this is an incompatible thought, with peaceful coexistence. In fact, it is incompatible with the idea of countries following their different policies in their own ways. I wanted to put that before the House; it is an obvious thing, but I thought that I might place that before the House, because there is a great deal of confusion of thought in this matter. To put it on an entirely

different level, when people talk of siding with this military bloc or that, it exhibits again a strange confusion; when people talk about joint defences and the like—they may be necessary or not necessary; we may argue about it, but—they uproot themselves from the basic foundations of Indian policy, because the moment you think of that, you have given up all the policy that you have adhered to for the last dozen years and more; you may discuss which is the better and which is the worse, but it means giving up your independent policy, giving up your non-alignment policy, for what, for some kind of help that you receive. That is the utmost at which one can put it. Well, there are various types of help, and the best help that one can receive is that of friendly relations with a country. Now, if we want some kind of material help and we think that is essential for us, in the shape of arms etc.—help, of course, we receive from all countries, financial help, credits etc.—that is a different matter; but once you go into the other aspect of help, arms etc. you are inevitably sucked into the military vortex of military thinking; you are inevitably sucked—you cannot be sucked in two vortexes in one side—with the result that that leads to your giving up your basic position, and that leads, again, what is more important, to enmity with the other side. You fall into the cold war area immediately, whether you want it or not.

13 hrs.

Therefore, we should have a little bit of clear thinking on this. If we want to go into the cold war, of course, that is a different matter; but let us not talk about some matters without thinking of the necessary consequences. Personally, I think that the attitude that India has taken up, India's foreign policy of non-alignment, has created a powerful impression on, I would venture to say, almost all countries of the world, the big countries and the small countries. They have appreciated it and they

have found that it offers help to them in the larger context of the world's affairs occasionally.

Even in this matter, as I just mentioned in another sense about the Congo, we are called upon to assist because we are one of the very few acceptable nations left. Suppose there were no acceptable nations left in the world from that point of view. Then what would happen? Conflicting fears, rivalries, jealousies and conflicts.

Therefore, we feel that in spite of many failings etc., the policies that we have pursued in regard to international affairs have served India's cause and the cause of the world and of world peace. I move.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

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

There are some amendments tabled.

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): I move my amendment No. 1.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Baikunth Bazar): I move my amendment No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: This is the same as the first one.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): They all want priority.

Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir): I move my amendment No. 3.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kasliwal.

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah): I am not moving my amendment No. 4.

Mr. Speaker: I will treat all these amendments as moved, so that any one of them may be put to vote, if necessary. Ultimately one may be put to the House.

Shri B. C. Kamble (Kopargaon): I move my amendment No. 5.

Shri Naldurgkar: (Osmanabad): I move my amendments Nos. 6 and 7.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I move my amendment No. 8.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—East): I wish to move my amendment No. 9.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): I move my amendment No. 10.

Shri Jaganatha Rao: I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the said policy.” (1).

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I beg to move:

“That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto approves of the said policy of Government.” (2).

Shri A. M. Tariq: I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the said policy.” (3).

Shri B. C. Kamble: I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the present international situation

and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the policy as laid down in Article 51 of the Constitution of India with regard to promotion of international peace and security; and directs the Government to pursue its foreign policy more fully in conformity with the positive contents of Article 51 of the Constitution of India.” (5).

Shri Naldurgkar: I beg to move:

(1) That for the original motion the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of and endorses the said policy of the Government of India.” (6).

(2) That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the said policy of the Government of India and endorses the efforts made by them in respect of nuclear disarmament and the maintenance of world peace”. (7).

Shri Jaipal Singh: I beg to move:

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

“This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, is of the opinion that the policy pursued so far which aimed at vacating Chinese aggression has been halting and lacks in purposive-

ness and therefore all possible steps be taken to vacate Chinese aggression on Indian territories." (8).

Shri Sadhan Gupta: I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the said policy generally, but is of opinion that active steps should be taken in regard to the following:—

(a) liberation of Goa and other Indian territories under Portuguese occupation;

(b) immediate transfer of *de jure* sovereignty over the former French possessions to India; and

(c) mobilisation of active moral support to the liberation movements of all colonial peoples." (9).

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, regrets,—

(a) that the House has not been taken into confidence in regard to the proposed treaty between India and Pakistan on Canal Waters dispute;

(b) that no steps have been taken to liberate such territories of Jammu and Kashmir from Pakistan which she has occupied by force;

(c) that the country was not immediately informed of

the violation of the Indian border in the NEFA area by the Chinese soldiers on the 3rd June, 1960; and

(d) that no steps have been taken so far to establish full diplomatic relations with Israel." (10).

Mr. Speaker: Both the motion and the amendments are before the House. Hon. Members are aware that in such discussions, I would like to give opportunity to all interests and Groups, big and small alike. Therefore, a limit of time for speeches is necessary. I would urge upon leaders of Groups to restrict their speeches to 20 minutes; I will allow 5 more minutes when necessary. Other hon. Members will take 15 minutes each.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee and Shri Nath Pal rose.—

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): He has just yielded to me.

Mr. Speaker: After such motions, he is supposed to be entitled to speak first.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur): Both caught your eye.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has made a wide-ranging and valuable speech, and it is only natural, because we live in momentous days when, on the one side, there is deep disappointment at the recent breakdown of the Summit Conference and a certain amount of fear for the future and, on the other, there is the phenomenon of the now invincible resurgence of Africa, the remarkable political renaissance that has taken place there and also the premonition of the people coming into their own in different countries of the world as widely separated as Japan and Turkey and Korea and Laos. India's moral weight in world affairs should, therefore, be pulled in the direction that leads to the freedom and happi-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

ness of all the peoples. Even though we are not a great Power, we hold a certain amount of moral prestige and authority.

The hopes centred on the Summit Conference have been dashed for the time being on account mainly of the infamous U-2 incident and the virtual promulgation by the United States of the right of aggression in defiance of all canons of international propriety. There has also been anger against those responsible for the breakdown of the Summit. There are some people even, unfortunately, in our country who have made the flaming anger of Mr. Khrushchev in Paris the main count of their indictment against the Communist attitude of mind, so to speak. On the actual issue at Paris, Mr. Khrushchev was so incontestably in the right that things could only be said against his manner. It is good, however, that in the downfall of the Summit, there was at least one man at the top who was genuinely angry. This blazing anger was a just anger of the common people who cared about the Summit and did not relish the glib, smooth suavity of double-dealing diplomacy.

Anger and disappointment, of course, are not enough in themselves, and it is necessary to move ahead. We have before the United Nations—the General Assembly is going to meet so very soon—the Soviet proposals on disarmament with their emphasis on the destruction of nuclear missiles, banning of the means of delivery of such weapons and dismantling of foreign bases. Efforts in this direction must proceed, and I am very happy that our Government has made statements welcoming the proposals regarding disarmament. I am sure that every step would be taken in the United Nations General Assembly in this regard.

The Prime Minister has pointed out how it is a wonderful pointer of our times that since 1950, a large

number of African States have come into their own as independent entities. Some 24 have come into existence since 1950 and 4 more are to be free within a year. We might, therefore, say that the world's political and moral climate is changing. But in spite of that, diehard colonialism has been up to its pranks in the Congo. There is no doubt at all that spurred on by big-money interests, the Belgian Government had thought of cutting its losses in an effort to save what they could by keeping a grip, through people like Mr. Tshombe, on Katanga, which is so fabulously rich in metals like copper and uranium.

It is a happy thing that Shri Rajeshwar Dayal is going to the Congo in pursuance of an assignment given to him by the United Nations. We know his task is delicate and difficult. We wish him success. But I wish to say in this House that it is necessary for us to beware that a section even of the Indian Press has already supported the confederation demand in the Congo. There have been statements to the effect which suggest that the imperialist elements which are an unconscionably long time in dying would even use the United Nations and would try to fill what they call the vacuum in the Congo. The task of the United Nations, as I see it, is to restore peace, to secure total Belgian withdrawal which certain papers reported this morning was almost completed. If that is so, it is a happy thing and the job of the United Nations is to help the Congolese to stand on their own administrative feet. It is necessary, therefore, for Congo's closest friends in Africa and also in Asia—and I am sure that Congo considers India to be among her closest friends—to try whatever they can to help her so that dissident elements in Congo may come together and the colonialists will not be able to have a finger in the pie.

It is in relation to this that I much regret to have to say that it is a pity

that India has not played an even more active role. It is a pity that the Prime Minister, for example, has not hesitated to be rather profuse in the other House on the last occasion when he discussed foreign affairs in praise of the United Nations Secretary-General. I do not wish to say anything against the Secretary-General; but it does appear from the documents which have appeared in the papers that he definitely retreated before Mr. Tshombe's threat of physical opposition. He tried to treat Katanga on virtually the same terms as the Congo and he was described by the Congo Premier Mr. Lumumba as having made himself, by a unilateral and erroneous decision, a party to the conflict between the rebel government of Katanga and the legal government of the Republic.

I have also been rather disturbed by certain reports of a sort of United Nations Administration in the Congo vested with broad powers and independent of the Congolese government. It is a dangerous idea which has got to be fought and whatever is done has got to be done after complete recognition in tangible terms of the independence and sovereignty of the Congo. It may be that there are many difficulties and that there are dissident elements; may be that the position is very complicated and may be that the settlement sometime later would be rather different from what we envisage. But the Congo people must be left to themselves and must be given only brotherly assistance and not with a view to some kind of interest in the future.

It is in this regard that I again regret to have to say that we have missed the role of our Prime Minister which he used to play so ably earlier. The Prime Minister of our country used to be hailed as the organ voice of freedom in Asia and Africa. Now, we get a feeling these days that, unfortunately, that voice nowadays is very faint, somewhat hushed. I noticed from the proceedings of the other House that he told the other

House that culture and breeding make for the voice being rather low. I quite appreciate that but I feel that when evil has to be pilloried and when people's hearts have to be appealed to—and the Prime Minister knows very well how to do it—dulcet tones are not always enough. Whether in the Commonwealth Conference or elsewhere, lately, he seems to be the sedate statesman rather tired of a long crusade. It is a pity because we wish him to recall his former accents of anti-colonialism and then Africa and Asia landing India's policy, will take him again and India also more closer to their hearts.

I wish, in this connection, to suggest to the Prime Minister that very expeditious steps are taken to see that the newly independent States of Africa get the feeling that we are having, as early as possible, full diplomatic relations established with all those States.

Turning now towards the East, I notice that the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam will complete 15 years of its freedom on the 2nd of September. It is a pity that in spite of the International Commission, in which India has a special responsibility, military build-up is reported to be going on in South Viet-Nam and there are disquieting reports circulated about the United States military advisers being very active in that area. In the neighbouring region, Laos, there is now a progressive government with Prince Souvanna Phouma at its head. I would suggest that we should do whatever we can to recognise it without delay.

This question of full diplomatic recognition reminds me that in regard to the German Republic we do have growing economic and cultural relations but we do not yet have full diplomatic relations. Is it because Bonn, not a very savoury customer, holds a pistol that we do not give full democratic recognition to East Germany? I do believe that something ought to be done in this regard.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Coming nearer home, it is a welcome development that the Prime Minister goes to Pakistan. Whatever our differences, India and Pakistan must be peaceful and friendly neighbours. I fear I have to repeat the familiar charge against the government of our country, the charge of remissness regarding the Portuguese possessions in India which still continue to be a canker. Even Dadra and Nagar Haveli which have liberated themselves are not yet integrated and I do wish the Prime Minister tell the country something more in detail about the steps which, at least, are likely to be taken in the near future, to get rid of the Portuguese canker from our country's face.

In regard to Pondicherry, I do not quite understand why for an indefinite period we should go on waiting on the favour and the good pleasure of France. I do not quite know why in spite of the kind of assurance given by the Prime Minister some time ago, the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has not yet been extended to Pondicherry. (Interruption). Why not take special steps, by some kind of extraordinary proceeding, to permit the representation of Pondicherry in Parliament?

I notice the Madras Hindu, a very sedate paper, suggested that, perhaps, Government ought to take without delay steps in order to give representation to Pondicherry in Parliament and particularly to extend the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to the former French territories.

The other day some questions were asked about Indians in Burma and the citizenship laws which operate there. Also the question of displaced persons came into the discussion. We feel that in spite of our very great friendship with Burma, perhaps, things are not moving fast enough and we are not helping our people sufficiently in that area.

In Ceylon, the new government which has come into power is, certainly, very much more helpful and I do hope that steps will be taken so that we can proceed towards the solution of the problems of the Indians in Ceylon.

In regard to the negotiations which are in progress now between India and China, preliminary to a settlement of our disputes, it goes without saying that all men of goodwill must hope that this question will be resolved peacefully. Whenever we hear of any incidents, it is rather disturbing. But, I think it is good for us to remember that nothing should be said or done to queer the pitch of settlement particularly when the discussions are now proceeding; and as far as the President of our country is concerned, he made a very fine statement the other day expressing his expectation that soon our disputes with China will be resolved peacefully. I say this because whatever the present strain between us—there is no good trying to deny that there is a kind of strain between India and China—India and China are great and mature countries which must put an end to their disputes and work together again for world peace and amity.

I did not wish to introduce any unpleasant element into my speech this morning but I fear I have to refer to what the Prime Minister, speaking in the Rajya Sabha, had said in regard to the party which I represent. The Prime Minister had, I expect one of his temperamental outbursts which were at one time pleasing to the people but which are now unfortunately such as generally placate the reactionaries. He attacked the All India Peace Council which has a large number of very eminent Congressmen and I am sure they can look after themselves. Then he chose to call us, the communists, unpatriotic and anti-national and so on. In these matters it is the people who decide and we should leave it to the people

to find out who are anti-national and who are anti-patriotic. As far as we are concerned, we do not claim the monopoly either of patriotism or of wisdom. If the Prime Minister decides to call us names he does not really hurt us but he discredits himself and lowers the standards of political controversy in our country. It is a fact that we stand by the Prime Minister in relation to his policy of non-alignment a great deal more than most other people. But it remains also a fact that he has a kind of communist phobia which leads him to make some allegations from time to time. I am sorry to have to refer to it but in the Rajya Sabha he did say that communists were roaming about the border areas carrying on a campaign against India.

13:21 hrs.

(Shri Jaganatha Rao in the Chair)
I wish to challenge the Prime Minister to substantiate the charge which he has made. As far as we are concerned it is a crude travesty of the facts conceived at one time in hatred and published with guile.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Does the hon. Member know that first of all I specifically referred to the New Age? I should like to know if that represents the views of the hon. Member and his Party. Secondly, if he wants the names, I can give the names of the people who are in the borders.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, I say definitely that the Prime Minister of the country making a statement in the Rajya Sabha has got to substantiate the allegations or withdraw them. I say definitely that it is a travesty of the facts, repeatedly done over and over again. The Congress President made a speech in Calcutta to the same effect and even Dr. B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister of West Bengal had to contradict it. In the U.P. Assembly, there was an adjournment motion referring to this kind of thing

and it was proved after discussion to be a complete fib. It is a complete falsity a statement which is absolutely devoid of the truth. If agents provocateurs are the people whom he has in mind, I do not know. But the Prime Minister must not be permitted in spite of his being a very great man to make a statement in the House saying that communists are roaming about in the border areas carrying on a campaign against India. We threw out a challenge and we ask him to tell us what is being done and we shall answer it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It has been publicly done by the New Age? Have you any reply to it.... (Interruptions)

Mr. Chairman: The reference is made to the New Age.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The challenge remains anyhow. We are not going to take things lying down even though we do have a full appreciation about the other aspects of the Prime Minister's foreign policy. I regret that I have to say this kind of a thing in this House particularly because the Prime Minister had discussed many matters in regard to which we are very willing to come to terms with him and agree with him.

He has referred to communism being a rigid proposition and he has referred to certain discussions which were taking place. I do not know why the Prime Minister goes on saying that communism is rigid when he surely knows—communists might be weak and they may not be able to understand everything—that they know that theirs is not a dogma but a guide to action which they are trying to interpret from time to time. It is only a good thing that in the international sphere there are discussions now going on as to how peaceful co-existence leading to the abandoning of war can actually be achieved and therefore I say that it is very important that that movement which is led by communists, and the movement which for the achievement of freedom in the countries of Africa, is assisted to the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

greatest extent by the work that the Government of India does. The Government of India has done important work in this regard and we wish them to go faster and give us some satisfaction in regard to the questions and issues which I have brought before the House.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister with his broad historical vision and sweep of imagination has been able to deal with a multitude of problems. It is proper that he should do so since his views and observations on all these burning problems are eagerly and anxiously sought by so many throughout the world. But I feel that the House as a whole should try to address itself, while constantly bearing the wider world perspective in mind, to the problems and issues which concern us directly and which affect us directly and which bear on our own interest. Very often the debates in this House have tended to be disproportionately concerned with the state of relations between the USSR and the United States of America to the utter neglect of our own interests. I am trying to concentrate my own attention on a few matters which are of importance to our country.

The Prime Minister referred to the summit collapse. It is a shattering blow to the hopes and expectations throughout the world of a better future and perhaps some relief from those agonising tensions and fears to which the world seemed to be condemned since the end of the last World War. There has been a return to some aspects of the cold war. But I am not here and I do not have that obsession in these matters that Professor Mukerjee has which makes it easy for him to apportion the blame. But actually if we are very keen and sincere in the pursuit of peace, the best thing to do is not to go on dishing out blame but to see how the atmosphere is created where the resumption of these talks is made easier and not to render it impossible by that

kind of an attitude. Non-the-less, I do venture to hope that inspite of the return to cold war the danger of hot war has not been enhanced and my reasons are scientific in nature. These are: the recovery of the capsule of the United States after it was put in the orbit and the return of the canine passengers of the Soviet spaceship after their triumphant cruise in stratosphere and beyond. These are momentous events which portend a new relationship not only between man and nature but between man and man. These stupendous scientific advances are destined to profoundly affect the course of history. If science in its erratic methods threatened annihilation of mankind as symbolised by the atom and hydrogen bombs, it is conceivable and reasonable to expect that in her more sober moments, as exemplified by these magnificent advances of these two countries, science may liberate us for ever from the perpetual threat of war and annihilation. I, therefore, venture to hope that the two principal contestants having reached a balance of power which has come in our time to replace and supplant the earlier conception of the balance of power and the consequence of a conflagration and conflict being too obvious and too apparent to everybody, perhaps the danger of war has lessened considerably, though not eliminated altogether. None-the-less there is that imponderable and unpredictable element in human idiosyncracies and therefore, I think that it will be at our own peril that we will be weakening our pursuit of peace and slacken the vigilance to guard peace

Having said that, I should like to turn my attention to some immediate problems that concern us directly. The Prime Minister claims that his foreign policy enjoys a broad support in the country. So far as we are concerned, the criticism of that policy and our disagreement with that policy has been occasioned by and limited to certain deviations from that policy of non-alignment, those wavering hesi-

tancies about the duties and responsibilities cast upon those who have embraced non-alignment.

Mr. Chairman, that policy has brought two distinctive advantages to the country whenever it has been honestly implemented. One is a substantial contribution to strengthening of world peace and the other enhancement of our prestige in the world. These are no mean achievements.

But, Sir, our policy is something like our planning. Our planning is very efficient in its conception, woefully deficient in its implementation. The same happens to our foreign policy. Our planners have got accustomed to assuming a 25 per cent deficiency in the fulfilment of the Plan target. Likewise there has been always a deflection of a few degrees from the rigid path of non-alignment, but during the past year or so there has been a more scrupulous adherence, a more scrupulous observance of the rigid disciplines of non-alignment, and to that extent there has been a greater understanding, a better appreciation of that policy in the world.

There are two remarkable developments to which, therefore, I should like to refer. They are the warm, spontaneous reception extended to our President during his recent visit to the Soviet Union and the liberal offer of credits and assistance for the fulfilment of our Plan; and, secondly, the magnanimous gesture on the part of the United States of America in the form of that huge food loan which may relieve this country of the gnawing anxiety of feeding our people during the critical period of the Third Five year Plan. Well, some credit goes, of course, to the drive and energy of the Food Minister, but all these, Mr. Chairman, are definitely the by-products of the foreign policy. And what a change it is from the past when the United States students in order to express their sympathy with this country and to express their protest against those who were stalling the provision of the badly needed wheat in 1951 had to collect each a

handful of wheat and rice, make two bags of them and take them to the Senate House. There has been a progress since that time.

Mr. Chairman, I should like now to turn to an immediate thing and that is, as the Prime Minister said, his proposed visit to Pakistan. We are happy that he is making this visit. Sir, the settlement of the canal water dispute marks the end of one of those problems which have been plaguing our relation with Pakistan. High tributes are due to the statesmen of both sides. This solution means the triumph of patience, faith and perseverance over passions, suspicions and prejudices. I should like to make a specific reference to Mr. Iliff. I think he is the President of the World Bank.

An Hon. Member: Vice President.

Shri Nath Pai: In that case, he should be promoted to presidentship for the magnificent job he has done—Sir, I am told he is the Vice-President. I should like to make a specific reference to him and to his devoted team of officials who in spite of the repeated rebuffs and failures persisted in their anxious efforts till success was achieved.

Sir, there has been a rectification of our boundaries with Pakistan both in the east and in the west. This is, once again, a solution of a naughty problem, and credit is due to Sardar Swaran Singh and his colleagues for their deft handling of this thorny problem, as it is due to his counterparts in Pakistan. All these factors make the visit of the Prime Minister to Pakistan most opportune and, I think, most propitious for starting, perhaps, a new chapter in Indo-Pakistan relations.

Mr. Chairman, our approach to and our appraisal of Pakistan has been conditioned principally, and I think rightly, by the memories of those wounds and injuries of 1947 and also by certain imbalance in the strength of the two countries. During the past 13 years some of these wounds have

[Shri Nath Pai]

been healed and I think India has emerged considerably stronger industrially and otherwise. I feel, taking all these factors into consideration, perhaps, the Prime Minister will be in a position, first, to persuade the leaders of Pakistan about the desirability of signing a "no-war pact" with us and, also, taking those steps which may make it possible to have better, more normal and cordial relations between these two countries. The vast resources which are badly needed for the development of the two countries and the uplift of the common man who suffers equally in both the countries—ours perhaps less because of our planned economy—can then be diverted to more fruitful and useful purposes. I think, Sir, we should not be wanting, we must not be wanting in warmly responding to any genuine gesture that Pakistan may make; it must be warmly and fully responded if it is made genuinely on her side.

Perhaps, Sir, as the first few steps towards that better relationship with that neighbouring country the Prime Minister may also consider the question of abolition of visas and the customs regulations. He, Sir, in his visit, carries the best wishes of the entire House for the success of his mission.

I shall now say a few things about the development in another neighbouring country, that is, Ceylon. We are happy that the Prime Minister of Ceylon is going to visit our country. What has happened recently in Ceylon is a reassertion of Asia's faith in democracy. Many gloomy prophecies were made that democracy was collapsing in Asia and military dictatorship was the final solution. Both Burma and, now, Ceylon have given a fitting reply, nailed down this lie. There is a second thing about this visit. That really symbolises the emergence of the women of Asia. When she comes we will get an opportunity of not only doing homage to the new womanhood in Asia in her form but also such mundane matters as the problem of

Indians in that country will be raised and I think a new approach, perhaps a new solution will be found to that problem.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister, in the other House, referred to conditions in Tibet as 'troubled conditions'. I feel that it is grossly inadequate to refer to what is happening in Tibet as troubled, to refer to that grim tragedy that is being enacted in that unfortunate land as 'troubled conditions'. Mr. Chairman, under the pretext, under the totally absurd and untenable plea of fighting poverty and uprooting backwardness and feudalism an ancient culture is being systematically destroyed and an alien pattern of values is being forcibly imposed upon Tibet. China is guilty in that country, not only of violating her own sacred obligations but also of violating basic and fundamental human rights. Last year, when this issue was raised in the United Nations India remained neutral, abstained from voting. The reasons given for this inexplicable behaviour of our country are that it would have amounted to interference in the domestic affairs of China and, secondly, that it would not have served any purpose. Both these pleas can apply to the question of denial of human rights in South Africa. When persistently, and I think very rightly, India has been championing the cause of human rights in South Africa, we chose to remain neutral on the issue of the rights of the Tibetans in the United Nations. Why? I think this neutrality was a betrayal—if that is a harsh word, we can't help using it of the faith which the Tibetans had placed in this country when they signed that agreement in 1951 with China at the instance of the leadership of this country, the government of this country. Secondly, this neutrality is a betrayal so firmly enunciated when our foreign policy which the Prime Minister so firmly enunciation when he addressed the United States Congress. On that occasion he said that when justice is threatened, freedom menaced or aggression takes place we

shall not and we cannot remain neutral. Did not all these three tests apply to Tibet? Did not all these three factors operate in Tibet? Still we chose to remain neutral. Somehow one gets an impression that too often we are far more worried about China's susceptibilities and China being offended than our own principles and our legitimate interests. This year, we understand that the question of human rights in Tibet will be raised by Malaya and Thailand—two Asian nations—at the United Nations, and I hope that the voice of India will be rallied on the side of the sufferers, the victims, and not be stifled out of fear or deference to the wrong-doer.

I should like to turn to another important issue, that is, China. I am not one of those who hold that the policy of this country *vis-a-vis* China has been wrong *ab initio*. It is not my attitude. Given India's idealism, given our sympathy for China's long suffering, given our admiration for the way she had emerged out of the fiery ordeal and the Chinese professions of friendship and peace and freedom, given our lack of experience of the harsh realities of what is called real politics, this passionate pursuit of peace, friendship and co-operation with China was wholly understandable. What is, however, wrong with that policy is that having received a grim warning when China violated all her obligations with Tibet, we refused to draw the necessary lessons and the necessary inferences. We continued hugging to our heart the China of our own conception the China of our dreams, refusing to see the true visage of China very big and clear. We completely ignored the voice of realism.

What did we do? There was a second warning this time, more direct and more dangerous, when China violated in 1954 our own borders. How did our country react? A mild murmur was raised with China in a note, in an *aide memoire*: perhaps your soldiers have crossed accidentally into our country; perhaps they have forgotten to bring their visas with them

and these are not good manners, good neighbourly behaviour; better manners demand better, etc. I am quoting the contents of the note though not the text. This is how we reacted. So, for five long years we continued this self-deception, completely ignoring the realities with China. One is reminded of the Government of India realising this, that is, the Government of India have suddenly taken, to its bosom and to its heart, the philosopher's adage: see not, hear not, speak not. They refused to see the realities of the aggression. They refused to hear the voice of warning and they refused to speak to the nation about the truth of that aggression. What has happened now? As a result of this unrealistic policy, and partially of course—this is another by-product of that foreign policy—of our having not sufficiently tried to take care of our immediate neighbours, their susceptibilities and their interests, having tended to take them for granted, sometimes, a new situation is developing, and that is, these neighbours of ours are trying to tend to be neutral in the dispute between India and China. I think this is a very dangerous state of affairs.

Recently, three separate agreements have been signed between China and our neighbours who traditionally have been our closest and most faithful allies and if today they begin slightly to waver, who is responsible except this policy of the Government of India? We know that only the day before yesterday, an agreement was signed between Afganistan and China. An agreement has already been signed between Nepal and China. An agreement has been signed between Burma and China. I am not here to sing a hymn of hatred against China. The Prime Minister is easily provoked to anger or to sarcasm when anybody offers the slightest criticism of his China policy. No one can take exception to talks, when he states that the first recourse in the settlement of disputes should be negotiation, to the method of talks. Quite true. But what are we to do if one of the parties

[Shri Nath Pai]

to the dispute first proceeds to do what it wants in its interest, first proceeds to get what it wants and then comes round and professes loyalty to the method of talk and negotiation, and wants to sit down and talk? Is it wrong to ask that fellow, that chap, to disgorge what he has swallowed, what he has grabbed, what he has unjustly seized?

The second aspect of the talks is this. Talks are quite all right; but talks about what? Talks should be confined and should be aimed at the main objective, that is, vacation of Chinese aggression from our territory. Is that what is happening? Is it not a fact that China has successfully sidetracked the main issue of her aggression? Is it not a fact that China today is succeeding in making us acquiesce in her very subtle efforts to convert what is basically a border aggression, a case of aggression into our territory, a border dispute? Are these wrong inferences? Are these unfair inferences?

Let me now refer to the nature and the scope of these talks. This what the Prime Minister told the other House on the 18th of this month:

"As a matter of fact, only last night, an official deputation came from China to carry on talks at the official level about maps, papers, documents, etc., etc."

Extremely good; but not a word about the main issue of aggression; not a word about when and how China is going to vacate our territory. If the talks were directed to those aspects, we should wish well. I say that the Chinese policy of the Government—I am constrained to say, for, one does not say it in happiness, joy or with a feeling of pride but in sorrow, sadness and even humiliation—has failed.

How do I proceed to prove it? What should be the standard that is applied

in establishing the success or failure of a policy? Here again, I shall be guided only by the rigid criterion, the standard, the scale of values, set down for us by the Prime Minister. Speaking on the 16th March on the Demands of his Ministry, this is what he has laid down, and India should always take it to her bosom and follow this text and apply it to this Government and all Governments if we want our salvation. These are his Miltonic words:

"After all, the foreign policy of any country concerns itself primarily with the promotion of its freedom, of its sovereignty, of its integrity. These are the first steps of a foreign policy. And in so far as it is unable to do so, well, it has failed. Whether it has failed because of wrong approaches or whatever the reasons may be, in that measure, it has failed".

I am prepared to accept that definition and that conclusion. I apply that test and ask, "What has happened to our country?" Is it not a sad fact that when on the 15th August, 1960, the Prime Minister unfurled the tricolour and saluted the motherland, the motherland, that is, India has shrunk in her size, smaller than the India we inherited in 1947? Can this ugly fact be completely ignored? This is a sad truth. Earlier, when somebody made some criticism, the Prime Minister accused the Opposition of having proved incompetent to understand the grave issues in regard to China. This incompetence of the Opposition to understand this grave danger is far less harmful than the incompetence of the Government to understand it and to deal with it. Let us remember that China has her own way of solving disputes. Normally, there are two ways of solving a dispute: either by mutually agreed solution or by one of the parties imposing its will on the other party. China unfortunately has always showed a pronounced preference for the second method, a forte for the second type.

Let it not be forgotten that the dispute between China and Tibet beginning with 1911 and continuing till 1951 was basically not a dispute about autonomy, because China always explicitly accepted Tibetan autonomy as is made very clear by her then allies—the United States and Great Britain—in that famous *aide-memoire* of Mr. Anthony Eden, the then Foreign Secretary, and that autonomy was coterminous with *de facto* independence. The dispute then was basically, principally, primarily, about the boundaries of China and Tibet. But how did China solve this boundary dispute? Of course the dispute was solved by dissolving the identity of Tibet, by obliterating the personality of Tibet.

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

Shri Nath Pai: There is another important factor. In the pursuit of her objective, China in her history was never deterred by the price she may have to pay even if that amounts to millions of human lives. During the past 100 years, beginning with 1954 and ending with 1956, 72 million Chinese died in rebellions, in revolutions, in civil wars and in international wars. What a stupendous, staggering figure it is? Are we even now, at this late stage, trying to draw the true dimensions, the full magnitude, of the peril that confronts us? Are we trying at this late stage to improve and show an awareness of this new challenge that has come across the border and which will be staying there, as the Prime Minister rightly pointed out, for a long time. All our thinking and planning for the future must reckon with the presence of this new threat, this new challenge, this new factor. Then only perhaps we will be able to take up those formidable tasks and sacrifices which this new a challenge demands of us.

In this connection, I was a little gratified to have this assurance from him given to Dr. Kunzru:

"All I can say is that we have been not vaguely, but actively, taking steps to this end. Those steps have reached a certain definite stage, which give us an assurance to meet such dangers."

I hope that we will be acting upon it and above all, creating that sense of unity and national strength, which is very necessary, as Lord Montgomery in his analysis of present China has shown, "If China has an edge on us, it is her real unity". Here may I say, I am reminded of a *sloka*. It is from *Raghuvamsa*. This is what the Kavi-kulaguru says:

न वीर्यं गुप्ता मनोर्हे प्रसूति

It roughly means that in the matter of defence, one shall not rely upon either the professions of goodwill of one's potential aggressor nor on the promise of help of one's professed friend, but basically on one's own strength. That is the one thing we must learn when we discuss this China problem and not be merely satisfied by pointing a finger at her obvious mistakes, but basically concentrate on building our own strength.

I know you have rung the bell once. I seldom speak in the House and seldom plead for extension of time. In nine months, this is my second speech. The Prime Minister did refer to Africa. We are all happy about the emergence of an Africa joining in Asia's march towards a better life. It means the whole of mankind coming into its own stature. I am very glad about the part the United Nations is playing and I fully endorse the handsome tribute paid by the Prime Minister to Mr. Hammarskjöld in handling a very delicate and difficult task. Passing of judgments at this time will not help either Congo or the solution of that very difficult problem. The assertion of the authority of the United Nations is a very good thing.

But the Prime Minister talked about Portuguese Africa and I was natural-

[Shri Nath Pai]

ly reminded of Goa. It has become a practice these days to make a ceremonial reference to Goa. 13 long years have passed and every year on ceremonial occasions, lip sympathy is paid to the suffering of the Goans; and in the meanwhile, Portugal goes on with every contempt for us, doing all that she wants in that part. I hope I am wrong, but if I have understood some remarks of the Prime Minister, it was a little extra-ordinary coming from him that he expects that first there will be, as a result of the new forces generated in Africa, a liberation of those—dark parts of Africa—Portuguese Africa—and as a by-product of it, as a consequence of it, perhaps Goa will be liberated. I feel a little humiliated and hurt. What I would have thought would have been appropriate is, when the whole of Africa today is rising, Mighty India would shake this last vestige of foreign rule from her territory, wipe away the blot on her honour and inspire the unhappy Africans under Portuguese rule in Africa. Unfortunately, the order seems to be changed here.

The Prime Minister, in defence of his foreign policy, said the other day that the roots of our foreign policy are in the long past of the country, in the culture of the country, in the spirit of the country, in the consciousness of the country. This consciousness, culture, long past, the spirit of the country, I think, are the common heritage of all of us. I think the culture, spirit, consciousness and the past of a country are not located, I may venture to say, in any individual or group of individuals. Naturally, therefore, those who disagree and criticise some aspects of the foreign policy of the Government definitely deserve better than those expressions of wrath or ridicule, which have become very customary in his approach to those who have the courage of disagreeing with certain aspects of his policy.

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah): Mr. Chairman, within the 15 minutes allotted to me, I thought I would confine my remarks to two major issues, about which the Prime Minister also had been pleased to mention, viz., the question of disarmament and the question of cessation of nuclear tests. But before I go into those questions, I am constrained to reply to certain matters which have been raised by the last speaker. He waxed eloquent about our policy over China. He was speaking in ignorance of a debate that took place in this House on the 29th April over a joint communique that had been issued jointly by our Prime Minister and the Chinese Prime Minister who was on a visit here.

It was pointed out in that debate that our object was a negotiated settlement with China. Probably the last speaker was not present at that time; that is why he was saying all sorts of things—maps are being examined and so on. He forgot completely that one of the conditions of that joint communique was that factual material had to be examined. He waxed eloquent again and said, we are losing friendship with our neighbouring countries. Just because Afghanistan had entered into a treaty of friendship with China, is that the reason why our relations with Afghanistan are going to be affected? He said, we are losing friendship with Nepal. Why? Just because Nepal has entered into a treaty of friendship with China! It is an amazing thing. He went on further and said, because Burma has entered into an agreement with China, therefore our relations with Burma are going to be affected. I cannot understand the argument how our good relations with our neighbouring countries are going to be affected if they have solved their own problems with China in a spirit of peaceful negotiation and in a spirit of accommodation.

There is one other point in connection with our China policy and that is contained in substitute motion No. 8.

That motion has been sent by nine Members. It says:

"that the policy pursued so far which aimed at vacating Chinese aggression has been halting and lacks in purposiveness...."

I want to know in what respect our policy is halting. The House accepted that joint communique. There was a debate and the House practically unanimously endorsed the policy of the Government in that respect. I do not understand where the question of a halting policy comes. It is in the nature of things that where there is a negotiated settlement, there are no short-cuts. It is in the nature of things that a negotiated settlement is bound to take a long time. Both parties sit down and talk to each other in a spirit of friendliness. I cannot understand how these Members are in a position to say that our policy has been halting.

They again say that our policy lacks in purposiveness. How? The very object of these negotiations is to vacate the Chinese aggression. If they want to suggest that we should take other means—as they have suggested in the latter portion of the motion—let them say so. Let them come forward and openly and plainly say that they do not believe in these negotiations and let us take military action or things of that sort. But they dare not say that.

14 hrs.

Having said that, I want to come to these two questions of disarmament and cessation of nuclear tests. After the failure of the Summit Conference, it was thought that the 10-nation committee which had been meeting in Geneva on disarmament will continue to function. But, somehow, a month later the Soviet Union walked out of that 10-nation committee and the talks broke down. The long story of the disarmament talks in the last ten years has been tortuous, and I want to give the House a few dates on that.

In 1957 when talks were going on in London between the four parties to

the disarmament conference, they were very close to an agreement. They were so close to an agreement that some journalists even remarked that they were perilously close to an agreement. But, later on, what happened? All the four powers who were parties to that committee, for reasons of their own, took divergent stands. In 1950 when there was a meeting on conventional armaments, the Soviet Union walked out of that conference. In 1955, the Western bloc, that is, the United States and the United Kingdom, made certain proposals, and when those proposals were accepted by the Soviet Union, they resiled from them, which was an extraordinary thing. In the talks on conventional arms they adopted an equivocal attitude. In 1957 when the matter went up to the United Nations and the Soviet Union tabled a resolution for a disarmament commission of all the members of the United Nations, that resolution having failed, the Soviet Union declared that they would take no more interest in disarmament talks. In 1958, however, as a result of our efforts, disarmament talks were again resumed. The failure of those disarmament talks is really a crisis of confidence, I should say, and if there can be no real confidence without disarmament there can certainly be no real disarmament without confidence.

The Prime Minister was pleased to say in the other House on the debate on foreign affairs that he would like to have a balanced approach to these talks. What did he actually suggest by a balanced approach? I think he meant that no one side should have a military advantage over the other. You will recall, Sir, that during the last few days the disarmament commission met, which was an emergency session, and again the resolution which we had tabled along with five other nations was unanimously adopted. And what was the resolution? That resolution urged upon all parties for continued efforts for the continuation of international negotiations on disarmament. I must congratulate

[Shri Kasliwal]

the Government on the passing of that resolution. Now the matter rests at that, and I believe and pray that in the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly—as the Prime Minister has been pleased to say, it is going to be an important session—this question of disarmament will be solved.

Now I go to another question, and that is the question of cessation of nuclear tests. The Geneva talks on nuclear tests were recessed as they did not produce any results. We were told that in the beginning some progress was made. We were told that there was a treaty, which was under discussion, and 17 clauses of that treaty out of 22 clauses had been agreed upon. But it appears that those 5 principal clauses were not agreed upon. Subsequently, an extraordinary thing happened, and that was, during the pendency of those talks one of the great powers, the United States, said that they were going to resume underground tests. The Soviet Union, who was invited at these tests as observers, rightly rejected the invitation. They wanted advance information about what kind of device the U.S. were going to detonate. They wanted advance information about the object of those underground tests and they wanted to have the charts, maps etc. about that detonation. The United States refused to supply them. And what did the Soviet Union do? The Soviet Union said, probably as a counterblast or as a counter measure that if the United States was going to resume these tests, then they were also going to resume these tests, which is a very unfortunate position. I say that so long as the Geneva talks have not broken down, so long as it is under the auspices of the General Assembly resolution that these talks have been held, so long it is not open to any of these powers to resume tests and it will be illegal and immoral on their part to resume the tests.

You will see that although they threatened to resume these tests, they

have not resumed these tests. The world opinion is so strong that none of these powers, however strong it may be, dare resume these tests. The House will recall that in 1954 the Prime Minister apprised the world as a whole of the dangers of atomic radiation and he sounded a clarion call for a standstill agreement on these tests. Subsequently, in 1957 history was created in this House when a resolution, which the Defence Minister moved on the suspension of these tests, was unanimously adopted in this House. And armed with that resolution the Prime Minister addressed appeals both to the leaders of the United States and to the leaders of the Soviet Union, and those appeals evoked affirmative response. I am very happy to note that even now the Government have taken care to see that the item "Suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapon tests" is included in the provisional agenda of the United Nations General Assembly, and they have said that their objective is to have controlled cessation of nuclear tests. I am very happy to note that the Government have not slackened their vigilance over this very great issue which threatens the very existence of humanity.

I will take just two more minutes and will refer to one other question, and that is the attitude of France. You will recall that here in this House some important questions were put when France detonated for the first time its own atomic device, and France did it against world opinion. And today France wants to detonate a hydrogen bomb, which is a very bad thing. I really do not know how those powers which are not associated with the Geneva talks are going to be controlled. You will recall that when last year this matter came up before the General Assembly some delegates had said that if an agreement took place at Geneva between those three powers, the other powers would be prepared to give an undertaking that they would adhere to such an agree-

ment. I do not know whether France has given an undertaking but I would suggest to the Government that they should consider whether France should not also be associated with these talks. With these remarks I express appreciation of the way Government have handled their external affairs during the last quarter or so.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): Just now the previous speaker referred to disarmament. I think it is a good thing that the Government of India is pursuing a policy of disarmament, and it is giving high priority to it. But, at the same time, I think our most vital question today is our northern frontier. The Prime Minister said that if anybody thinks that war is inevitable, then disarmament has no meaning and, similarly, co-existence has no meaning. I quite appreciate it. But disarmament is meant for nations who are well-possessed of arms. For the world powers which are having enough armaments with them it is a good thing.

We must join in their voice to reduce armaments. There I agree. But to say that this is the only vital question for India is not correct. I think the most vital question for India is our northern boundary. This I say because so far, that is, up to 1947, from the beginning of history the mighty Himalayas and the Tibetan plains had separated India and China. Both these giant nations were thousands of miles apart due to the Himalayas and Tibet. There the three big empires were meeting, namely China, the British Empire of India and Russia. They were always carrying on manoeuvres to let the other down. But never in recorded history up to 1950 did China succeed in eliminating the boundary of Tibet. There were occasions when the Tibetan rulers reached Peking, defeated the Chinese Emperors and took tributes from them.

I do not want to go into history because the time at my disposal is

limited. But today, the events which occurred after 1947 and the success of the Communist Party there have brought the Chinese up to our frontiers and the fact that we were kept apart was eliminated from the picture. Not only Tibet was erased from the political map of the world but we were put in a situation where the Chinese today are in a position to challenge us not only on the border but inside also. To say that the Chinese are not in a position to influence the smaller nations is a completely wrong inference. Had our power been to the same extent which it was previously—I mean the power of the Government of India because at that time the British Government was here—Burma, Nepal or Afghanistan would at least have consulted us before entering into pacts with China. Today they directly enter into pacts with China without prior consultations. They are very friendly nations to India and I welcome their friendship, I want that our friendship should become more and more strong. Though Nepal entered into an agreement with China in March this year, still you know of the incident that occurred in Mustang. The Nepalese Prime Minister has said that Kore Pass lies three miles into the territory of Nepal but the Chinese violated that pact, came down to Kore Pass, killed a Nepali and arrested some other persons.

Today the hon. Prime Minister said that the Chinese have sent a reply to our protest saying that nine Chinese came to cut bamboos and were misled by a fog etc. This, I think, is an indication of the effectiveness of our administration there in NEFA. It is argued and it is said, which is correct also, that in NEFA we are having an adequate administration. But these nine men came down to Takshanmath and later on returned. You can imagine yourself what would have been the condition of nine Indians if they had gone four miles north of our border. Would the Chinese patrol personnel have allowed nine Indians to enter four miles into Tibetan territory? They would

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

never have allowed them to go four miles into their territory. They would have apprehended them and put them into jail. Whatever it may be, if the Chinese say this, let us know what the correct position is. What is the version of India? Were they bamboo cutters, ordinary men or were they really military men who came to watch our movements there in that area? Takshanmath is not an ordinary centre. It has a Buddhist temple which is very much revered by the Buddhists in those areas. Not only people in the NEFA area but Bhutanese and Sikkimese also and people from great distances go there on pilgrimage. Therefore I want that such areas should be adequately guarded. It should have been the business of our patrol personnel to chase those Chinese at least up to the frontier and to see as to what the condition of that area was.

The second point was regarding this Shipki La. It is a fact for certain that Shipki village was established by the Indians or by the villagers of Namadia village. Namadia is in our territory in Himachal Pradesh. The new village is there on the La, that is, on the Shipki La pass. It is good that whatever does not belong to us, we say that it is Tibetan. I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister said so. But what is the position according to our White Paper? The first statement regarding it is this. I quote:

"The first of these incidents occurred on the 10th September, when a party of Indian border police on its way to the shipki La Pass sighted a party of Chinese Military personnel on the Indian side of the frontier. . . . During this conversation, the Chinese Commander intimated that he had 'received instructions from the Tibetan Government that the border extended up to Hapsang Khad and that Indian personnel should accordingly not advance beyond Hapsang Khad.'"

Hupsang Khadis two miles on our side of Shipki La. Further, it says:

"On the 20th September at about 4-45 A.M., a party of 27 Indian Border Security Force came face to face with a party of 20 Chinese troops and officers two miles on the Indian side of the Shipki La Pass. The Indian Commanding Officer asked the Chinese Officer to withdraw his troops. The Chinese Officer replied that he had received no further communication from his Government. He added that meanwhile his instructions were clear, namely, to patrol right up to Hupsang Khad, and in carrying these out he was prepared to face the consequences. He concluded that if the Indian party went beyond Hupsang Khad he 'would oppose it with arms.'"

It is good that India recognised that Shipki La village belongs to China, but what about Hupsang Khad? Does it not belong to India? If it does, why did we fail in liberating this village from the hands of the Chinese?

I was saying that after 1947 and after the coming into existence of the Communist regime in China, events took place which brought the Chinese face to face with India. Our men were challenged in Ladakh. 12,000 sq. miles of our territory was occupied by the Chinese. Therefore smaller nations like Nepal, Bhutan and others naturally feel as to what would happen to them. Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim are Himalayan Kingdoms. They were never in physical contact with China. Ethnically, culturally and economically they were always with us. Up to 1947 not only did they not have any contact with China in any physical sense but in other ways also. They had no access to China. But the events which took place have brought the Chinese near Nepal—I would even say in Nepal because Kore Pass lies three miles inside Nepal.

The influence of China extends up to just near Bhutan and Sikkim also. So a situation has been created where ideologically also there is a conflict. There is a conflict of ideas, between the Communist ideas and the Indian ideas, not only in India but in Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim also. This will reverberate in other countries of Asia also. The Chinese have come here and have started building roads. They have already built roads up to Nepal, Butan and Sikkim borders, and inside our country in Ladakh. They are connecting Longju also by road. These three Himalayan Kingdoms are not so dependent on us. With the turn of events, they are bringing railway to Lhasa. Naturally, economically also they will be dependent on them if the Chinese go on succeeding in this way.

In the wake of Independence, we find two things. First is the entanglement with Pakistan in Kashmir. Today, big leaders like Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan say that we should disentangle our forces from there and then guard our frontiers. I do not believe in such things. When the Prime Minister said about joint defence, I quite agree with him. Because, any nation's power depends upon its effectiveness in safeguarding its entire border, be it north or south or towards Pakistan or Burma or anywhere. Our strength should be developed in such a way that no nation dares challenge our authority. Even if today there is a thinking in Government circles also that we can work only on one side of the frontier, I totally repudiate it. If there is any thinking of this nature in our Ministry, that should be changed. Because, the country wants personnel to defend all the frontiers. They need not hesitate that if a situation has arisen today, India cannot take the challenge. The people of India will give you their hand. The Government should not depend upon the advice tendered by Private Secretaries. You have to depend on the advice of the people of

India and look to them for guidance. Do not look in your own room for guidance. That is the difficulty with our country. The moment we start dealing with the people, we will get power enough to check any advance of the Chinese and also liberate the areas which have been occupied by the Chinese.

The northern frontiers of India today are not the frontiers of the pre-1947 period. They have become totally vulnerable, vulnerable in the sense because genocide has been committed by the Chinese in Tibet. You know what is the condition. We see Tibetans coming like swarms from that area: small children of one week and two weeks are coming. I think they are bent on killing their culture and their Buddhist religion. We need not study our northern frontiers and the cultural situation there also through foreign eyes, because we are having some advisers who are not Indians. I do not say that we should not have foreign advisers. If they are good people, we should have them. What has been done by our Government to study the cultural and other conditions, economic conditions and the poverty of the people in our northern frontiers? When I say that we need not depend on their private advices, I say you must train an army of non-officials and spread them over the entire frontier, in the southern areas and in Goa also to study the conditions there and report to the Government what steps should be taken. We do not know this Takshanmath where it has been alleged by the Chinese Government that nine bamboo cutters came. That is one of the most important maths of that area. Very few people know this. Many Bhutanese are here in India. They know more about India than Indians know about Bhutan, because we have become habituated to flying in the air and we never walk on the earth. When I say about these things, I sincerely mean that in 12 years we could have trained not only hundreds, but thousands of diplomats and we could have trained so many non-officials who have taken courage

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

and gone anywhere. What is the number of non-officials who have been trained? This is one of the biggest lacunae of the Government. We need not depend only on Members of Parliament. There are 400 million people outside in the country and talent is outside also. You must recruit them and send them to our borders.

To say that these are difficult areas is, also I think, not a good account of the situation. All these difficult areas are visited by ordinary people. When I say that our northern frontier is the most strategic place in the world, from our point of view, I say so because our diplomats have given superfluous attention to this area. They have not studied it. They have not gone there. They are not even prepared to go and work there, to understand the problems and to stay there for a few months together. One hour's visit and photography won't serve the problem. We are face to face with a great problem.

When we talk about disarmament, there are two powerful nations. But, disarmament today depends on the policy of China also. I want that we must have cordial relationship with China and the Chinese people. What is China today? It is a huge population; they have a huge army and ruthless leadership. They have one of the most efficient and largest armies in the world. If you are going to meet them, you must prepare here people of that nature, a disciplined nation like that and a discipline and efficient army also. I have every hope that the people of India and the army of India can give the finest account of themselves in meeting any challenge which may come from any quarter.

The Chinese are today practising a policy of irredentism. They want to go all over the territories which surround them. That is what they are doing because on no side of China, on no border of China there is any danger. Previously, they were afraid of

Mongolia. In Mongolia they pursued a policy which may be liked by the people of Tibet. They never invaded Tibet. They also pursued a policy towards India and the Himalayan Kingdoms in the light of Tibet. But, all these things have changed today. So, it is necessary that we should change our stand in that light because we are facing one of the mightiest powers, a power which is armed to the teeth. If you have to guide the destiny of 400 million people, that guidance will depend on the proper protection of the border. The moment you fail in protecting even an inch of your border, that would create demoralisation and that demoralisation is there. So, from the cultural point of view, from the economic point of view, all the areas from Ladakh to N.E.F.A. should be developed. All our rivers come from these areas. The economy of other States is also dependent on these rivers. I think that aspect of the matter should also be taken into consideration..

We are having very close relations with Bhutan. Bhutan is a nation of very fine people. It is also having a very fine administration. There are so many rivers and other things and so many natural potentialities that have to be properly tapped. And I believe that the people of Bhutan and their administration will tap their resources and that they will march shoulder to shoulder with India. But we should also be alert and vigilant, because if we neglect our own responsibility then we will be failing in our duty.

I want to say a word regarding Goa, because I want to be concrete in this matter. To say that something should be done is, I think, not enough. Because, lakhs of people of Goa are in Bombay and in other parts of India, and they are our own nationals. It is really a matter of great regret that nothing has been done in regard to Goa so far even though we are now in the thirteenth year of our inde-

pendence. We can straightway declare them as Indian citizens. A suggestion was made that people from Pondicherry should also be given representation here, as also people from Nagar Haveli and Dadra. We should give them representation, not only representation, we should enable them to stand on their feet. And at least now we must recognise the independence of Goa and allow them to form any government, wherever they like to. In that way we will be hastening their freedom.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): May I seek a clarification from my hon. friend? While I was entering the House I heard him to say that we are looking to the border question through foreigners' eyes and are guided by foreigners' advice. May I know what he means and whom he refers to?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I said that regarding the cultural aspects of the northern border, the people there are mostly Buddhists, and you can go and see. My learned friend Shri Khadilkar is very much experienced, he knows much more than myself, and he knows how we are guided from Nagaland, NEFA and other places, who is our guide, who is our special adviser. He should himself study and find out, and I would like that for understanding all these problems you must depend upon your own people and go there and see for yourself rather than depend upon others.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the broad policy of peace, non-alignment and peaceful co-existence which have been guiding the government of this country. I may say that during the last few years this policy has been progressively adopted by more and more governments of the world. Time was when wars were raging in Korea and Viet Nam and battle drums were being sounded on our frontiers with Pakistan.

14.33 hrs.

[SHRI HEDA in the Chair]

Our Government, in spite of all provocation, has remained firm with its policy of peace and non-alignment, with the result that today the principles of *panchsheel* and peaceful co-existence are not only being adopted in many countries of the East but also in the West, even by those countries which are allied with the opposite camps. It was interesting to see both the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, and also the Prime Minister of the USSR, Mr. Khrushchev, both going round the world on a pilgrimage of peace. The things that we hear these days like a committee to enquire into the stopping of atomic tests, disarmament commission, summit conference, these things were not on the agenda many years ago. It is only now when the big governments have realised the utter futility of embarking on any aggressive action that they have come to realise the sovereign necessity of adopting this policy of peace and mutual co-existence.

Well, Sir, while this policy has been succeeding all round the world and is being adopted by different countries in the East and the West, in America, Europe, Africa and Asia, we are faced with grim prospects both on our north-eastern border as well as our north-western border. It is no good principle which does not stand the test of strain. Our policy of peace has been first tested in our relations with Pakistan. It is good today to sing the hymns of peace with Pakistan and to offer a "no war" agreement with Pakistan. That has been offered long ago by our Prime Minister on a silver platter to the Pakistan Government.

But memories are short in politics. Time was when the invasion of Kashmir was fresh on our minds. And what has happened in Kashmir? Even today large chunks of Indian territory—and we claim the whole of Kashmir as our territory, as the territory of India—large chunks of this territory

[Shri Yajnik]

are in the occupation of Pakistan. And there has been often trouble on the "cease fire" line in Kashmir. There have been military formations and military equipments swarming on the Pakistan border, and there have been many groups and persons in India who have been repeatedly asking the Government to take up a tough line with Pakistan. Why should Pakistan continue to occupy Indian territory for all these years? Why should Pakistan go on fomenting trouble in the part of Kashmir that is now being governed by India? There have been explosions. There have been cases filed for conspiracy with agents of Pakistan. Pakistan underground has been active in India. All these matters notwithstanding, the Government of India, guided by our Prime Minister, has firmly taken to the line of peace.

There was this military alliance or military treaty between Pakistan and the United States. That brought renewed strength to the arms of those who wanted to involve India with some other powers. Nevertheless, this Government has stood firm like a rock and has not either made any abject surrender to Pakistan or gone about seeking any aid from any other camp.

And we see today that there is a turn in history which has made for a change in the whole atmosphere of our relations with Pakistan. Today even the Pakistan Government feels that there is a fresh breeze of amity and concord between the two countries and they have gladly come to demarcate the boundaries in the east and the west. Two teams have been working in peace and concord and harmony. The canal waters treaty is almost on the point of being signed. With regard to the canal waters treaty I may say that there are whisperings that I have heard that India has conceded too much and is going to offer crores and crores of rupees for the loss of some canals, while we have not got much for all the territories

that have been occupied in Kashmir and for all the property that has been left in Pakistan. I hear warnings to be vigilant about the terms of the canal waters treaty. However, the fact remains that with the help of the World Bank, a mutually agreed draft is in the process of being finalised, and our Prime Minister is going next month to Pakistan at the invitation of the President of Pakistan.

Shri Jaipal Singh: (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am sorry for interrupting my hon. friend. It is very interesting and I think more people should hear what he is saying. I regret there is no quorum.

Mr. Chairman: The bell is being rung.

Now there is quorum. The hon. Member, Shri Yajnik, may continue.

Shri Yajnik: I was saying that our Prime Minister is going to Pakistan to sign this canal waters agreement with the best wishes of the people of this country, and while there, he will naturally discuss all matters that are outstanding today between the two Governments. I do not know if he will open any talk about the explosions that are being engineered from the Pakistan side in Kashmir. I do not know if the Kashmir question will be discussed at all, but it is possible that apart from the canal waters agreement many more things will be discussed informally between the two statesmen.

A suggestion has been made that the question of Kashmir should be settled by negotiation and discussion, and war should not be in the picture at all, and that is why a section of the press and some eminent leaders have been asking the Prime Minister to offer once again what he had offered before but in vain, offer once again to Pakistan a no-war agreement. At that time the Prime Minister of Pakistan had stated that they would sign the agreement after the Kashmir question had been settled

The question of Kashmir is still outstanding and yet if there are friends, eminent leaders and publicists in India who are asking for a no-war agreement, I say it is a sign of the times, it is a sign of the new air of amity and concord that is developing between India and Pakistan. I also appeal to the Prime Minister, and I think the whole House will join me when I say this, to offer a no-war agreement again to the Pakistan Government. It is up to them to accept it. I think they will. If they accept it, it will again start a new era in our relations with Pakistan, and then naturally the customs union and other matters will be discussed and will be facilitated further.

In our relations with Pakistan, our policy of peace has stood the test. All grumbings and campaigns for a tough line with Pakistan have not helped so much as our peace policy, and today the Prime Minister is going with the best wishes of the country to Pakistan, and he will probably inaugurate a new era of peace and concord with Pakistan.

Now, look at the other side. Remember that Pakistan also has gobbled up and swallowed large chunks, thousands of square miles of Indian territory, territory inhabited by thousands of persons, having rivers, waterways and so on. Look also at the other picture of our trouble and our conflict with China. Nobody should minimise the extent of our conflict with China. Whatever be the past, there is no doubt that China has committed aggression, that thousands of square miles have already been occupied by the Chinese, and many more thousands are being claimed by the Chinese as their own. Luckily, the death of a few soldiers on our frontier has reverberated throughout the land, and awakened the people to the iron realities of the situation. It is all to the good. The military is now wide awake, new roads are being built, more money is being sanctioned, the Prime Minister and the Defence Minister are going to Ladakh, Bhutan

and other places. We are building better relations with Sikkim and Bhutan. A delegation went to Bhutan. Our relations with Nepal are closer than ever before. The Prime Minister made a statement in this House that an attack on Nepal would be considered an attack on India. It is all to the good. We have to be wide awake, to strengthen ourselves, to strengthen our armies, to strengthen our moral and material power. At the same time, here also, as in the case of Pakistan, the Prime Minister stands firm like a rock on the policy of peace, non-alignment and peaceful co-existence.

There are voices heard here and there, in this House and in the press, asking for a firmer and a tougher line with China forgetting all that has happened in regard to Pakistan. The Prime Minister of China has been here. Official teams of both sides have got together to settle the data, the graphs, the charts and the maps, to collect all the material, so that the two Prime Ministers and their officers may get together again and settle to mutual satisfaction the problem of our boundaries. Meanwhile, it is all to the good that there can be no further encroachment. The limit of encroachment has been definitely defined. There will be no more encroachment, that is certain. Even the Prime Minister of China had to come down knowing full well how unwilling the people of India were to receive him, seeing the seriousness of the feelings generated in the country by the brutal acts of his militia men.

If we adopt one line with regard to Pakistan, I am sure we have to adopt the same line with regard to China, which again has gobbled up large tracts of our territory. But as the Prime Minister has said, we will negotiate and negotiate to the bitter end, because the alternative is war and we do not want war. There shall be no war. There shall be no war between India and Pakistan, and there shall be no war between India and China. That is the determination

[Shri Yajnik]

of our Prime Minister, of our Government. If it has paid dividends with regard to Pakistan, I do not know why, given firmness, statesmanship and the mass support of the people, it should not pay dividends on the northeastern side of our frontier.

It was stated that the people of Bhutan and Sikkim are almost now turning towards China more than to India. I do not believe it. They are as well with India now, as they were with us before. In fact, the Government of India are giving large grants and loans to these Governments to develop their communications with India and their trade and commerce.

A reference was made to the pact of China with Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia; I think Indonesia was not mentioned. Burma has made a pact with China. What is wrong about it? We want settlements to be made of all outstanding questions. There were border disputes there, and probably, China had committed aggression. There was a military regime in Burma; it was a military chief who went to China. He was a realistic man. I say that when India was awakened, probably from the period of slumber, to the iron realities of the situation, and was up and doing, China thought it best to settle up all outstanding questions with the smaller neighbours first. I say that this settlement with Burma has something to do with what our Government have been doing. The settlement with Burma was speeded up because of what happened in India, because of the firm line, friendly but firm line that was taken by the Government here.

Ceylon is on trade relations with China. So is the case with Indonesia. In Indonesia, the Government actually ordered the Chinese settled in the villages to leave the country or to leave for the cities, that is, to leave their traditional shop-keeping in the rural areas. After some hesitation, and after some controversies had

continued for some time, ultimately China had to yield and eat her humble pie, because, after all, Indonesia was dealing with people that were settled in its country; and China has been removing in its own boats Chinese nationals who were opting for their native land. There are many others staying there, but Indonesia has taken a firm line, to which China has had to agree, and the whole process of migration is being conducted peacefully.

Now, there is this treaty with Afghanistan. What is wrong about it? China feels that it is after all in Asia. India is the biggest country in Asia, except for China. And China has set about making friends with all the small countries and settling up its longstanding quarrels with them in a give-and-take manner. For instance, in Burma, China had to give up some territory; it may have got some little territories instead, but it had to give something, if it took something. There had to be bargaining. Settlements were arrived at and have been ratified by both sides.

Settlements have also been arrived at with Nepal. I believe that the strength of India being behind Nepal has also compelled or induced the Chinese Government to settle up their questions with Nepal quickly, before it is too late.

I only plead that let there be no two standards in our foreign policy. There is only one standard, and that is of peace, non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. We shall deal with China as we have dealt with Pakistan. Let them not be put into two categories. One is ruled by a military clique, another by communists. We have no truck with the one or the other. But at the same time, this country looks upon all its neighbours as friends. We have borne patiently with Pakistan for years and years and allowed even some questions in Kashmir to be frozen up, even then, our Government have not lost pati-

ence, and now it is getting dividends.

I am sure that if with the winter there is freezing on the Himalayas, a thaw also comes with spring; and I am sure that if there is freezing today, if the problems have been frozen today with China, a thaw will come inevitably, and there will again be a new atmosphere of peace and concord between the two sides.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): If there is one problem that hangs over the heads of the millions of the inhabitants of this globe, if there is one problem that overshadows every other problem, it is the problem of disarmament. It is the problem of putting an end to the threat of the nuclear war, and that is a part of the thinking of so many persons in this world. It is a pity that the Summit Conference did not come up. I do not want to go into the reasons for its failure. I do not want to say that somebody got angry and others kept their patience. I do not want to sit in judgment upon the reactions of anyone. But I think that with the calling off of the Summit Conference, the hopes of millions of people in this globe were dashed to the ground. It is a great tragedy, greater than the First World War and greater than the Second World War, that befell the peoples of this world.

14.57

[**SHRI JAGANATHA RAO** in the Chair]

Therefore, the major problem that the world faces today is the problem of calling a Summit Conference. I know people have been talking about the Red Summit Conference; people have been talking about the Summit Conference of some sections of the globe. There have been all kinds of suggestions. But I believe that a Summit Conference is the greatest possible need of the day, and it should be called not only with the help of those countries which have atomic know-how, which have nuclear weapons, the Big Powers of the world, but it should also be with the help of—if I can put it very mildly—those countries (to use an expression which

the Prime Minister used this morning) which are acceptable countries.

I believe that the problem of disarmament will never be solved unless there are some countries represented at that conference, which can be described as acceptable. I would, therefore, suggest that the UN should take up this problem again, and that the Summit Conference should be called into being as early as possible. Allied with that problem is the problem of disarmament.

I am very happy that my country was responsible for sponsoring a resolution, along with other countries, for calling the UN Disarmament Commission. It is true that the resolution as it was passed ultimately was in an amended form, but I believe that this is a great tribute to the peaceful intentions of my country that this resolution should have come from my country at the UN.

15 hrs.

Now, I believe that that resolution about the United Nations Disarmament Commission should be put into effect. All urgent measures should be taken so that disarmament gets out of the region of controversy, out of the arena of debate and discussion and out of the area of conflicting theories, and gets into the region of practical politics. I do not want to sit in judgment upon the proposals of disarmament put forward by one bloc of nations or another bloc of nations. I believe that it is very difficult to find a short cut to this disarmament problem. It is not possible to simplify this problem. Ultimately, this problem has got to be tackled by stages. If I can use the expression, there is no way of cutting this Gordian knot of disarmament. This Gordian knot of disarmament has to be loosened gradually and slowly with patience and in the spirit of statesmanship.

I would, therefore, think that these are the two most urgent problems of the world and I believe that the United Nations General Assembly which

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

is going to meet soon will address itself to them and that the voice of our Prime Minister, who has always been for disarmament and for a Summit Conference, would be heeded and the world will be rid of fear and apprehension.

Now I come nearer home. I know that in one of his interviews the President of Pakistan accused our country of lack of responsiveness. I also know that in his broadcast to the nation on Independence Day, he said something similar. But I believe that this talk was not based upon facts. It is because our Prime Minister has accepted his invitation to go to Pakistan and stay there for five days in order to sign the Canal Waters Agreement. I believe that that agreement is a triumph of the policy of egotiation. No one ever thought that this canal waters dispute would come to an end. This dispute was discussed sometimes on the floor of this House when our tempers ran very high. But the patience of the World Bank Vice-President, the patience of our country and the patience also of Pakistan—the combination of the patience of all these three forces—have brought about a settlement that some persons thought was impossible of achievement. If patience can bring about a settlement of that dispute, I have no doubt that it will bring about also the solution of our Kashmir dispute with Pakistan. So, if our policy of negotiation has justified itself in this very very big problem, I hope it will justify itself also when we deal with China or with any other country. I believe that this policy is going to pay us rich dividends. Of course, I know that our Prime Minister will discuss several problems with Pakistan. There have been frequent goings-on between the Pakistan officials and officials of my country. There have been some meetings also on the ministerial level. All these things have been going on. But there is one thing; no meetings have taken place for some time between the Minister of Rehabilitation of Pakistan and the Minister of Rehabilitation of

my country. I wish that this two-way traffic should also begin because there are so many outstanding problems of the refugees from India and the refugees from Pakistan, and I believe that a solution of them is called for as early as possible. All these problems are there and we shall succeed in solving them, given goodwill, patience, statesmanship and the goodwill of our friendly countries on both sides. I believe the basic problem with Pakistan will be solved only when Pakistan subscribes to the no-war declaration which was suggested to that country by our Prime Minister. If that no-war declaration is signed between Pakistan and my country, I have no doubt that all the problems between these two countries will offer themselves for solution sooner or later.

Therefore, I would urge upon the Pakistan Government and the enlightened President of Pakistan that he should consider this, and our Prime Minister should come back after signing this no-war declaration.

I come now to Indo-Ceylon relations. Of course, I think my country has always been very generous in recognising the talents and the gifts of the Indian women. We have given them equality. There is no doubt about it. But I must say that the matchless gifts of leadership shown by Mrs. Bandaranaike are an example for the whole of this world. I want that she should have many years of good rule along democratic lines so that she can cement the relations between my country and her country and between her country and other countries also. I think she has made a very good start, and I have not the slightest doubt that her country will prosper under her able leadership. She has taken one good step; she has nominated two persons of the Tamil-speaking population to Parliament. I hope that the problem of Tamil-speaking Indians and of the state-less persons, hanging fire for the last so many years, will now be solved. Of course, she has given an assurance to that effect, and

I am sure that when she comes to my country, this problem will become easier of solution and that the stateless persons will no longer be stateless but will become nationals of her country.

I would like to say a few words about Africa. Of course, there was a time when Africa was called the Dark Continent. But I believe that Africa is now awake and is going to be a big force in international politics. I think it was Prof. Arnold Toynbee who said in one of his lectures that perhaps the future of the world may not be dominated by either Asia or Europe but may be dominated by Africa. It is quite possible that the African giant which has woken up now may become a very very big giant. Already so many countries of Africa have attained independence and I thank this whole hon. House in sending our greetings to them. I believe that some more countries—eight of them—will attain freedom in the year to come. This is all a very happy sign of the times. Belgium's colonialism has been liquidated there. Britain's colonialism is liquidating itself very fast. Italy has also liquidated its colonialism. But there are some countries which are holding fast to that. Portugal is still holding fast to Angola. I think the march of time is so swift and so great that Portugal will not be able to resist that march. So, I would say that we play our part in the continent of Africa and we have our friendly relations with them.

Some time ago, I read that Indians are more close to them than any other persons of any other continent. Therefore, I think, we should have a special responsibility and special friendliness towards these persons who have attained freedom. I hope our Prime Minister would establish our Embassies or Consular offices there so that we may have living relations and living contacts with those countries.

Another point before I sit down and it is about Congo. Nothing can be a greater tribute to what our Prime Minister called the acceptability of our

country than the invitation from Congo. I am very happy that one of my countrymen has been asked to be the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in Congo. I am also very happy to find that some of our Army officers are rendering very good service there. I am also happy to find that we have sent a medical mission there. This is symbolic of our foreign policy. Our foreign policy is the policy of the healing touch; our foreign policy is the policy of bridging differences between warring nations; our foreign policy is the policy of bringing people together; our foreign policy is the policy of remaining firm and patient and also friendly.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to join the Prime Minister and other friends who have congratulated the resurgent Africa. We were all united when we were fighting for our own national freedom under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi (*Shri K. C. Sharma*: And Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.) in pleading for the freedom not only of India but also of all other colonial countries and more especially of South and South-Eastern Asia and Africa. As fate would have it, Africa continued to be under colonial regime for several years after the Second World War, even after India had become free. Nevertheless, one of the basic tenets of India's foreign policy has been to encourage the efforts of the African peoples to achieve their own freedom. And, in that way, it was the privilege of so many of us to convey the good wishes of India to the Pan African Congress and their leaders, notably our revered friend Dr. Palmer. At long last, they have become free and we are very glad about it.

We are also glad of the role of the United Nations has come to play in the latest drama in Congo. There, very few people expected the people of Congo to become free so soon because we knew how die-hard were Belgium and her imperialist policies, as die-hard and reactionary as Portugal. Since we have had a bitter taste of

[Shri Ranga]

Portugal's die-hardism and imperialism in India, we least expected Congo to become free so soon. Therefore, the pleasure at Congo's achievement of freedom is all the more greater and sweeter.

Unfortunately, I do not know why the Congo's Prime Minister chose to pick up a quarrel with the United Nations and also to subject her representatives including some of our own nationals to some humiliation. We regret these incidents and we sincerely hope that very soon wiser counsels would come to prevail and he would find it possible to accept the advice of the United Nations and its far-sighted statesman, the Secretary-General.

It is only during the last 10 years, that is since 1950, as has been stated in this brochure supplied to this House by the hon. Prime Minister, that two-thirds of the area in Africa has come to be liberated. 178 millions out of a total population of 220 millions have become free and England has given up her whole imperialistic hold over 1,127,000 sq. miles and France over 32,00,000 sq. miles. Thus, western imperialism has been beating the retreat.

Even while this is happening, this inspired and resurgent Africa was rising, on the other side in the East, a new imperialism has been raising its head. This imperialism has also two priests, just as the western imperialism has had Britain and France as its priests on that side, Russia and China. Russia swallowed so many countries in South-East Europe and now China is slowly spreading her tentacles over the areas of India, Nepal and other countries of the East.

My hon. friend, Shri Indulal Jainik also deplored the fact that China has come to take this particular stand. But, what else could we have expected from China, from what she has come to do against India? In 1950 and thereafter, she has been trying to gain more and more control over Tibet. Tibet which has been free and independent for centuries, at the same time, was being

brought under the sway of China and Chinese imperialism and so-called sovereignty or suzerainty and all the rest of it, off and on whenever here imperialistic greed became irrepresible. Nevertheless, Tibet had been free and the Tibetan people had considered themselves free, though adversity made them, from time to time, to accede to the overlordship of China. They continued to consider themselves free and they were actually enjoying their freedom.

An Hon. Member: *De facto.*

Shri Ranga: Even as late as 1914, the British Government and the Chinese Government found it necessary to invite Tibet as one of the partners to a Tripartite Conference that they had in Simla. And, they concluded a treaty; and that treaty, later on, could not be signed by China. But, England and Tibet signed that treaty and agreed to abide by it. Therefore, Tibet could not be said to be either a vassal or a province of China. Yet, today China laid claim to Tibet; and our country, fresh as it was in its liberated state, wanted to go all out against imperialism. Therefore, she surrendered what all rights, privileges and approaches Great Britain had won or achieved not for the territorial integrity of Great Britain but for the territorial integrity of India during her regime. We surrendered all that; we were very liberal. But was it not our duty also even in the interest of India to have taken care to see that China would not gain control over Tibet to such an extent and in such a manner that India's territorial integrity would be, some day or the other, be endangered and disturbed? We failed in our duty at that time. Our warnings did not have any impact upon the policy of the Government of India although we were at that time together in the same party; at that time there was practically no opposition party, either in the Provisional Parliament or later on. Thereafter the recent events had taken place. The Chinese sent their emissaries and agents and officers and forces and generals in

order to bring Tibet completely under their control. As a protest against this, that great religious head of those people the Dalai Lama chose to leave that country and come away to India. All the rest of the world expressed its gratitude to India for having given succour and also hermitage, as it were, to the Dalai Lama and all his friends, unfortunate refugees who have had to come away from Tibet. Now, is it not the duty of India to raise the question of Tibet at the U.N., especially after all this information had come into the possession of the whole world as to how and in what unholy manner the Tibetan people had been treated and suppressed, insulted, imprisoned as it were, socially and politically in their own country by the Chinese imperialists? When this question was raised last time at the U.N. to our utter surprise and shock and shame that delegation chose to remain neutral. I do not know why. Again our delegation is going there and there were certain feelers in the Press that our delegation was not likely to take any sides at all. Why not?

An Hon. Member: United Kingdom remained silent.

Shri Ranga: Did Mahatma Gandhi fear taking sides on the side of the colonial people who were fighting for freedom even when we were not free, even when freedom did not appear to be next door? Yet we were fighting for their freedom. Why should we remain neutral and non-committal? When we are rejoicing with the advent of the resurgent Africa, should we not also try to do something, at least a little bit, by lending our voice of support to Malaya and other countries who have the courage of their convictions and who are prepared to raise this question of Tibet in the U.N. It may be said that it is an internal problem for China. The whole history of the relations between China and Tibet and India proves that it cannot be treated as an internal problem of China. Secondly, if it is an internal question, then the Algerian question is an internal problem or the Tunisian question is an internal problem. Why

did our Government take so much interest in the freedom of these people and why did we try to use our own good offices diplomatically and at the U.N. in order to help the freedom struggles? By the same token, is it not proper to stand up for the Tibetan people? It is being said that Tibetan people had plenty of domestic slavery and so on. But are we quite sure that similar evils did not dog the steps of so many of our African peoples in all these various countries which are becoming free? Are we asking all these people to wait until all these evils are got rid of before they become free?

Then again it is said that the Chinese had provided schools, hospitals and so many other things after they went there. But so did the British say, the French, the Portuguese and other imperialists also say about their own achievements in all these colonial countries. Nevertheless, we spoke for the freedom of all these people. Similarly, is it not right and proper that we should do in this case also? Merely because China is supposed to have done this and that during the last ten years of her oppression in Tibet, we should not allow China to continue to oppress these people. Here is a report of the international jurists who have studied this question and have said how genocide has taken place, how the Tibetan's religion has been interfered with and so on. It is giving more convincing proof than any other that China is oppressing the people of Tibet and it is the duty of India to stand up for Tibet today in her great hour of need.

I am not talking about this as a moral or altruistic thing. There is also the question of territorial integrity of India. The British realised for a long time what great need there was for having a State like Tibet which, in the usual terms, was known a buffer state, which would not be a vassal either of China or of Russia. These were the two great giants sitting over the head of India on either side. They have to be kept apart and away from India and we should help Tibet to continue to remain free.

[Shri Ranga]

My hon. friend the hon. Prime Minister was referring to the basic policy of India. When it affects the rest of the world it is one thing and when it affects India, the territorial integrity of India, it is another thing. In this regard, I find that the basic policy—whatever it may be called—of the Prime Minister and the Government of India has been a failure and has brought us evil fruit of China's aggression over India. My hon. friends like Shri Yajnik would like us to be as patient as we have been with Pakistan over Kashmir. These two things are not on all fours. Three-fourth of Kashmir is with us; only one-fourth is held by them. They are complaining that they are patient with us! I find here that a part of India has been swallowed by China and the Prime Minister did not have the freedom of mind to say to the Prime Minister of China when he was here for so many days in conference that China was the aggressor. In the eyes of all our people it continues to be the aggressor until it vacates the occupied part of India and reaches a friendly agreement in regard to the territorial integrity of India. In these circumstances, how is it possible for us to be patient with Chinese aggression in India?

The talks are going on and all sorts of things are being said. I speak subject to correction and I hope the hon. Prime Minister would be able to say that what I have heard is wrong. We all understand that these talks were to be confined to understanding each other in regard to our claims for territorial boundaries in certain parts only of the whole of our boundary between China and India. We understand now that the whole of the frontier is being discussed. If that is so, it is a very dangerous thing and a dangerous development. The Prime Minister owes an explanation to the country and he has to justify why it is so, if it is so and why the scope of the discussions had got extended in such a dangerous manner.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would like to explain this matter. There has been no enlargement of the scope of the discussion at all. There are, as I said repeatedly in our correspondence, three sectors—the northern, the eastern and the middle. These are the sectors, either in parts or in small parts or big parts, that are considered. But, obviously, you do not consider a frontier; you cannot get a map of this little bit or that little bit. But when you explain, possibly, you draw up a line, that is a different matter, but the actual matters in dispute are in these sectors.

Shri Ranga: There is the question of our relations with Pakistan. I am glad the Prime Minister is having an opportunity of going over there in order to give his imprimatur and in order to put his signature also on that treaty. How did we come to reach this particular state, friendly, effective and useful? At one time we were told by our Government that our case was entirely right, we had nothing to yield, we did not do any harm at all, we did not think of doing any harm at all to the claims, to the legitimate claims of Pakistan for the waters of the sacred river Sind. So did the Pakistan Government say to their own people. For years this dispute went on. But now, in the end, thanks to the good offices of the World Bank, we seem to have come to the conclusion that there can be an agreement which would be acceptable to both the parties. But there is one small point in it. Other richer countries in the world are prepared to bear a part or a portion of the burden of the construction of various dams and distribution canals. All these things have to be built up in Pakistan in order to settle this particular dispute.

We are glad that this dispute is coming to a close. But we would like this approach to be extended to the various other aspects of the relations between Pakistan and India. Pakistan has been throwing out a number of feelers. What they are we do not

know and we do not know the full extent of them. A few of them have been indicated in the Press. We would like the hon. Prime Minister to explore these possibilities and then see whether we can possibly reach, not at one stage but in a piecemeal fashion, an agreement with Pakistan over as many of the outstanding points of dispute as possible, because if we really want to develop our own social economy in our country we should certainly try to minimise the points of friction between Pakistan and India and in that way save quite a lot of expenditure on defence forces and also have peace of mind on these frontiers so that we can in a better way face the other adversaries who have shown themselves on our frontiers.

Then, my hon. friend wants us to continue the fifteen-year long fundamental or basic policy of non-alignment. I do not think it is any longer possible for so many of us to continue to agree with him. I said so on the last occasion and I wish to repeat it now. But that does not mean that we should straightaway begin to search for other friends, other allies and think in terms of pacts and other things. But it is high time that we should, first of all, be able to tell the rest of the world that we are no longer uncommitted, we are no longer wedded to that policy of non-alignment, we are not willing to take any sides in this cold war, we are not responsible for this cold war at all. My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, for whom I have a lot of affection, was saying this morning that there was nothing wrong with Mr. Khrushchev, other people were in the wrong and that this cold war should not be allowed to be a hot war. The cold war is becoming a warm war or a hot war or it may become a very hot war, indeed, if the way in which Mr. Khrushchev faced the Summit Conference was to continue to the method and attitude of Soviet Russia and China in regard to world problems. Into that we do not wish to go. I

agree. we do not wish to enter up to that. There is common ground between us and the Prime Minister in that, but when it comes to the continuation of the policy of non-alignment, touch-me-not and so on, then I can only say that we cannot afford to continue with that.

Therefore, Sir, the proper thing for India would be to begin to take steps, however tentative it may be, to achieve friendship and closer relationship in regard to international affairs with all the countries in the south and south-east Asia and in that way develop a kind of concordat, an international comradeship, and thus gain sufficient strength to be in a position to deal with the western nations on the one side and the eastern nations on the other. Today we are weak. We have been proved to be weak by China. We are being helped to become weak by the kind of psychological—I would not call it warfare—episodes that seem to be arising on the horizon of our own defence forces and their ministerial chiefs. I do not know what is being done in order to bring about a whole-hearted agreement, a complete agreement between the Chiefs of Staff on the one side and the ministerial heads here. It is easy to blame one man. It is much better to take the whole of the Cabinet as one unit if there is anything wrong. I think it is the whole Cabinet that has allowed this kind of a bad atmosphere to develop knowingly or unknowingly for too long a time, and it is no good wailing now that the papers have been writing this and writing that. There are certain sections within the Cabinet, outside the Cabinet or around the Cabinet, which have been interested in this kind of a Press controversy. But anyhow, this bad atmosphere has been created as a result of which the impression of other people about our strength must have gone down very much, gone down to a very great extent. That also helps these potential aggressors and the active aggressors to continue to increase their aggressive designs upon India

[Shri Ranga]

Therefore, I hope the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues would see to it that our defences are strengthened, the *esprit de corps* in the defence forces is maintained intact, developed and made stronger, and that we develop this concordat with all the South-East Asian and Asian countries. We should develop it further and widen its scope so that we can hope to claim these resurgent nations of Africa also as our friends, and all of us taken together if we begin to march together then it may be possible for us to hold these great power blocs on both sides, to lessen their cold war, to prevent it growing into a hot war and, possibly, achieve a hopeful approach towards world peace through disarmament and other things.

श्री अ० सु० तारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जनाब चेयरमैन साहब, आज इस एवान में हम वजीर आजम की तहरीक पर बहस कर रहे हैं ।

मैं इस सिलसिले में हिन्दुस्तान के वजीर आजम को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ उस पालिसी पर जिस पर हम कारबन्द हैं, उस वक्त से जब से हम ने आजादी हासिल की है । यकीनन यह जो हमारी पालिसी है, गैरजानिबदाराना, इसने तकवियत पहुँचायी है हमारी उस तहरीक को जो बहुत सालों से इस मुल्क में थी । हमारी यह कोशिश रही कि हम किसी गिरोह में शामिल न हों । हमारी हमेशा से यह कोशिश रही, और इस कोशिश में हम कामयाब रहे कि हम अपनी जात को, अपनी हुकूमत को किसी गिरोह या जमाअत के साथ वावस्ता न करें ।

जनाबवाला, पिछले साल से जिस तरह अफ्रीका के मुल्क आजाद हो रहे हैं, और उनके साथ जो हम ने राबता बढ़ाया है, और उनकी तहरीक के साथ जिस तरह हमने हमदर्दी का इजहार किया है, यकीनन वहाँ की अवाम हम से एक गहरा ताल्लुक पैदा कर

चुकी है, हम चाहते हैं अफ्रीका के इन मुल्कों के साथ जिनमें अभी अभी आजादी आयी है, हम अपने ताल्लुकात इस्तवार करें । हम चाहते हैं कि हुकूमत के अलावा भी जो अवामी ताल्लुक है वह वहाँ पैदा किये जायें और वह ऐसे लोगों के जरिये पैदा किये जायें जिनका माजी या जिनका हाल सियासी रह चुका हो, ऐसे लोगों के जरिया करें जो वाकै इस मुल्क की आजादी में कोई अहम रोल अदा कर चुके हों । हमारी हुकूमत को यह जेवा नहीं देता कि हम आजाद मुल्कों के साथ ऐसे लोगों के बलबूते पर जो इस मुल्क में, इस मुल्क की तहरीक में, किसी गैर मुल्की ताकत के हमेशा परवरदा रहे हैं, और उमको मजबूत करने के लिये इस मुल्क में रहें हैं; उनसे ताल्लुकात पैदा करें । जनाबवाला, मैं एक काश्मीरी की हैसियत से नहीं बल्कि एक पूरे हिन्दुस्तानी की हैसियत से अपने वजीर आजम को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ उस सिलसिले में जिसमें कि वे पाकिस्तान जा रहे हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे वजीर आजम के पाकिस्तान जाने से हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की कशीदगी को दूर करने में बड़ी मदद मिलेगी । वह वहाँ पर नहरी पानी झगड़े को खत्म करने के लिये एक मुआहिदे पर दस्तखत करने के लिये जा रहे हैं । मुआहिदे पर दस्तखत होने से यकीनन हमारे ताल्लुकात पाकिस्तान से बहतर हो जायेंगे । मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जो कि यह चाहते हैं और जिनकी हमेशा यह स्वाहिश रहती है कि तमाम हमसाया मुल्कों के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात बहतर हों और पाकिस्तान से तो और भी ज्यादा अच्छे होने चाहिये क्योंकि पाकिस्तान हमारा एक हिस्सा है और हम में से ही अलग हुआ है । हमारे वहाँ बहुत जानने वाले हैं, अपने दोस्त हैं और बहुत से सियासी लोग भी हैं । लेकिन इसके यह मानी तो नहीं है कि हम पाकिस्तान को खुश करने के लिये या दूसरे मुल्कों के बड़े बड़े सरबराहों को खुश करने के लिये या

हिन्दुस्तान की चन्द सियासी जमातों को खुश करने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान का कोई हिस्सा उठा कर पाकिस्तान को भेंट कर दें । नारा लगाया जाता है और इस नारे की हिमायत की जाती है कि कौमन डिफेंस हो । कौमन डिफेंस के माने क्या हैं यह मैं इस ऐवान में खुद जनरल अय्यूब की जवानी बयान करना चाहता हूँ । कैनाल वाटर डिस्प्यूट्स के बारे में जनरल अय्यूब ने यह कहा था :—

“I am determined to find a solution of the Kashmir and the canal waters issue at all costs. . . . Today, India is holding Kashmir at the point of bayonets of 80,000 troops and a large number of police. If the world conscience has some regard for justice, then this rule cannot last for long.”

यह हालत है उस शक्स की जो हम से मुआहिदा करना चाहता है । जो हम से दोस्ती करना चाहता है । मैं अपने उन दोस्तों को जो कि उस कौमन डिफेंस के नारे की हिमायत करते हैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कौमन डिफेंस के साथ पाकिस्तान के फौजी डिक्टेटर ने एक शर्त रखी है कि काश्मीर उस के हवाले कर दिया जाये । पाकिस्तान का फौजी डिक्टेटर चाहता है कि वंगर उस के किसी हक के काश्मीर उस को इनाम के तौर पर दे दिया जाये । अब काश्मीर किसी एक आदमी की जागीर नहीं है । न मसानी साहब की है न रंगा साहब की है । न नाथपाई साहब की है और न पंडित जवाहरलाल नरू की है । काश्मीर हर हिन्दुस्तानी का है उसी तरह जिस तरह कि हिन्दुस्तान पर हर काश्मीरी का हक है । यह हमारा मुल्क है । यह हमारी सरबमीन है । यह चन्द लोगों को खुश करने के लिये किसी को भेंट नहीं की जा सकती ।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि बिल्कुल उस तरह जिस तरह से एक आजाद कौम दूसरी आजाद कौम से दोस्ती करती है, दूसरी आजाद कौम से

ताल्लुकात बढ़ा रही है, हम भी अपने पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान से दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात कायम करें । हम भी आजाद हैं और यकीनन आयन्दा भी आजाद रहेंगे । पाकिस्तान के साथ आजादाना ताल्लुकात रखेंगे । आजादाना खयालात का इजहार करेंगे लेकिन किसी कीमत पर नहीं करेंगे । यह हकीकत है, यह तवारीखी हकीकत है, यह फौजी हकीकत नहीं है कि कामश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है और वह हमेशा से हिन्दुस्तान का एक हिस्सा रहा है । इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि कुछ लोग जो कि इस नारे को तकवियत दे रहे हैं वह एक गलत बात की हिमायत कर रहे हैं ।

मैं मुबारक बाद देता हूँ अपने वजीर आजम को । मैं तारीफ करता हूँ उनके सब और निःमन्दी की । अगर देखा जाये उस १४ अगस्त के बयान को जोकि पाकिस्तान के सदर ने दिया है, यकीनन उस जज्बे के साथ, उस मुहब्बत के साथ और उस अकीकत के साथ जिसके कि साथ हमारे वजीर आजम वहां जा रहे हैं, तो उनको नहीं जाना चाहिये था । लेकिन यह हमारी दयानतदाराना पालिसी है, यह हमारे रहनुमा की दयानतदाराना खारिजा पालिसी है कि हम उन चीजों की खातिर में नहीं लाते । हम जाती ईश्यूज पर ऐतमाद नहीं करते । हम चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात बेहतर हों ।

जनाबबाला, चीन का यहां जिक्र किया गया है । इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि चीन के साथ, चीनियों की कुछ गलती से हमारे ताल्लुकात उन से कशीदा हो गये हैं । लेकिन यह भी एक हकीकत है कि बहुत सी कौमों, बहुत से लोग यह चाहते थे कि यह कशीदगी जंग की सूरत अखतियार कर बैठे । बहुत से लोगों को इस बात का यकीन हो चुका था बल्कि बहुत से लोग इस बात की तैयारी कर चुके थे कि जंग हो कर रहेगी । लेकिन फिर एक बार

[श्री अ० मु० तारिक]

इस मुल्क के वजीर आजम की पालिसी और इस हुकूमत की पालिसी काबिलेदाद है कि हम ने जंग के हालत को सुलह और मुहब्बत के हालत में तबदील कर दिया। हम ने उस नफरत को फिर एक बार मुहब्बत में तबदील कर दिया जो कि इस मुल्क की सरहदों के अन्दर फैलाई जा रही थी। हम चीन से मसालिहत करेंगे लेकिन किसी कीमत पर नहीं। हम यकीनन् जंग भी नहीं करेंगे। चीन से वगेर किसी इश्तियाल के। हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि छोटी छोटी बातों पर झगड़ा किया जाये। इस वक्त हम चीनियों से गुफ्तशुनीद कर रहे हैं। हमारे कुछ लोग वहां गये थे। और वहां से कुछ लोग यहां आये हैं और मुझे उम्मीद है कि वजीर आजम की मौजूदा पालिसी फिर एक बार हमें मौका देगी और फिर एक बार इस मामले को मुहब्बत से तय करने में मदद देगी।

जनाबवाला, मैं इस हुकूमत को उन ताल्लूकात पर जो कि उस ने नजदीकी मुल्कों मसलन अफगानिस्तान, ईरान, तुर्की, इंडोनेशिया और दूसरे छोटे छोटे मुल्कों से कायम किये हैं और पैदा किये हैं मुबारकबाद देता हूँ। यकीनन् उन की दोस्ती ने हम को तकवियत दी है उन मुल्कों के मुकाबले पर जो कि दोस्ती की बुनियाद रखते हैं हथियारों पर या दौलत पर। हमारी दोस्ती की बुनियाद खलूस और मुहब्बत पर है और हम इस रास्ते पर चल कर अपने मुस्तकबिल को रोशन बना रहे हैं।

जनाबवाला, मैं इस तरफ भी अपनी हुकूमत की तवज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान में अब यह हकीकत है और हमारे नोटिस में यह बात आई है कि वहां पर फौजी अड्डे हैं। गैर मुल्की हुकूमतों ने वहां फौजी अड्डे बनाये हैं। हमें उस की तरफ तवज्जह करनी चाहिए जब कि खुद हमारी

सरहदें खतरे में हैं, जब कि खुद हम पाकिस्तान से जंग लड़ चुके हैं और पाकिस्तान हर वक्त यह कोशिश कर रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान से जंग की जाय। हम को उन फौजी अड्डों की तरफ से बेखबर नहीं होना चाहिये और अपनी फौजों को हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों पर और मजबूत करना चाहिये।

कुछ लोगों ने यहां तजकिरा किया है और कुछ नुक्ताचीनी की है हमारी उस पालिसी की जो कि हमारे डेलीगेशन ने तिब्बत के बारे में अकवाम मुत्तहिदा में अपनाई है। लेकिन मैं अपने उन दोस्तों को बतलाना चाहूंगा कि वह एक पालिसी है जो कि इस हुकूमत की है और इस मुल्क के हर वाशिन्दे की है जो कि तिब्बत के बारे में और चीन के बारे में हमारे डेलीगेशन ने अकवाम मुत्तहिदा में अख्तियार की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह एक सही पालिसी है और उस पर हमें कारबन्द रहना चाहिए। यह कहना कि हमारे डेलीगेशन ने वहां कोई खाम काम नहीं किया है और गैरजानिबदार रह कर हमारे लिए बदनामी का वायस हुआ है, मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसा ख्याल करना बिलकुल गलत है। मैं अपने डेलीगेशन के रवैये की पुरजोर ताईद करता हूँ। मैं तो कहूंगा कि यह वुगतान है सिर्फ उन लोगों का जो कि यह चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के आपसी ताल्लूकात सराब हो जायें।

इस के अलावा मैं वजीर खारिजा की तवज्जह इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले चन्द सालों से हमें यह मालूम हुआ है कि वजारत खारिजा में कुछ फाइलें गायब हुई हैं, कुछ राज इधर उधर हुए हैं। हमें इस की तरफ फौरी तौर पर तवज्जह देनी

चाहिए। हमें वजारत खारिजा में देखना चाहिये कि कुछ ऐसे लोग तो नहीं हैं जो कि वहां हमारे वजीर आजम के दायं बां तो जरूर घुमते हैं लेकिन उन से इतिफाक नहीं करते हैं और उन की पालिसी पर पूरे कारबन्द नहीं हैं। सब से बड़ा खतरा हमें उन लोगों से हो सकता है जो कि वहां हैं और वहां होते हुए भी हमारे वजीर आजम की मौजूदा पालिसी पर इतिफाक नहीं रखते और मैं अपनी हुकूमत की तवज्जह ऐसे लोगों की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इन चन्द्र अल्फाज के साथ मैं वजीर आजम की खारिजा पालिसी की ताईद करता हूँ।

(جناب چيئرمين صاحب - آج)

اس ليوان ميں هم وزير اعظم کی تحريك پر بحث کر رہے هيں -

ميں اس سلسلے ميں هندوستان کے وزير اعظم کو مبارکباد ديتا ہوں - اس پالہسی پر جس پر ہم کاربند ہوں اس وقت سے جب سے ہم نے آزادی حاصل کی ہے - يقيلاً يہہ جو ہماری پالہسی ہے - غير جانبدارانہ - اس نے تقويت پہنچائی ہے ہماری اس تحريك کو جو بہت سالوں سے اس ملک ميں تھی - ہماری يہہ کوشش رہی کہ ہم کسی گروہ ميں شامل نہ ہوں - ہماری ہميشہ سے يہہ کوشش رہی اور اس کوشش ميں ہم کامياب رہے کہ ہم اپنی ذات کو - اپنی حکومت کو - کسی گروہ يا جماعت کے ساتھ وابستہ نہ کریں -

جناب والا - پچھلے سال سے جس

طرح افريقہ کے ملک آزاد ہو رہے ہوں -

اور ان کے ساتھ جو ہم نے رابطہ بويایا ہے - اور ان کی تحريك کے ساتھ جس طرح ہم نے ہمدردی کا اظہار کیا ہے - يقيلاً وہاں کی عوام ہم سے ايک گہرا تعلق پيدا کر چکی ہے - ہم چاہتے هيں کہ افريقہ کے ان ملکوں کے ساتھ جن ميں ابھی ابھی آزادی آئی ہے - ہم اپنے تعلقات استوار کریں - ہم چاہتے هيں کہ حکومت کے علاوہ يہی جو عوامی تعلقات هيں وہ وہاں پيدا کئے جائیں - اور ایسے لوگوں کے ذريعے پيدا کئے جائیں جن کا ماضی يا جن کا حال سیاسی وہ چکا ہو - ایسے لوگوں کے ذريعے کریں جو واقعی اس ملک کی آزادی ميں کوئی اہم رول ادا کر چکے هيں - ہماری حکومت کو يہہ ذہبا نہیں ديتا کہ ہم آزاد ملکوں کے ساتھ ایسے لوگوں کے بل بوتے پر جو اس ملک ميں - اس ملک کی تحريك ميں - کسی غير ملکی طاقت کے ہميشہ پروردہ رہے هيں - اور اس کو مضبوط کرنے کے لئے اس ملک ميں رہے هيں - ان سے تعلقات پيدا کریں -

جناب والا - ميں ايک کشمیری

کی حيثيت سے نہیں بلکہ ايک پورے هندوستانی کی حيثيت سے اہ وزير اعظم کو مبارکباد ديتا ہوں اس سلسلے ميں جس ميں کہ وہ پاکستان جا رہے هيں ميں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے وزير اعظم کے پاکستان جانے سے

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق]

ہندوستان اور پاکستان کی کشیدگی کو دور کرنے میں بڑی مدد ملے گی۔ وہ وہاں پر نہری پانی جھگڑے کو ختم کرنے کے لئے ایک معاہدے پر دستخط کرنے کے لئے جا رہے ہیں۔ معاہدے پر دستخط ہونے سے یقیناً ہمارے تعلقات پاکستان سے بہتر ہو جائیں گے۔ میں ان لوگوں میں سے ہوں جو کہ یہ چاہتے ہیں اور جن کی کہ ہمیشہ یہ خواہش رہتی ہے کہ تمام ہمسایہ ملکوں کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات بہتر ہوں اور پاکستان سے تو اور بھی زیادہ اچھے ہونے چاہئیں کیونکہ پاکستان ہمارا ایک حصہ ہے اور ہم میں سے ہی الگ ہوا ہے۔ ہمارے وہاں بہت جاننے والے ہیں۔ اپنے دوست ہوں اور بہت سے سیاسی لوگ بھی ہیں۔ لیکن اسکے یہ معنی تو نہیں ہیں کہ ہم پاکستان کو خوش کرنے کے لئے یا دوسرے ملکوں کے بڑے بڑے سربراہوں کو خوش کرنے کے لئے یا ہندوستان کی چلد سیاسی جماعتوں کو خوش کرنے کے لئے ہندوستان کا کوئی حصہ اٹھا کر پاکستان کو بھینٹ کر دیں۔ نعرہ لگایا جاتا ہے اور اس نعرہ کی حمایت کی جاتی ہے کہ کومن ویلفیئر ہو۔ کومن ویلفیئر کے معنی کیا ہوں یہ میں اس ایوان میں خود جنرل ایوب کی زبانی

بہان کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ کھلال واٹر ڈسپوٹس کے بارے میں جنرل ایوب نے یہ کہا تھا۔

"I am determined to find a solution of the Kashmir and the canal waters issue at all costs... Today, India is holding Kashmir at the point of bayonets of 80,000 troops and a large number of police. If the world conscience has some regard for justice, then this rule cannot last for long."

یہ حالت ہے اس شخص کی جو ہم سے معاہدہ کرنا چاہتا ہے۔ جو ہم سے دوستی کرنا چاہتا ہے۔ میں اپنے ان دوستوں کو جو کہ اس کومن ویلفیئر کے نعرے کی حمایت کرتے ہیں بتلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ کومن ویلفیئر کے ساتھ پاکستان کے فوجی ٹینکٹر نہ ایک شرط رکھی ہے کہ کشمیر اس کے حوالے کر دیا جائے۔ پاکستان کا فوجی ٹینکٹر چاہتا ہے کہ بغیر اس کے کسی حق کے کشمیر اس کو انعام کے طور پر دے دیا جائے۔ اب کشمیر کسی ایک آدمی کی جاگیر نہیں ہے۔ نہ مسانی صاحب کی ہے نہ رنٹا صاحب کی ہے۔ نہ ناتھ پائی صاحب کی ہے اور نہ پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو کی ہے۔ کشمیر ہر ہندوستانی کا ہے اس طرح جس طرح کی ہندوستان پر ہر کشمیری کا حق ہے۔ یہ ہمارا ملک ہے یہ ہماری سرزمین ہے۔ یہ چلد لوگوں کو خوش کرنے کے لئے کسی کو بھینٹ نہیں کی جا سکتی۔

میں چاہتا ہوں کہ بالکل اس طرح جس طرح سے ایک آزاد قوم دوسری آزاد قوم سے دوستی کرتی ہے - دوسری آزادی قوم سے تعلقات بڑھا رہی ہے - ہم بھی اپنے پورے دیہی پاکستان سے دوستانہ تعلقات قائم کریں - ہم بھی آزاد ہیں اور یقیناً آئندہ بھی آزاد رہیں گے - پاکستان کے ساتھ آزادانہ تعلقات رکھیں گے - آزادانہ خیالات کا اظہار کریں گے لیکن کسی قیمت پر نہیں کریں گے - یہ حقیقت ہے تواریخی حقیقت ہے یہ فوجی حقیقت نہیں ہے کہ کشمیر ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے ورنہ ہمیشہ سے ہندوستان کا ایک حصہ رہا ہے - اس لئے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ کچھ لوگ جو کہ اس نعرہ کو تقویت دے رہے ہیں وہ ایک غلط بات کی حمایت کر رہے ہیں -

میں مبارکباد دینا ہوں اپنے وزیر اعظم کو - میں تعریف کرتا ہوں ان کے صبر اور دانشمندی کی - اگر دیکھا جائے اس ۱۲ اگست کے بیان کو جو کہ پاکستان کے صدر نے دیا ہے - یقیناً اس جزیبہ کے ساتھ اس محبت کے ساتھ اور اس عقیدت کے ساتھ جس کے ساتھ ہمارے وزیر اعظم وہاں جا رہے ہیں - تو ان کو نہیں جانا چاہئے تھا - لیکن یہ ہماری دیہاتدارانہ پالیسی ہے یہ ہمارے رہنما کی دیہاتدارانہ خارجہ پالیسی ہے کہ ہم ان چیزوں کو خاطر میں نہیں لاتے - ہم ذاتی ایشور پر اعتماد نہیں کرتے -

ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ پاکستان کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات بہتر ہوں -

جناب والا - چوں کہ یہاں ذکر کیا گیا ہے - اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ چین کے ساتھ چینوں کی کچھ غلطی سے ہمارے تعلقات ان سے کشیدہ ہو گئے ہیں - لیکن یہ بھی ایک حقیقت ہے کہ بہت سی قوموں - بہت سے لوگ یہ چاہتے تھے کہ یہ کشیدگی جنگ کی صورت اختیار کر لے - بہت سے لوگوں کو اس بات کا یقین ہو چکا تھا بلکہ بہت سے لوگ اس بات کی تیار کر چکے تھے کہ جنگ ہو کر رہیگی - لیکن پھر ایک بار اس ملک کے وزیر اعظم کی پالیسی اور اس حکومت کی پالیسی قابل داد ہے کہ ہم نے جنگ کے حالات کو صلح اور محبت کے حالات میں تبدیل کر دیا جو کہ اس ملک کی سرحدوں کے اندر پھیلائی جا رہی تھی - ہم چین سے مصالحت کریں گے لیکن کسی قیمت پر نہیں - ہم یقیناً جنگ بھی نہیں کریں گے چوں کہ بغیر کسی اشتیال کے - ہم نہیں چاہتے کہ چھوٹی چھوٹی باتوں پر جھگڑا کیا جائے - اس وقت ہم چینوں سے گفت و شنید کر رہے ہیں - ہمارے کچھ لوگ وہاں گئے تھے اور وہاں سے کچھ لوگ یہاں آئے ہیں اور مجھے امید ہے کہ وزیر اعظم کی موجودہ پالیسی پھر ایک بار ہمیں موقع دے گی کہ پھر ایک بار اس معاملے کو محبت سے طے کرنے میں مدد دے گی -

[شری اے - ایم - طاریق]

جناب والا - میں اس حکومت و ان تعلقات پر جو کہ اس نے نزدیکی ملکوں مثلاً افغانستان - ایران - ترکی - انڈونیشیا و دوسرے چھوٹے چھوٹے ملکوں سے قائم کئے ہیں اور پیدا کئے ہیں - مبارکباد دیتا ہوں - یقیناً ان کی دوستی ہے ہم کو تقویت دی ہے ان ملکوں کے مقابلہ پر جو کہ دوستی کی بنیاد رکھتے ہیں ہتھیاروں پر یا دولت پر - ہماری دوستی کی بنیاد خلوص اور محبت پر ہے اور ہم اس راستہ پر چل کر اپنے مستقبل کو روشن بنا رہے ہیں -

جناب والا - میں اس طرف بھی اپنی حکومت کی توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ پاکستان میں اب یہ حقیقت ہے اور ہمارے نوٹس میں یہ بات آئی ہے کہ وہاں پر فوجی آقے ہیں غہر ملکی حکومتوں نے وہاں فوجی آقے بنائے ہیں و ہمیں اس کی طرف توجہ کرنی چاہیئے جب کہ خد ہماری سرحدیں خطرہ میں ہیں جب کہ خود ہم پاکستان سے جنگ لو چکے ہیں اور پاکستان ہر وقت یہ کوشش کر رہا ہے کہ ہندوستان سے جنگ کی جائے - ہم کو ان فوجی آقوں کی طرف سے بیخبر نہیں ہونا چاہئے اور اپنی فوجوں کو ہندوستان کی سرحدوں پر اور مضبوط کرنا چاہئے -

کچھ لوگوں نے یہاں تذکرہ کیا ہے اور کچھ نکتہ چینی کی ہے ہماری اس پالیسی کی جو کہ ہمارے قبلیگیشن نے تہمت کے بارے میں اقوام متعدہ میں اپنائی ہے - لیکن میں اپنے دوستوں کو بتلانا چاہوں گا کہ وہ ایک پالیسی ہے جو کہ اس حکومت کی ہے اور اس ملک کے ہر باشندے کی ہے جو کہ تہمت کے بارے میں اور چین کے بارے میں ہمارے قبلیگیشن نے اقوام متعدہ میں اختیار کی ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ ایک صحیح پالیسی ہے اور اس پر ہمیں کاربند رہنا چاہئے - یہ کہنا کہ ہمارے قبلیگیشن نے وہاں کوئی خاص کام نہیں کیا ہے اور غہر جانبدار ہے کہ ہمارے لئے پندنامی کا باعث ہوا ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ایسا خیال کرنا بالکل غلط ہے - میں اپنے قبلیگیشن کے رویہ کی پر زور تائید کرتا ہوں - میں تو کہوں گا کہ یہ بنقان ہے صرف ان لوگوں کا جو کہ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان اور چین کے آپسی تعلقات خراب ہو جائوں - اس کے علاوہ میں وزیر خارجہ کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ پچھلے چند سالوں سے ہمیں یہ معلوم ہوا ہے کہ وزارت خارجہ میں کچھ فائلوں غائب ہوئی ہیں - کچھ راز ادھر ادھر ہوئے ہیں - ہمیں اس کی طرف فوری توجہ دینی چاہئے - ہمیں وزارت خارجہ میں دیکھنا چاہیئے کہ کچھ

ایسے لوگ تو نہیں ہیں جو کہ وہاں
ہمارے وزیراعظم کے دائیں بائیں ضرور
کھومتے ہیں لیکن ان سے اتفاق نہیں
کرتے ہیں اور ان کی پالیسی پر پورے
کاربند نہیں ہیں - سب سے بڑا خطرہ
ہمیں ان لوگوں سے ہو سکتا ہے جو کہ
وہاں ہیں اور وہاں ہوتے ہوئے بھی
ہمارے وزیراعظم کی موجودہ پالیسی پر
اتفاق نہیں رکھتے اور میں اپنی
حکومت کی توجہ ایسے لوگوں کی
طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں - ان چند الفاظ
کے ساتھ میں وزیر اعظم کی خارچہ
پالیسی کی نائید کرتا ہوں -

Shri Jaipal Singh: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very glad that the hon. Minister of External Affairs has at last realised that most of us, perhaps, get into the rut of a routine debate. Again and again, whenever I have been given the opportunity by the Chair to participate in a debate on external affairs, I have pleaded that we should all be non-party people; it is not a question of a party—one party debating against the other party. It is the country as a whole expressing its views on foreign affairs. I find that the hon. Member from Phulpur did accept this suggestion of mine several years ago, but I find he has consistently failed to implement it.

Look at the composition of our representation that goes abroad. Very soon, we shall be sending our representation to the United Nations. It seems it has become a family affair of Shri Krishna Menon to go there year after year. I am not saying anything in the absence of anybody. I am surprised that the Treasury Benches are empty. But I congratulate that the burden of listening to this debate has been left to my very dear friend, the Parliamentary Secre-

tary, who should have been Deputy Minister long ago. But that is the type of peaceful co-existence we are having. He should have been something long ago. He is the oldest Parliamentary Secretary we have in this House. However, this is a debate on external affairs.

As the Minister of External Affairs has indicated to us that we have to get out of this rut of routine debate and routine speeches, so, I want to give out my mind, something that I have been feeling for a long time. Instead of only talking of peaceful co-existence, let us mean business. Have we peaceful co-existence in this country? Do we really ourselves mean it? When we try to give out homilies to other countries, we are competent and qualified to do that? Tomorrow there is a debate on Assam. We shall see what we mean by peaceful co-existence. I do not want to anticipate what shall take place tomorrow, but, here, in the debate on external affairs, let me make it clear that I think there is a great deal of hypocrisy in our preaching. Peaceful co-existence is a matter of making *chapatīs*. That is to say

دونوں हाथ سے رोटی پکاتی ہے ।

That is the point. I know during the last external affairs debate when I spoke on this very ambiguous position we have of non-alignment, the Foreign Minister could not quite understand what I had meant and he spent a good few minutes on what I had said. Unfortunately I had another assignment and I was not present. But at any rate, I welcomed the fact that he did notice what I said.

This morning he said something we are not sitting on the fence, but on the other hand, we are judging everything on its merits and we are trying to destroy this fence. But what we are trying to do is instead of sitting on the fence or not sitting on the fence, we are zigzagging here to

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

there all round the place from time to time. I fully admit that our attitude certainly has had an effect and influence on very many countries. But if you notice the substitute motion to which I am a party—No. 8—you will find that I am very very deeply disturbed about what is happening in regard to our relationship with our neighbouring country, China.

We were told only this morning that all the countries were talking of peaceful co-existence. Russia is talking of it. But how is it conducting itself? It was over Tibet that we agreed to peaceful co-existence. But what has been the result? I am not war-mongering; I have no doubt whatever we mean peace. But do the other people who are talking aloud from house-tops mean peace? That is the point. Much is made of disarmament. Can you disarm if the other man does not believe in disarmament? These are fundamental issues where we should make our own mind up and then try to preach to the whole world.

I find that when we talk to everybody else we are not quite truthful. Take the question of South Africa. Why have we withdrawn our relationship from there? Why have we withdrawn our relationship from Portugal? Why do we talk aloud here and why do we talk to everybody regardless of whether they agree with us or not? If we mean peace at any cost, personally I do not mean peace at any cost; I am not prepared to accept peace at any cost, as some friends have said. It is not that simple. So, I say, we had better be a little more honest in our professions, we had better be witnesses to what we profess.

Take, for example, this white paper which has been given to us in the last couple of days. If you look at the second page, you will find we are still brown Britishers or white Britishers or whatever we like to call

ourselves. Here we say, "In black Africa....". What do we mean by this sort of insolent language "black Africa"? Is this the type of document that should have been distributed to us, dividing Africa into black Africa and white Africa? Do we accept this? This is only a symptom of our hypocrisy. I regret I have to put it that strong, because I felt that after the very serious, controlled and staid speech that our Foreign Minister gave and also his appeal that we should not be in a rut, I should give out my mind.

We talk of negotiations. Before we come to negotiations, I better go back again to the Minister of Defence, who seems to be indispensable, when it comes to the United Nations delegation. I happened to be in that part of the world last year. It was an amazing thing that I discovered that he was the most disliked person. Here the Prime Minister has more than once told us the reason why he is disliked is they are all frightened of him, because he is much too brilliant, and they just cannot stand up to him. Well, Sir, I have seen his brilliance here. I have known him for the last 36 years. I have known him when he was a nobody and I have to know him today because he is everybody from being the Defence Minister to the Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, the Transport Minister and Communications Minister and everything in fact, depending upon what the circumstances are.

I feel we are making a mistake in undermining the appropriate role of the people we have sent abroad. Take the case of our representation in the U.N.O. There is our permanent representative. I know the alternate representative who is going there is a very fine man. He is a contemporary of mine, a fine man. But what is wrong with the permanent representative that he should not be the alternate representative? It is because the great Shri Krishna Menon must

do the selection. He must have men who will do exactly what he says. What is wrong with our ambassador in Washington? We talk of our foreign exchange shortage and yet there is a regiment going along. I know many of our colleagues are going. I am very glad that they are going. I am glad that Shri Pande has had the courage to say that he will not go unless he is given the appropriate role there. That is all right.

We get some public relations officer. This is not the first time he is going there. He has gone there before. We have the public relations officer in our embassy in the United States. Do we have to call somebody all the way every time Shri Krishna Menon has to go and that he must be a nominee of Shri Krishna Menon? Is that how we operate?

Coming back to this question of Chinese aggression, I am bracketed with quite a good few of fellow Members here. I feel very strongly that we have not done anything like what we could have done. Not only now but even at the early stages, it was very much easier to do it, to vacate Chinese aggression. But today we are only talking of "patience, patience, patience" as Gandhiji used to say "Shanti, Shanti, Shanti". It is amazing. It is not going to lead us very far. We know the country we are dealing with, a very old civilisation.

16 hrs.

If I may go back to the rut, every time I participate in a debate of this kind I have always to ask my very dear and revered friend, the Prime Minister, as to how far he has gone ahead in his negotiations with Pakistan in regard to the Chittagong Hill Tracts. I ask this question again and again: what has he done so far to get back the Chittagong Hill Tracts? 99.9 per cent. of the population there were non-Muslims, most of them Buddhists. But the Congress leaders in Bengal, in their hope of getting

a little bigger chunk on the Murshidabad side, jettisoned what really belonged and should have belonged to India. It was an accomplished fact, an *fait accompli* when the problem was discussed. I want to ask a direct question, not for the first time—I think it is the 13th time that I am asking this question—as to what concrete steps have been taken by our Government to see that the Chittagong Hill Tracts which should, by all canons, by all the rules, by all the notions applied at the time of partition—which we have not applied and which they have applied—belong to India, come to India, and what progress have you made. That is all I have to say.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Anand (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Chairman, instead of there being real appreciation of what the Ministry of External Affairs have done, the opposition have, as usual, taken the opportunity to level criticisms, and it seems they make criticism for criticism's sake. I would like to touch on the home front. I know that the External Affairs Ministry are doing all they can to safeguard India's interests. Even so, I would like to make a few suggestions for whatever they may be worth.

Recently, I read in the papers that a delegation had come from Bhutan and, possibly, from Sikkim also. It is said that the delegation that came to Delhi, came for the purpose of getting this Government to talk over things with the Sikkim and Bhutan Governments so that they could have adult franchise, election laws and so on and so forth. Here I have to make a suggestion that in view of the border situation, elections and the like in Bhutan and Sikkim should be put off. I am in full sympathy with all their democratic demands. It is a democratic age and naturally what they want is perfectly justifiable. Even so, our present position is such that we should not dabble in their internal affairs or bring about uncer-

[Maharajkumar Vijaya Anand]

tainty in them. We have seen in recent elections how people scramble for power, and it leads to all sorts of bitterness. I feel that in Sikkim and Bhutan at least for the next five years there should be no elections. The Maharajas of Sikkim and Bhutan represent the very essence of democracy. I know them personally and I can tell you that their love for the people is amazing. They are for the people and by the people. Let the Maharajas be there, at least for another five years....

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): They are for the people and by the people. What about "of the people"?

Maharajkumar Vijaya Anand: There is the Nepal border, and I am very happy to see that good relations with Nepal have been maintained, and it is a very happy augury that the Prime Minister of Nepal has been visiting India. I hope the same will be with our Prime Minister and he will also visit Nepal often.

Now I come to Pakistan. Their slogan and motto has been "heads I win, tails you lose". This has been their policy motto and their be-all and end-all—heads I win; tails you lose. No matter what we do, they want to have their own way. They make demands on India, and the policy of appeasement with them has never proved beneficial. The recent broadcast of Field-Marshal Ayub Khan was not a very diplomatic one, and I am not very happy about it. First he queered the pitch and then went on to say that he would welcome our Prime Minister to Pakistan. It was indeed very noble of our Prime Minister to have accepted to go to Pakistan after what was said by President Ayub Khan in his speech. The time has come for us to tell Pakistan that we shall have nothing to do over the talks on Kashmir once and for all. It suits their propaganda to keep the Kashmir problem alive. It is high time that we told them that

we would entertain no talks on the question of Kashmir once and for all, and unless that is made clear, Sir, that country keeps feeding its people with all imaginary things. It suits their propaganda, whereas it does us a lot of harm. So, it is better for us to tell them once and for all that we shall not discuss Kashmir and if they want to go ahead with their complaint in the United Nations, they are welcome to do whatever they like, because Kashmir has been a part of India and shall remain India's.

The policy of non-alignment has brought about very rich dividends. India's stature in the international sphere has gone up and today India is respected for its non-military alliances, for having no pacts and for not joining military alliances. The motto of India, led by the Prime Minister, is "friends of all and enemies of none". This is entirely due to the dynamic personality of the Prime Minister.

Shri Nehru's foreign policy, to describe in one sentence, is one of peace through non-alignment. May I say 'peace' to Shri Nehru is what 'truth' was to Gandhiji? Likewise, 'non-alignment' is to Shri Nehru what 'non-violence' was to Gandhiji.

Many hon. Members have suggested that we should leave the Commonwealth. I ask "what is the matter? Why should we leave the Commonwealth?". Britain has been a very good friend and we are equal partners in the Commonwealth. We have a sovereign Parliament, we have a sovereign Republic, Britain is our very good friend and it is to our advantage to be in the Commonwealth rather than be out of it. If anything, our going out of the Commonwealth would mean that Pakistan would have the upper hand and it would be a golden opportunity for Pakistan to do more propaganda against us. It is a happy augury that the Queen will be visiting India this

winter. I feel that Her Majesty should be given a greater reception than we had given to even President Eisenhower.

Last year, when I was a commentator for the B.B.C. and I was going about on the Continent in between test matches I had occasion to go to the Scandinavian countries.

In the Scandinavian countries the Police are very strict. On one occasion I saw a car being parked on the wrong side of the road. There was a light coloured man inside the car. The Policeman accosted him and said, "You are on the wrong side of the road". He replied something. The Policeman asked, "Are you an Italian?". He replied, "No, I am an Indian." The Policeman turned round and said, "You are an Indian. You are Nehru. Go on, I will not fine you." That is how this country is looked upon in foreign countries.

Regarding China, there have been speeches, for and against, in this House. I belong to that school of thought who feel that China has let us down badly. She has stabbed us in the back after the great things that we have done for that country. They are a ruthless nation. They are inhuman in their treatment. I know it. People who have been there have seen things for themselves. To behead a man, to tie him upside down with his legs tied up in the air and to dangle him all over the streets is a common occurrence. Doing a man to death is a *banye haath ka khel* for them. That is how they behave. That is how they live. Even their diet is so unlike others. I know of a historical fact, written in a book by a very good authority, that they take a live pig and bury it in such a way in a particular type of box—I do not know how it is done—that the pig decomposes, the worms begin to eat each other and ultimately one big worm turns out. They take it out on marriage and other festive occasions, cut raw slices and serve it with wine. That is how those people live.

I am all for military action if there is further aggression of Indian soil. I fully appreciate and realise that people who want military action are justified, but let us not do it just now. Let us wait till they do something more. In that event India should not lag behind. Then there will be no question of speeches. We must throw them out then.

We should be thankful to our leaders that we have a stable government in this country. Only 13 years ago India and other countries became free and independent. You have seen the fate of other countries. Even a country like Ceylon, whose literacy is far higher than ours, has had a change of government, what to talk about Pakistan. You never know what tomorrow has in store there. There has been a military rule in Burma. As for the Malayan States, the least said the better. There is a *coup d'etat* every evening or every morning. So is the case with Indonesia. So I say that we should be thankful to our leaders that we have got a stable government which is responsible and which has the confidence not only of the people of this country but of the whole world.

With these observations I resume my seat.

Mr. Chairman: I have a brief announcement to make. I have been authorised by the hon. Speaker to announce that this debate will extend up to 6 p.m. and the half-an-hour discussion will be postponed.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): Will the hon. Prime Minister reply tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Prime Minister will reply tomorrow morning.

Shri Raghunath Singh: My half-an-hour discussion is being postponed now for a month. So I want to be certain about it. Three times it came

[Shri Raghunath Singh]

on the Agenda. Again, it is being postponed.

Mr. Chairman: This debate is also equally important.

Shri Raghunath Singh: When will I get the time for this?

Mr. Chairman: Next session.

Shri Raghunath Singh: It cannot be in the next session. It is not a resolution. It cannot come up in the next session. In the previous session I wanted to raise a half-an-hour discussion, but I got a notice that it was postponed. Then it was never taken up. This time also the same thing is happening. A poor man like me always suffers. Those who have influence have the things.

Mr. Chairman: He can represent that to the hon. Speaker.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Two sessions have passed and my half-an-hour discussion is never taken up. This happened in the previous session and this is happening this time also.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Shri Mahanty.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thought that distance dims perspective, but listening to the debate on foreign affairs in this House I think that our focus is so much heightened that all other issues have been obliterated. This morning I was slightly amused to learn

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): Why not we stick to ten minutes now?

Shri Mahanty: This morning I was slightly amused to learn that a chit from Congo regarding our acceptability has so much enthralled the hon. Members on the official benches, so glibly they have gone on talking of non-involvement and the virtues of *Panchsheel* that the most outstanding

issues of our foreign policy today have been left almost untouched. I shall not call it a deliberately trying to avoid the issue but definitely it is a subtle attempt to evade this. Five years ago the Chinese started their aggression on Indian territory. In the mean time five long years have elapsed, 12,000 square miles have been kept under Chinese occupation and today we are glibly discussing the merits of non-involvement. We are considering the issues of war and peace, morals of the cold war and peaceful co-existence.

It is essential that the issues are clarified because the issues have to be clarified if any purposive action is going to flow. What are the issues today? Many graceful speeches have been made and will be made equating Jawaharlal Nehru's non-involvement with Gandhiji's non-violence etc. But the fact is to be remembered that today the basic issue of our foreign policy is not non-involvement or involvement. Today the basic issue is the vacation of Chinese aggression that has been committed on Indian territory. Is there any escape from that? If anybody has the wisdom to say, "Yes, there is another answer to it", certainly I will abide by his decision. We cannot have the cake and eat it. We cannot talk of blood, sweat and tears when opportunity is provided to us and also ask the country to be united to vacate the Chinese aggression and then at the next moment turn round and talk of non-involvement. According to my limited way of understanding today the basic issue of our foreign policy is how to vacate the Chinese aggression. I am pained to say that there is no purposeful attempt on the part of the Government to meet that situation.

Let me also say that if it means involvement, I would welcome that temporary involvement. If it means our sucking into the vortex of military relations, I would welcome it in the interest of maintaining the inte-

grity and the sovereignty of our country. If it means warlike preparations, it is far better to have warlike preparations than to acquiesce in this kind of international bullying and aggrandisement. Either we have to make ourselves ready for the final parting with (these 12,000 square miles or more to the Chinese or it is high time that we tell the country that we are going to take definite steps to redeem the occupied territory from Chinese control.

I do not say so in a jingoistic or chauvinistic spirit. Today the fact has to be borne in mind that China is about to establish its stranglehold and superiority and build its influence not only throughout South East Asia but also in Western Asia, in Africa and in Eastern Europe. On the eve of this adventure, China is intent that she must give a rough and raw deal to India so that the small nations are terrorised, so that a psychological atmosphere is created for acquiescing in this kind of aggression.

Let us look at the record of China which stands by peaceful co-existence and *Panchsheel*. The other day, she has blatantly violated her treaty of friendship with Nepal and has transgressed into the demilitarised area with blood and fire. Look at the spectacle of a communist China fighting against Indonesia. Over what? Over petty interests of Chinese capitalists. That is the record of the country. Even now when an official team is engaged in considering the border issues, Chinese intrusions have taken place in N.E.F.A. area. With this record of this country, it is really baffling my imagination how we are still pinning our faith on and we are still glibly talking of *Panchsheel*.

China is about to sign a treaty of friendship with Burma. That should not deflect us. That is more directed at driving a wedge between Burma and other Asian countries which are suffering from Chinese aggression. It may also be taken as an attempt to strike a diplomatic victory over India. But, what has been done in Burma?

In Burma, we have seen that China has been fighting for 56 square miles of territory. The fight has gone on from 1955 to 1960, for small bits of territory here and there. If China could fight for these small bits, a few square miles of territories, here, we are concerned with thousands of square miles of Indian territory. But, our Prime Minister goes on talking glibly of non-involvement and *Panchsheel*.

In this context, I am sorry to say that there is a deliberate attempt on the part of this Government to avoid the issue. I will substantiate my allegation by giving one instance only. We know, after the Chinese Prime Minister's departure from Delhi in April last, an official team was appointed by both the Governments for reporting on the India-China border disputes. What amuses me is, what the two powerful Prime Ministers could not achieve, it is supposed that a team of officials at the Deputy Secretary level will decide. Be that as it may, the terms of reference of that team were:

(1) location and national features of the boundary as claimed by the two Governments, that is, examination of factual data, whether papers, documents, maps and records, etc.

(2) the basis of the boundary alignments in treaties and agreements, tradition and custom. Some time back, we were told that the team had completed consideration of item 1, and for the consideration of item 2, the Chinese officials had reached the Indian capital. But pertinently, one might ask why the team was appointed after all. Moreover, what was there to determine afresh? The very fact that the Government of India are not sure about their own boundaries as defended by them lends juridical and moral support to the Chinese aggression committed in the northern borders of India. I am sorry that the Government of India could have been so ill-advised as to accept a proposal to appoint an official team to go into this question, which

[Shri Mahanty]

was well decided both in history and in geography. Times without number the Prime Minister had declared that the Indian boundary was settled in law and in fact, in history and in geography, in treaties and in conventions, in maps and in records. Then, where was the necessity for appointing this team and thereby agreeing to subject the Indian borders to a controversy? If it is not avoiding the issue, I do not know how this can be evaded. What two powerful Prime Ministers could not achieve is sought to be achieved by a team of officials at the Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary level.

In this context, I would like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that of late some Government spokesmen have sought to minimise the enormity of the situation by belittling it as a mere border dispute, by equating the Chinese aggression on a par with our dispute with Pakistan in the Kashmir sector. I do not know what these gentlemen seek to achieve by this kind of equation. Be that as it may, the fact has to be remembered that on no account the aggression of China can be equated with the disputes which have been started by Pakistan with India. All those who equate it with India-Pakistan disputes and are seeking to minimise it as some border dispute are suffering from incurable myopia. I would beg of the Prime Minister not to allow his Government to be vitiated by this kind of myopic approach and this kind of perverted perspective. There can be no question of equating what is happening in Pakistan with China. It is a subtle attempt to divert the attention of the nation from matters of moment to matters which are not so consequential.

In this context, it is really heartening to note that the Prime Minister has declared in another place that active steps taken by the Government are now complete which will enable the Government to meet any possible

Chinese aggression on the border, etc. But, he has not stated what active steps have been taken by the Government. The hon. Prime Minister can take shelter behind the plea that it is in the interests of security that these details should not be given to Parliament, that it is not in the public interests that such details are given to Parliament. I would venture to submit that many Prime Ministers in many democratic parliaments have given out details about those matters which agitate the mind of the nation. To give the latest instance, during the Suez crisis, the British Prime Minister Mr. Anthony Eden had to give the minutest details of the military preparations and other preparations which the British Government had to undertake in the Suez area. Therefore, I think it will be perfectly in order for the hon. Prime Minister to take the trouble to inform the Parliament and through it the entire country what steps have been taken by the Government to meet this Chinese aggression. It is not enough to say in the Rajya Sabha or elsewhere that all possible steps have been taken. It is necessary that this Parliament should know them. Parliament which, ultimately will have to bear all this strain and responsibility of the situation, must be taken into confidence and must be told what steps have been taken. If the Prime Minister had in view the roads which are now under construction, then I will most respectfully submit that such assurances have to be taken with a big pinch of salt. We know what he is referring to as construction of border roads—construction of border roads for which a paltry provision of Rs. 15 crores has been made and for that too, authorisation did not feature in the General Budget papers, but for which authorisation had to be sought for in Supplementary demand. These border roads, in this context, do not make one very optimistic so as to accept the hon. Prime Minister's assurances with any amount of optimism. Let me say that the border roads, of course, will

fulfil a great need. Our logist will be much improved. But, I would like to know how you are going to utilise the logistics, for supplying what? I noticed in the press the other day that our Chief of Army Staff Gen. Thimayya, has been visiting the Mountain Welfare School in Itay. He will be spending 4 days with the Alpine troops of the Italian army studying their clothing, equipment and methods of training. This experience should be useful according to certain sources in solving some of the problems faced by our soldiers in border areas and in providing them with clothing, and equipment similar to those used by soldiers who live at great heights elsewhere. If this report is true, and I think it is, then the inescapable conclusion that one arrives at is that even now our border forces are ill-equipped and ill-prepared to meet the challenge that has been posed to us in our northern frontier.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am sorry I have to intervene; he will forgive me. Gen. Thimayya has been requested by the All-India Council of Sports to visit this particular place with a view to advising the Council as to how we can develop mountaineering amongst our young men in this country. Although we have a Mountaineering Institute in Darjeeling, and Tensing Norkay and others are associated with it, we felt in the All-India Council of Sports that since Gen. Thimayya was going to be round about there, if he could go over and look up the manner in which this training was conducted, it would be of use to the All-India Council of Sports. It has really nothing to do with military affairs.

Shri Mahanty: I am more disturbed now, after my hon. friend's intervention, than before. I thought the Army Chief of Staff had gone abroad in connection with some of the matters which are of real moment. Now I understand he has gone about to gain experiences about mountaineering. Certainly it is not the Army

Chief's job. For that, my hon. friend could have very well gone.

Be that as it may, I am not trying to minimise the gravity of the situation. My simple point is this, that by the construction of these roads our logistic position will no doubt improve, but it will improve for what? If we have no weapons, no armaments, if we have no other equipment to supply our army and sustain them, this improvement in logistics will be of no avail. I feel there has been a paralysis of our will and determination to meet the challenge that has been posed by our northern neighbour. Let that fact be considered. To obliterate that fact let us not have discourses on the merits and demerits of non-involvement, panchsheel, cold war, etc.

In this context, I should like to make a reference to our Prime Minister's projected visit to Pakistan. Nothing could be more welcome than his efforts to bring about peaceful relations with Pakistan, and I really congratulate the Prime Minister for having taken up courage in this regard notwithstanding some of the objections that we hear from time to time. I do concede that in our subconscious not only this generation but also generations to come will carry some of the bitter racial memories in regard to Pakistan, but the fact has to be remembered that both history and geography have so conditioned these two countries that we have to live together. There is no escape from that fact. If, to achieve that unity we have to pay some petty amount of money here and there, if we have to make some petty sacrifices here and there, it is far more welcome than conceding thousands of square miles of territory under a kind of international bullying and blackmailing. Therefore, in this context it is really heartening to learn that the Prime Minister is taking purposeful steps to solve some of these outstanding differences between India and Pakistan

[Shri Mahanty.]

which have bedevilled our relationships. I wish him all success in this venture.

Before I close, I wish to make a reference to the dramatic developments in Africa which have completely changed the face of that continent. It is heartening to note that 24 independent African States have come into existence since 1950 and four more are to be independent within a year. The urge for freedom in Africa will be appreciated from the fact that since this White Paper was laid on the Table of the House, half a dozen or more African States have gained independence. But it is a tragedy of history that colonial Powers do not read the significance of these developments, do not appreciate the dramatic changes which have been changing the face of Africa. In this context, while congratulating these free nations on their struggle against colonialism and imperialism, I deem it proper to sound a note of warning that those who in the name of freedom and democracy are struggling hard to deny the very same values to the oppressed people of Africa will be washed away by forces which are inimical to this concept. That will be a tragedy not only for those nations but to the cause of democracy and peace in the world as well. I am sure they will take note of it.

Mr. Chairman: I may observe that there are many more speakers on the list. So, the time-limit may be limited to ten to twelve minutes. Shri Dinesh Singh.

Shri Dinesh Singh (Banda): Much has happened since we had the occasion in this House last time to discuss foreign affairs. On the one hand, the hopes and aspirations of the world climbed the long and arduous road to the summit and then tumbled down. To this extent the world moved nearer a general conflict. On the other hand, many more countries in Africa have become independent. If we look at

the picture of Africa ten years ago, we find that there were only four independent countries in this vast continent. Within these ten years, 20 more countries have become independent, and there are only four territories that need to liberate themselves from foreign domination. The freedom of the countries in Africa has a general bearing on world problems, because these countries will very soon take their places in the comity of free nations in the United Nations, and will enlarge the area of non-involvement which alone is the hope of the world for saving itself.

We see this picture of the world gradually evolving itself from foreign domination, and people becoming more and more vociferous in their drive towards non-involvement. I am surprised that when the entire world is talking of non-involvement, some people in this House should doubt the policy of the Government which has always been in favour of this non-involvement. This is a strange situation. People are saying that our policy is neutral, that we are sitting on the fence, that we are zigzagging, but we have been pursuing this policy in spite of being ridiculed and talked down. When that policy is bearing fruit now and when everyone is recognising its merit, I am amazed that some people here should try to blame the Government for following this policy.

Coming back to Africa, we find that there has been some trouble. The Congo has had a most unfortunate experience of colonialism. But the world assembly has come to its rescue, and in that we see the hope that whenever there is a colonial plot to dominate a country, the international organisation will take steps to see that the hard-won freedom of the people is not thrown away. Here in this House today our Government was criticised for its policy regarding the Congo. I cannot see the reason for this criticism. There is nothing that

we have done that justifies it. We had been asked by the United Nations to send some people to help organise the security forces there, to see that there is general calm there, and in response to that we sent some people. I cannot see what is so terribly wrong with that. Here, we are asked not to stand in between the aspirations of the African people. We are not doing that. We are not interfering in the internal affairs at all. We are today only there to see that the United Nations' work is carried out.

Then, I should like to refer briefly to the situation in Algeria. The situation there is tragic. The time has come when we should render some effective help to the Algerian people. I am not sure to what extent we can go out and help them openly, but I do feel that a certain amount of pressure can be put upon the Government of France, as we did in the case of Netherlands, when Indonesia's freedom was being blocked by them. I think this very vast area where people have been suffering for a very long time needs our help, and the time has come when we must render them some effective help.

Then, the situation in Goa is also rather tragic, in the sense that we have not been able to do very much in removing this gangrene from our body. It is rather a difficult situation. We are blamed sometimes for not taking effective steps. There is no definite step, I think, which we can take, short of war, but it has been the policy of the Government of India, to which we all agree in this House, that we should not go to war. I feel, however, that we should do something to stop the smuggling that is going on, which is demoralising the people there; and we should also do something in regard to the building of the roads, that had been mentioned here several times; and I hope that this matter will be considered.

We are blamed here of weakness in our relations with China. Several Members from the opposite side have

blamed us not only for weakness, for surrendering our territory but for all sorts of actions which we are supposed to have taken. And the hon. Member Shri Nath Pai mentioned that we should do something to liberate these territories.

It is very curious that in his speech, he read out a short verse in Sanskrit, I am afraid I am not a Sanskrit scholar to repeat that verse, but he said that it meant roughly that we should not bank too much upon the weakness of our foes or too much upon the support of our friends, but upon ourselves. I submit that that is exactly what we are doing.

In this area, as has been pointed out before in this House several times, movement is very difficult, and communications are very difficult. It is not possible for us overnight to take some drastic steps. But we are building roads. We are extending effective administration to these areas. And unless we are able to do that, unless we are in effective control there, I submit that there is very little that we can do. We may talk about it here, and we may shout about it here, but beyond that, effective steps can only be taken when we have got the means of getting to those areas; then, the time comes when we have to do something. But I submit that we are moving in that direction. At the same time, we are having talks with the Chinese. And not only that, but we have tried to mobilise all the forces at our command to try to develop this area. I submit that positive action is being taken there.

Then, Shri Ranga, during his long and eloquent speech brought in the question of Tibet. He said that the British Government had kept this State as a buffer State between India and China. I think there is some misunderstanding on that score. The British Government had never recognised the independence of Tibet; they had always recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet. As such, I can-

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

not see how it is said that Tibet was maintained as a buffer State. When the Central authority in China was weak, it could not extend its effective influence in Tibet. That is true. But to say that Tibet was maintained by the British as a buffer State and surrendered by us to China is giving a wrong impression not only to this House but to the entire world. I wish the hon. Member had considered this matter most seriously before throwing these charges at us. What has happened in Tibet is very sad. Everyone admits it. No one wants to condone one Power for doing whatever it has done. But in our enthusiasm to condemn people, we should not forget the facts as they are. The facts are quite clear, and there is nothing we have done to surrender Tibet to China or to any other Power.

So when we look at this situation and at the charges that are levelled against the Government, we find that there is really no force in them, and that this whole House is actually supporting the policy of the Government. We are very happy today that in spite of our differences, we have the general support of the House in our foreign policy.

श्री वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : सभ्यपति जी, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के डिप्टी लीडर, प्रोफेसर हीरेन मुकर्जी ने, जिन को मैं बड़े आदर की दृष्टि से देखता हूँ . . .

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : कब से ?

श्री वाजपेयी : उन की विद्वता के लिये, विचारों के लिये नहीं। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को एक चुनौती दी है। मुझे विश्वास है कि उस का उत्तर दिया जायेगा। केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास राज्य की सरकारों से और पहाड़ी जिलों से जरूर ऐसी खबरें आई होंगी, जिन से यह साबित किया जा सके कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी उन जिलों में चीन के आक्रमण के सवाल

पर गलत ढंग का प्रचार कर रही है। मैं अपने कम्युनिस्ट दोस्तों का ध्यान इस सप्ताह के बम्बई के बिल्डिंग की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। बिल्डिंग पर कोई यह आरोप नहीं लगा सकता कि वह कम्युनिस्ट-विरोधी है। अगर उस पर कोई आरोप लगता है तो वह यही है कि वह कम्युनिस्टों की तरफ काफी झुका हुआ है। लेकिन इस सप्ताह के बिल्डिंग ने लिखा है—

“In upper Garhwal, there are two villages, Chanyee and Thanyee. The Communists have gone round to tell the people that the area belongs to China because the names of villages sound Chinese. In other hill districts of UP, local Communists are accusing the Government of India of raising the bogey of China's aggression to take away public attention from other pressing problems, like unemployment and rising prices”.

मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर यह खबर गलत है, तो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के हाने माननीय सदस्यों को इस अखबार पर मुकदमा चलाना चाहिये और उसे माफी मांगने पर मजबूर करना चाहिये। लेकिन इस तरह की खबरें और भी मिली हैं। मैं पिछले साल जब अलमोड़ा गया था, तो वहाँ के लोगों ने मुझे बताया कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से सम्बंधित एक सांस्कृतिक संगठन है जो सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों में नाटक या अभिनय के द्वारे लोगों को आकृष्ट करता है और उस मण्डली ने वहाँ एक ऐसा नाटक किया, जिसमें चीनी सेना को लिबरेशन आर्मी के रूप में भारत में आते हुए दिखाया गया था। मैं चाहूंगा कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के प्रवक्ता इन आरोपों का ठीक तरह से उत्तर दें। सवाल यहाँ सिर्फ न्यू एज का नहीं है, जिसका उल्लेख प्रधान मंत्री जी ने किया है। लखनऊ से न्यू एज का एक हिंदी संस्करण निकलता है,

जिस का नाम जनयुग है। उस पत्र ने उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के एक विज्ञापन को छापा था। उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने जब चीन की आक्रामक गतिविधियाँ बढ़ने लगीं तो प्रदेश के सभी हिन्दी अखबारों को एक विज्ञापन दिया। मैं उस विज्ञापन को आप को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ :-

“उत्तर प्रदेश के निवासियों पर देश की उत्तरी सीमा की रक्षा का भार विशेष रूप से है। चीन की आक्रामक कार्याविधियों का सामना हम पारस्परिक सहयोग और संगठित प्रयत्न से ही कर सकते हैं। प्रदेश की सरकार पूरे राज्य और विशेषतया सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिये अनेक योजनाएँ चला रही हैं। इन योजनाओं को सफल बना कर आप स्वदेश प्रेम का परिचय देंगे। और राष्ट्र की शक्ति बढ़ाने में सहायक बनेंगे।”

यह विज्ञापन सभी हिन्दी पत्रों में छपा और जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का हिन्दी का जनयुग है, उस ने भी इस विज्ञापन को छापा। मगर थोड़े दिन के बाद जनयुग के सम्पादक ने अपने अखबार में एक माफीनामा छापा। माफीनामा इस प्रकार था कि हम ने यह जो विज्ञापन छापा है यह हम ने बड़ी गलती की, हमने बड़ा पाप किया और हम को चीन को आक्रामक नहीं कहना चाहिये और हम ने अपने पाठकों की भावनाओं को दुःख पहुँचाया है, हम ऐसा पाप फिर कभी नहीं करेंगे। हम को इस बार माफ किया जाये

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : पत्रचालाप भी किया था नहीं ?

श्री वासुदेवी : जो माफीनामा है, उस का जो अंग्रेजी में अनुवाद है, उस को मैं आप के सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ।

“Many readers had sent indignant letters, calling attention to the anti China advertisement of the U.P. Government. The at-

tention of the paper had been drawn to the 'lying and mischievous' contents of the advertisement even before these letters were received.”

'lying mischievous'

शब्द इनर्वाटिड कामाज में है।

“There was no doubt that an advertisement of this kind should under no circumstances have been published by the paper.”

प्रश्न यह है कि जब उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के विज्ञापन में चीन के आक्रमण का नहीं केवल चीन की आक्रामक कार्यवाही का उल्लेख था और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का नीति सम्बन्धी वक्तव्य नहीं, केवल विज्ञापन था तो उस के लिये माफी मांगने की क्या जरूरत थी ? क्या यह बात यह नहीं बतलाती कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी इस विवाद में देश के साथ नहीं है, राष्ट्र के साथ यहाँ है? चीन के बारे में उसके अन्दर मतभेद हो सकते हैं मैं उन को समझ सकता हूँ। लेकिन एक बार जब इस संसद ने और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने निर्णय किया कि चीन ने आक्रमण किया है तो मैं नहीं समझता कि देश में जो भी पार्टियाँ हैं या गुप हैं उन्हें इस बात को छुट दी जा सकती है कि वे इसके ऊपर विवाद करें कि आक्रमण किया है या नहीं किया है। आक्रमण किया है या नहीं इसका फैसला सरकार करेगी और अगर एक बार यह फैसला हो गया कि आक्रमण किया है तो देश में रहने वाले प्रत्येक नागरिक का कर्तव्य है कि वह उसी के अनुसार चले। मगर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है, इस सवाल पर देशभक्ति का परिचय नहीं दे रही है और जब कभी हमारे प्रवान मंत्री कभी कभी-कभी कभी जो उन को खटकता है और जो सारे देश को खटकता है—उसका प्रकटीकरण करते हैं तो कम्युनिस्ट नेता चुनौती देते हैं। चुनौती देते हैं कि आप साबित करिये। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इससे बड़ा प्रमाण और क्या हो सकता है

[श्री वाजपेयी]

अगर चीन ने आक्रमण नहीं किया है तो क्या चीनी फौजें हिन्दुस्तान में गुड-विल मिशन के ऊपर आई है ? क्या १२,००० बर्ग मील भूमि भारत की भूमि नहीं है, जिस पर उन्होंने कब्जा कर लिया है ? इस सवाल पर अगर भावनाओं की दृष्टि से देश में बटवारा होता है, अगर जनता बांटी जाती है, तो यह देश अपनी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा नहीं कर सकता है। कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी को अपनी नीति बदलनी चाहिये। आर्थिक सवालों पर उनका कोई भी मत हो सकता है और मार्क्स के घिसे पिटे हुए जीवन दर्शन के साथ वह चिपकी रहे, इसमें कोई आपत्ति की बात नहीं है। मगर जब देश की स्वतंत्रता, देश की सुरक्षा में से चुनाव करना होगा, तो जो भारत के साथ खड़ा नहीं रहेगा, वह भारत में कैसे काम कर सकता है, इसका मुझे उत्तर चाहिये। मगर कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी अपना शलती मानने के बजाय चुनौती देती है और चुनौती देती है आक्रामक को नहीं, बल्कि आक्रामक के पक्ष में चुनौती देती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि समय आ गया है जब कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी को साफ शब्दों में कहा जाए कि वह अपनी नीति बदले और अगर उसने अपनी नीति नहीं बदली तो हम सीमावर्ती इलाकों में उसके कार्यकर्ताओं को नहीं जाने देंगे। वहाँ पर गरीबी है, भुखमरी है। एक हजार वर्ष की परतंत्रता के बाद हम स्वंत्र हुए हैं। हमारी सरकार ने भी इन पहाड़ी जिलों की तरफ जितना ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये था नहीं दिया है। अब वहाँ पर जा कर कोई कहे, आप गरीब हैं और हिमालय के उस पार चीन के साम्राज्य में दूध की नदियाँ बहती हैं तो मैं नहीं समझता कि यह कोई देश-भक्ति का काम है। मगर यह किया जा रहा है और सरकार को इसके बारे में सावधान रहना चाहिये।

मैं सरकार के इस फैसले का स्वागत करता हूँ कि इस बार संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की जनरल असेम्बली की जो बैठक हो रही है, उसमें हमारी सरकार चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में स्थान दिलाने के लिये पहल नहीं करेगी। अभी तक ऐसा होता था कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की कोई भी बैठक हो, अगर हमारा प्रतिनिधि मंडल स्वर निकालता था तो वह यही स्वर निकालता था कि चीन को वहाँ स्थान मिले। हम समझते हैं कि चीन को स्थान मिलना चाहिये लेकिन हमारा और चीन का जो विवाद है उस दृष्टि से अगर चीन को स्थान दिलाने के लिये हम पहल न करें तो चीन के प्रति हमारा जो गुस्सा है वह थंडा सा प्रकट होता है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक कदम है।

लेकिन एक बात जो हमारी समझ में नहीं आती है, यह है कि अधिकारियों के स्तर पर जो बातचीत चल रही है, उस बातचीत को गुप्त क्यों रखा जा रहा है? श्री रंगा ने जो सवाल उठाया था उसका प्रबन्ध मंत्री जी ने उत्तर दिया लेकिन उससे इस शंका का निवारण नहीं होता कि हमने सारी सीमा को विवाद का विषय नहीं बना लिया है। मैं उदाहरण के लिये कहता हूँ कि जैसे बाराहोती के बारे में हमारा झगड़ा है तो फिर उत्तर प्रदेश की हमारी जितनी सीमा तिब्बत से लगती है उस सारी सीमा की जांच पड़ताल की जाए, इसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : आपकी बात बिल्कुल सही है, मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ।

श्री वाजपेयी : मुझे खुशी है कि सारी सीमा की जांच पड़ताल नहीं की जा रही है। मगर अभी तक एक ऐसी धारणा बनी थी और उसका निराकरण हो जाना चाहिये। इसका कारण यह है कि सारी सीमा को हम विवाद का विषय बनायेंगे तो यह हमारे

लिये ठीक नहीं होगा। लेकिन असली समस्या यह है कि इन अधिकारियों को सितम्बर में अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश करनी है। जाहिर है कि ये अधिकारी कोई फैसला नहीं कर सकते हैं, इन्हें खाली रिपोर्ट करनी है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ अगर इन्होंने रिपोर्ट ऐसी करदी कि हम कोई समझौता नहीं कर सके हैं, तब क्या होगा ?

श्री जगह लाल नेहरू : समझौते का सवाल ही नहीं है।

श्री वाजपेयी : मेरा निवेदन है अगर वे समझें कि वी हैव फेल्ड टू एप्रि आन डाटा तब क्या होगा ?

श्री जगह लाल नेहरू : मैं नहीं जानता कि वे क्या करेंगे। लेकिन उनसे कहा गया है कि वे बतायें कैसे कागज हैं, कैसे डाकुमेंटस हैं, इसके इधर से या उधर से। उस सब को वे सामने रखेंगे और जांच करके बतायेंगे यह ठीक है या नहीं है। ठीक से मतलब यह है कि कागज गीर-तलब है, या नहीं है। इस किस्म की बात वे कहेंगे। वे थोड़े ही फैसला कर सकते हैं ? जाहिर सी बात है कि वे कोई समझौता नहीं कर सकते हैं चाहे जो भी उनके दिमाग में बात हो।

श्री वाजपेयी : वे समझौता नहीं कर सकते हैं, यह ठाँक है। लेकिन अगर कागज, पत्रों और दस्तावेजों के बारे में भी मतभेद रहता है तो यह बातचीत किस स्तर पर फिर से शुरू की जाएगी ? अगर अधिकारी आपस में एक मत नहीं हो सकते, अगर उनके दस्तावेज, उनके कागजपत्र बिल्कुल उलटी सीमाओं की रेखाओं की पुष्ट करते हैं तो फिर यह बातचीत हम कहां शुरू करेंगे और क्या इसका नतीजा यह नहीं होगा कि चीनी आक्रमण की समस्या लम्बी पड़ती चली जाएगी और हम आक्रमण को भूल जायेंगे और सीमा सम्बन्धी कुछ छुट-पुट विवादों को चर्चा का विषय बना कर उसमें फंसे रहेंगे ? अब सभी यह बात

मानते हैं कि भारत की भूमि को चीन के अपने कब्जे में कर लिया है और उस पर वह अपना आक्रमण मजबूत कर रहा है। सरकार ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया है कि उस अधिकृत प्रदेश में सड़कें बनाई जा रही हैं, तिब्बत में मिलिटरी बिल्ड-अप हो रहा है। ऐसी सूरत में अगर यह समस्या बातचीत से हल नहीं हुई तो क्या हम ऐसी स्थिति के लिये अपने को तैयार कर रहे हैं कि भारत की भूमि जो चीन के अबर्दस्ती कब्जे में है, उसको फिर से वापिस ला सकें ?

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में अल्जीरिया का उल्लेख किया है। स्वाभाविक है जब एशिया के नये-नये देश स्वाधीनता के प्रभात में प्रवेश कर रहे हैं और उनके जीवन के नये अध्याय का श्रीगणेश हो रहा है, हमारा ध्यान अल्जीरिया की तरफ जाए। लेकिन अल्जीरिया की तरफ हम अपना ध्यान ले जायें और हमारे पड़ोस में तिब्बत में ही मानवाधिकारों का उल्लंघन होता रहे, तिब्बत में नर-संहार के तथा दूसरी तरह के गम्भीर आरोप लगाये जाते रहें और हमारी सरकार तिब्बत के सम्बन्ध में चुप रहने की नीति अपनाये और जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में प्रश्न उठता हो तो इस प्रश्न पर विचार किया जाए यह तक कहने के लिये तैयार न हो तो फिर साम्राज्यवाद और उपनिवेशवाद के बारे में हमारी जो घोषणायें हैं, वे कुछ अपना अर्थ खो देती हैं। एक ओर तो पश्चिमी साम्राज्यवाद पीछे जा रहा है, गुलाम देश स्वाधीन हो रहे हैं और इधर हमारे पड़ोस में एक नया साम्राज्यवाद सिर उठा रहा है।

17 hrs.

यह साम्राज्यवाद पहले साम्राज्यवाद से अधिक घातक है, क्योंकि यह स्वतंत्रता के आवरण में आता है। यह मनुष्य की मुक्ति का नारा लगाता है, यह पराधीनता के साथ एक आर्थिक दर्शन को ले कर चलता

[श्री वाजपेयी]

है। तो जहाँ हम पश्चिमी साम्राज्यवाद के विनाश के उपर प्रसन्न हैं और एशिया अफ्रीका के नये स्वाधीन होने वाले देशों का स्वागत करते हैं वहाँ तिब्बत की ओर भी हमारा ध्यान जाना चाहिये। थाईलैंड और मलाया ने तिब्बत के सवाल को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठाने का फैसला किया है। होना तो यह चाहिये था कि भारत स्वयम् उठता पर अगर हम स्वयम् उठा नहीं सकते तो कम से कम हमें उन का समर्थन तो करना चाहिये।

जहाँ तक मानवाधिकारों का प्रश्न है, इस सम्बन्ध में कोई मतभेद नहीं हो सकता, और चीन भी बांधा हुआ है मानवाधिकारों का पालन कराने के समझौते से। चीन ने बांडुंग सम्मेलन में भाग लिया था और बांडुंग सम्मेलन में जेनेवा कन्वेंशन को स्वीकार किया गया था कि हम प्रत्येक देश में मानव अधिकारों का संरक्षण करेंगे और आज चीन में ही मानवाधिकारों को पैरों तले रौंदा जा रहा है। अगर उन का सवाल संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठता है तो भारत सरकार को उसमें पूरा भाग लेना चाहिये।

17.01 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair].

और उस में अपने नैतिक दायित्व को पूर्ण करना चाहिये। अब कहा जा सकता है कि अगर तिब्बत का सवाल वहाँ उठाया गया तो तिब्बतियों का फायदा नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि तर्क करने की यह पद्धति गलत है। तिब्बतियों का फायदा किस में होगा, इसका फैसला तिब्बत अधिक कर सकता है, और तिब्बत का फायदा किस में होगा यह फैसला हम करने लगे तो हम में और चीन में कोई फर्क नहीं रहेगा क्योंकि चीन भी यह कहता है कि तिब्बत का फायदा इसी रहेगा कि वह चीन के पेट में बँठा रहे। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि तिब्बत का फायदा किस में होगा इसका

फैसला तिब्बत वाले करें। और अगर वे चाहते हैं कि उन का सवाल संयुक्त राष्ट्र-संघ में उठाया जाये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत सरकार को इस नैतिक दायित्व से बचना नहीं चाहिये।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी पाकिस्तान जा रहे हैं। मैं उन के पाकिस्तान जाने के विरुद्ध नहीं हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह चाहता था कि यह जो नहरी पानी संधि हो रही है, उसके बारे में इस सदन को कुछ थोड़ा और बताया जाता। अभी तक हमें जैसे अन्वेष में रखा गया है, पर्व के पीछे समझौते हो रहे हैं और आज प्रधान मंत्री ने भी इतना कहा कि शायद १० साल का अंतरिम काल होगा, प्रश्न यह है कि उसमें हमें पाकिस्तान को कितना रुपया देना पड़ेगा या हम पाकिस्तान को पानी कब तक देते रहेंगे, राजस्थान का रेगिस्तान कब तक प्यासा रहेगा, पानी के लिये पाकिस्तान से हमें जो रुपया मिलना है वह मिलेगा या नहीं, और मिलेगा तो कितना मिलेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई भी ट्रिटी हो तो इस सदन को विश्वास में लिया जाना चाहिये और पाकिस्तान से किन शर्तों पर समझौता किया जा रहा है, इसका हमें पता लगना चाहिये।

यह भी कहा जाता है कि कश्मीर के ऊपर भी बात-चीत होगी। मैं नहीं जानता कि कश्मीर के ऊपर क्या बात-चीत होगी क्योंकि अगर कश्मीर के ऊपर कोई बात हो सकती है तो यही हो सकती है कि जो हिस्सा कश्मीर का पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है, उसे पाकिस्तान कब खाली कर ने जा रहा है। कश्मीर की समस्या पाकिस्तान के आक्रमण से उत्पन्न समस्या है, और कश्मीर की कोई समस्या नहीं है। मैं उन सदस्यों से मतभेद रखता हूँ जो कहते हैं कि चीन का हमला तो हमला है मगर पाकिस्तान का हमला हमला नहीं है। हमला हमला है, चाहे हमला करने वाला चीन हो या हमला करने वाला पाकिस्तान हो।

और अगर पाकिस्तान से हमारी मित्रता है, वह होनी चाहिये, तो उस का आघार आक्रमण नहीं हो सकता। जब तक कश्मीर के एक तिहाई हिस्से पर पाकिस्तान का कब्जा है तब तक तो मित्रता नहीं हो सकती। और अगर मित्रता नहीं हो सकती तो संयुक्त सुरक्षा का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। हां में इस सुझाव का स्वागत करता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ 'नो वार' डिक्लेरेशन करे। यह सुझाव हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पहले भी दिया था। यह सुझाव आज भी कायम है। भारत और पाकिस्तान इस बात की घोषणा करें कि सभी सवाल वे शांति से हल करेंगे, कश्मीर के सवाल पर भी लड़ाई नहीं करेंगे। अगर बात-चीत से कश्मीर का जो हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के पास है, वह हमें मिल जाये तो मैं इस बात-चीत का स्वागत करूंगा।

जो संयुक्त सुरक्षा की चर्चा करते हैं उन से मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। वे कहते हैं कि अगर पाकिस्तान से हमारी संयुक्त सुरक्षा हो गई तो पाकिस्तान के कश्मीर मोर्चे पर जो हमारी सेनायें लगी हैं वह खाली हो जायेंगी, और अगर वह खाली हो जायेंगी तो हम उन्हें चीन के मोर्चे पर लगा देंगे। मेरा निवेदन है कि जब तक सरकार की नीति यह है कि सेना को काम में नहीं लाना है तब तक चीन के खिलाफ सेनायें कितनी भी हो जायें, उस से कोई फर्क पड़ने वाला नहीं है और संयुक्त सुरक्षा से स्थिति नहीं बदलेगी। पहले सरकार की नीति बदलनी चाहिये कि अगर आवश्यकता पड़ेगी तो हम सेना का भी उपयोग करेंगे।

भारत और पाकिस्तान का सैनिक गठबंधन तब तक सम्भव नहीं है जब तक पाकिस्तान की विदेश नीति अलग है और हमारी विदेश नीति अलग है। हम

झगड़ों में नहीं फंसना चाहते—और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नीति ठीक है और देश को इस नीति पर दृढ़ता से चलते रहना चाहिये। लेकिन इस नीति को बदलने की बात तभी होती है जब कुछ लोगों को यह लगता है कि आज की स्थिति में हम अपने देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते। जब अमरीका से पाकिस्तान ने गठबंधन किया था तब भी यह आवाज उठी थी कि हमें सोवियट गुट में मिल जाना चाहिये और आज जब चीन ने हमारी सीमा का अतिक्रमण किया है तब भी यह आवाज उठ रही है कि हमें पाकिस्तान से मिल जाना चाहिये। मैं नहीं समझता कि यह कोई दृढ़ता की निशानी है। अगर इस से इस बात का पता जरूर लगता है कि अगर सरकार अपनी सीमा की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती तो देश के जनमत को दोनों गुटों से अलग रहने की नीति पर कायम रखना मुश्किल होगा। धीरे-धीरे यह आवाज उठेगी कि देश की रक्षा पहले है और उसकी रक्षा के लिये हमें किसी गुट में मिल जाना चाहिये। प्रोफेसर रंगा और श्री चक्रवर्ती राजगोपालाचारी जैसे मनीषी अगर हमें दोनों गुटों से अलग रहने की नीति को छोड़ने की सलाह दे रहे हैं तो शायद उन के सामने चीनी आक्रमण का खतरा है। लेकिन चीनी आक्रमण का मुकाबला करने के लिये हम पाकिस्तान की सेनायें अपने देश में बुला लें, मैं इसका हिमायती नहीं हूँ। प्रेजिडेंट प्रयूब कहते हैं कि भारत को हमारी जरूरत है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान को भी हमारी जरूरत है क्योंकि अफगानिस्तान में जो घटनायें हो रही हैं वे पाकिस्तान के लिये भी खतरा है, और इस समय बाताबरण समझौते का है। किन्तु अगर समझौते में चीन के खिलाफ हमें डटना चाहिये तो पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ भी डटना चाहिये। बात-चीत से अगर आक्रमण की समस्या हल हो जाये तो उस का स्वागत किया जायेगा। अगर किसी के आक्रमण का खतरा दिखला

[श्री बाजपेयी]

कर हम अपने देश की दोनों गुटों से अलग रहने की विदेश नीति को बदल दें, अपने राष्ट्रीयता पर आघात करें, मैं इस से सहमत नहीं हूँ। मुझे विश्वास है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की पाकिस्तान यात्रा सफल होगी इस अर्थ में कि कश्मीर का जो एक तिहाई हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के पास है, वह हमें मिल जायेगा। और सीमा पर जो तोड़-फोड़ की घटनाएँ हो रही हैं वह घटनाएँ भी बन्द हो जायेंगी। एक ओर तो पाकिस्तान मित्रता चाहता है, दूसरी ओर युद्ध विराम रेखा पर तोड़-फोड़ करता है। तोड़ फोड़ की क्या जरूरत है? अब वे कहते हैं कि हम जनमत संग्रह नहीं चाहते। जनमत संग्रह का तो पहले ही सवाल नहीं था? तो क्या वे चाहते हैं कि हम आक्रमण के सामने झुक जायें? अगर हम एक आक्रमण के सामने झुक जायें तो दूसरे आक्रमण का मुकाबला करने का हम में नैतिक साहस नहीं रहेगा। इस लिये दोनों आक्रमण अलग-अलग हैं क्योंकि दोनों झंडे अलग-अलग हैं, इस में हमारा विश्वास नहीं है और मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस सम्बन्ध में हमारी नीति स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये।

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a public warning should be given to Great Britain by all the Afro-Asian States not to interfere in the internal affairs of Jordan. It should be made clear to the Government of Great Britain that we cannot remain in the Commonwealth if British troops are sent to Jordan. The right of the people to determine their own form of Government by any means whatsoever cannot be challenged by Great Britain and if British troops are sent there, the power position of all the Afro-Asian States may be jeopardised.

Russia and India must evolve a common foreign policy on the question of Jordan. I suggest that a conference of non-aligned nations should

be convened to explore the possibilities of handing over the defence and foreign affairs portfolios to the United Nations Organisation.

An Hon. Member: All the nations?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Not all the nations but all the non-aligned nations, India included. If the conference fails to come to an agreement or is not held at all, India should unilaterally take the first step in that direction. *Panch Sheel* and national sovereignty are anti-thetical concepts. *Panch Sheel* is possible only within the framework of a world Government. The alternative to a bi-polar world is not war or hegemony but the emergence of a multi-polar world which, in my humble opinion, constitutes the greatest menace that has ever confronted humanity.

The goal of disarmament can be achieved only by handing over the control of defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation. Disarmament is not possible in a world of sovereign nation States. Neither Russia, nor China, nor America, nor England, nor France will throw away their nuclear weapons. Conventional weapons will have to be gradually eliminated, because they have become obsolete. There cannot be any interference by Russia, China and America in the affairs of the non-aligned nations if they hand over the portfolios of defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: You should become a delegate.

Shri Raghunath Singh: He has only given his idea.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Today the pull of the West over Russia has increased. This process must be reversed. This process can be reversed

by handing over the portfolios of defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation. The vesting of control over defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation is tantamount to the establishment of a federal union between India, China and Russia. The goal of a federal union between India, China and Russia is the integration of the old world into one political unit. This goal can be achieved by vesting control over defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation.

The threat of a military dictatorship, and of a dictatorship of the leftist variety, can be averted only by handing over the portfolios of defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation. The day this is done all the problems of international politics will be solved for ever and the conflict between China, Russia and America, which may lead to war or hegemony or the break-up of the bi-polar world into a multi-polar one will come to an end. The threat of a political settlement between Russia and China, or Russia and America, or China and America, on the basis of the maintenance of the *status quo*, or the division of the non-aligned nations into two spheres of influence, or the withdrawal of Americans from the whole world can be averted only by handing over the portfolios of defence and foreign affairs to the United Nations Organisation. The danger of war and hegemony, if any, can be warded off if the United Nations Organisation is vested with part sovereign left powers. There will be neither democracy nor sovereignty in any part of Asia if the United Nations Organisation is not transformed into a world government. There cannot be any political settlement between Russia and America on the basis of the maintenance of the *status quo*. The *status quo* has changed and is changing fast. It has changed in Japan, Laos, Turkey, Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Pakistan. The power position of America has been weakened wherever changes have taken place. There is no reason why Russia will consolidate

American position by entering into a political settlement on the basis of the maintenance of the *status quo*.

Revolutionary changes are taking place in Africa. Cuba is trying to change the *status quo* even in the new world.

If the *status quo* in the new world is changed, the power position of the United States of America will be weakened. Both Russia and America will be adversely affected if England, France and Western Germany are integrated into one political unit. Behind the scenes discussions are going on between the Prime Ministers and the leaders of these three countries for the achievement of a political integration of these three countries.

The *Status quo* cannot be maintained because it has become obsolete. It is only after the establishment of a new order that a *status quo* can be maintained for long. The Vienna settlement gave a century of peace to Europe because it was based on a new order established by the dominant powers. The *status quo* in the old world is so clearly disadvantageous to Russia that no settlement with America is possible. There are no Russian bases or troops or military alliances in the new world. There are American bases, troops and military alliances in the old world. Nuclear stalemate has strengthened the power position of America in the old world. America cannot be driven out by Russia because there is a balance of terror. America will not voluntarily withdraw from the old world in order to please Russia. It is only by internal upheavals as in Turkey and Japan that America can be made to withdraw step by step. Hence I plead that a warning should be given to Great Britain not to interfere in the internal affairs of Jordan because it is only by internal upheavals that the *status quo* can be changed. It cannot be changed by war or hegemony. It cannot be changed by a political settlement. The only way in which the *status quo* can be changed is by the will of the people and by revolutionary action.

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

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I will take fifteen minutes more because I am a Member who speaks only on this subject.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Member was speaking on external affairs. It is a different subject. I will not allow him to speak on that.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am speaking on external affairs.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member said that he was the only person . . .

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I speak only on external affairs and that too thrice a year only. I should be allowed to speak for 15 minutes.

Shri Raghunath Singh: That is right. He speaks only thrice a year on external affairs.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: This ten minutes' time limit should be applied to other hon. Members who speak on all subjects under the sun.

China bars the way to a political settlement between Russia and America on the basis of the division of the non-aligned nations into two spheres of influence. Hence I plead for a political settlement with China. A division of the non-aligned nations into two spheres of influence means further augmentation of American power in the old world to which no Russian Government would ever agree. Hegemony can only be established by war and conquest. Russia is in East Germany by the right of conquest. Russian hegemony over Eastern Europe could not have been established had Germany not been defeated. But war is no longer possible because it would lead to the destruction of the globe. The status quo which cannot be maintained but which cannot also be changed either by war or by the establishment of either Sino-Soviet or Russo American or Sino-American hegemony can be changed only by the handling over of the defence and the foreign affairs portfolios to the United Nations Organisation.

A resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact is not possible because both Rus-

sia and China have become nuclear powers and further because there is no danger of American intervention in China. The Sino-Soviet pact was formed when Russia was not a nuclear power and there was a danger of American intervention in China. Now both these conditions have ceased to exist. The interests of China and Russia clash in Tibet, Sinkiang, Mongolia, Manchuria, Korea, Siberia and the Western Pacific. It was with the object of frustrating the Russians that Great Britain, after conquering Tibet recognised Chinese suzerainty over Tibet. A century ago, Korea was divided into two spheres of influence, Russian and Chinese, exactly at the same parallel where it stands divided today between China and America. The invasion of South Korea by North Korea was in reality an attack upon China by Russia which America misunderstood as an attack upon the west. Siberia is the bone of contention between Russia and China and the Chinese are trying to sabotage Russian hegemony in Eastern Europe. China and Russia are behaving like rivals in Latin America and Africa. The invitation to the Afghan King to visit China is an attempt to create a wedge between Russia and Afghanistan.

International communism stands divided into two camps, pro-Chinese and pro-Russian. The conference of communist powers held recently in Rumania emphasised these differences. The recent exodus of the Russians from China and of the Chinese from Russia show clearly that the conflict of interest has broken down all ideological bonds.

Thus is my last argument. The fear of the non-aligned nations rallying round the banner of the U.S.A. prevents the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact. A political settlement between Russia and China if ever arrived at will lead to political settlement between Russia and America on terms advantageous to the former.

There cannot be any political settlement between America and China, for their interests in the Western Pacific and in Formosa cannot be reconciled. Any political settlement between China and America will lead to a political settlement between Russia and America on terms advantageous to the latter.

One more word about China about which so much has been said on the floor of the House. I think that this Chinese menace has been exaggerated by some Members here. China cannot invade India. Russia and America will tear China to pieces if she launches any attack upon us. Already, China has become a headache to both Russia and America. China will not be allowed to augment her own power position at the cost of India. We are doing all that can possibly be done to improve our defences.

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): Mr. Speaker, this morning, while initiating the debate, the Prime Minister gave a very good account of the international situation and how it has been deteriorating in recent months. Events abroad have an impact on our country directly or indirectly. It is this awareness on the part of the Prime Minister from the day of our independence that has kept our country in the forefront of the world. The policy of non-alignment and non-involvement in others' affairs has won for our country the respect of the whole world and we occupy the foremost place in international scene.

This morning, Shri Ranga and some other hon. Members suggested that this policy is a good policy till our country is attacked, but when our country is attacked, there should be a change in our policy. I would respectfully say that the policy is basically sound and the philosophy of our foreign policy need not be changed. What is the other alternative that Shri Ranga has to suggest? China has made an incursion on our territory. Still we stick to our

policy and try to see that these differences or disputes do not develop into major conflicts. We hope that wiser counsel may prevail on China and the matter may be settled.

Our foreign policy, as the Prime Minister said this morning, has been misinterpreted or rather misunderstood in the sense that it is a negative policy, that it is a neutral policy, but I submit that it is a positive policy. It has also stood the test of time. The recent U-2 plane incident will clearly show how countries who were members of the NATO or CENTO have been involved, how Russia gave a warning to the countries that lent their bases for the U-2 flight. So, this is a pointer that countries are not helped by the military alliances of which they become members.

It was also said that our country was an uncommitted nation. It is uncommitted up to the time it commits itself. We make up our minds on each case as it arises, and vote in accordance with merits and in the interests of our country. A nation's policy is at least as much a product of its history as its temporary challenges. We are today what we are because of what we have been in the past. It is not aloofness that is indicative of our policy. We stand for reason and justice. So, we are respected and other countries look to us in matters of mutual disputes.

It is gratifying to note that this session of the U.N. Assembly will be a momentous session in the sense that 14 new African States have come in. The number now comes to 96. In October Nigeria will also become independent. The U.N. will thus represent mostly Asian and African countries. Hitherto the western countries were very powerful in the U.N., but now importance and leadership is shifting to this bloc.

In the matter of the Congo, the U.N. acted with readiness and effectiveness. It is because of the intervention of the U.N. that the Congo situation was not allowed to deteriorate, and I am sure the Congo will retain its identity.

[Shri Jaganatha Rao]

It is also gratifying to note that our relations with Pakistan are going to be cordial. The long drawn out negotiations on canal waters have come to a close, and our Prime Minister is going to Pakistan on the 19th September to sign the canal waters treaty.

About Portuguese Africa and Goa I wish to say that as other African countries have become independent in the recent past, they will also become free very soon. There is no other way of precipitating or accelerating the pace towards the freedom of the small territory of Goa.

My hon. friend Shri Jaipal Singh stated that the U.N. delegation had become more or less a family affair of Shri Krishna Menon. It is a very uncharitable remark. The delegation is chosen by the Prime Minister. Shri Krishna Menon is selected year after year because of his brilliance, which the hon. Member himself admits. What is the good of sending people who are not brilliant? It is he who has brought about the impact of our foreign policy on other nations. I was a delegate to the U.N. last year, and I have seen what position Shri Krishna Menon holds in the U.N. People may have different views, but let them not ignore the merit and qualities of a person who is fitted for the task.

Algeria is another problem which I am sure will also be resolved very soon because France cannot but follow the other nations. By next year I am sure it will become free.

Our Government have done a good thing in not moving this year for the inscription of the item of Chinese admission to the United Nations. But we believe in the universality of the membership of the United Nations. If any other nation would like to move in the matter, our vote is there.

It has also been suggested by my hon. friend Shri Ranga that China is making treaties of friendship with

Nepal, Burma and Afghanistan, and, therefore, our foreign policy has failed. We say we have friendly relations with all the countries. Nepal is a friendly country of ours. That does not mean that it should not be friendly with other countries. We want every country to be friendly with every other country. So, I do not see any reason or logic in Shri Ranga's speech when he says that the fact that China has made a treaty of friendship with Nepal is something harmful to us.

He also raised the question of Tibet. The Tibet question came up before the U.N. last year. India abstained, and I say, India rightly abstained. What benefit or advantage did Tibet derive because this resolution was moved by Malaya and Ireland? The debate took an acrimonious turn. The whole Assembly was divided into two blocs. Of course, many countries abstained. That was why we in the Indian Delegation also abstained last year and did not align ourselves either in favour of it or against it.

By and large, our foreign policy has stood the test of time, and it is the only policy that any nation should follow, however militantly strong it may be. There is a growing awareness on the part of the other nations that this policy of non-alignment does not merely mean not entangling any country into these entangling alliances, but it is a policy which is meant to save any country from war. I have moved an amendment, approving of the Government of India's policy in relation to the international situation, and I commend my amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Shri B. C. Kamble (Kopergaon): Within the very limited time at my disposal, I would like to raise four questions with regard to the international situation. The first question that I would like to ask is this. Taking stock of our ten years' record, are our foreign affairs going from good to better or from bad to worse? If

our foreign affairs are going from bad to worse, then, the second question is who is responsible for it. Where do we fix the responsibility? The third question is, if our foreign affairs are going from bad to worse, why this is happening. The fourth question would be how to avoid it.

Taking the first question namely whether our foreign affairs are going from bad to worse or from good to bad or from good to better, let us understand that apart from the reputation that our Government might have earned in different parts of the world or even in the UNO, none of our problems, that is, problems which India is concerned with, has been solved. Now one more has been added, and that is the very security of this country. I am not expressing an opinion; this is a fact conceded by Government. If one more problem has been added, and none of the problems with which our country was faced has been solved, the question is whether we are going from good to better or from bad to worse. Hon. Members and the Prime Minister may differ in their views. It is a matter of opinion. According to my humble submission, we are not going from good to better; we are going from bad to worse, because the very security of our country is threatened.

The second question is, who is responsible for it? For instance, if there is an epidemic spread in the city, immediately hon. Members get up and ask, 'What is wrong with the Municipality?', 'What is wrong with the Health Department?' and so on. So many queries are raised. Apart from the question whether anybody is really responsible for spread of an epidemic, in the sense that none of our problems has been solved but actually one more has been added to our problems, who is responsible for it? The principle of responsibility is very important; otherwise, it will be the end of democracy. Therefore, somebody should fix up the responsibility. Whe-

ther it would be the responsibility of the External Affairs Ministry or of the Prime Minister or of the Union Government or of this House, it must be accepted. In my own humble way, I submit that the External Affairs Ministry is responsible for it, because that Ministry is meant to see that at least the security of this country is maintained.

Now, why has this happened? This, according to me, is a very important question. This has happened because there is something inherently wrong in the very policy of Government. There are so many Members who have come here and championed that policy as a very good policy. I can understand it. A policy will be good to a certain extent, but it must be judged in terms of the results which it brings about. The result is well-known—an additional problem has been created. So the question is, how this has happened. If it is not the result of the policy the Union Government are pursuing, then where are we to lay the blame?

According to me, there is another aspect as to why this has happened. I am sorry I have got to say, even though I am a very small person, that our Prime Minister is not in a position to judge who are the friends and who are the enemies so far as India's interests are concerned. He has mistaken in regard to that. I am not sure whether he has tested that. We were told for so many years, at least ten years, that we have friendship with China and they and we are friends. But the result is that the friend has turned against us. Either we are wrong and are making wrong allegations or it is a fact that the friend has turned against us. This has not happened in any other country of the world where the Prime Minister of a country or the leader of the Government has said that a particular country is a friendly country, and that very friendly country has turned against it, and the Government have come complaining to the House, 'Look here, this is the position'. Therefore,

[Shri B. C. Kamble]

I submit that we have not been able to ascertain who are really our friends and who are really working against our interests.

Regarding the policy of Government, what I have to submit is this. I would ask whether this policy is sound. I am afraid mine may be a solitary voice in this House to say something about this policy in this way. I say that this Government is pursuing a policy without caring to know what our Constitution has laid down with regard to the broad principles which the Union Government should pursue. I am referring to article 51 of the Constitution of India. The principles enunciated in that article are sound, but hon. Members and particularly the Prime Minister, have neglected the contents of that article in such a way that I am compelled to read that article. It says

"The State shall endeavour to (a) promote international peace and security; (b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations; (c) foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another; and (d) encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration".

If without styling our foreign policy either as of non-alignment or of *Panchsheel* or of co-existence, the hon. Prime Minister had gone by these sound principles which are embodied in article 51 of the Constitution of India, I am quite sure our country would not have found herself in the position in which she is today. Why I am referring to this article 51 is because one of the important principles is not observed by our Union Government, particularly the Prime Minister. What is it? That is embodied in sub-clause (c) of article 51. It says that the State shall endeavour to foster respect for international law and treaty obligations. There were certain treaty obligations in regard to Tibet when the British were here; we inherited

them. When the treaty was arrived at between India and China in 1954, the Prime Minister made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on 26th August, 1954 and I am reading his words:

"The agreement itself, if I may say so, was rather a minor document but certain other principles contained in it were very important."

When I refer to that agreement of 1954, I do not find any reference either to the previous agreement to which India was a party, nor is it stated here that the previous agreement is cancelled. That is the general custom. It was in the previous agreement that the status of the Dalai Lama would be unhampered and there would be no interference. I am not speaking about the suzerainty of China over Tibet; it was admitted even by the British. Now, did we observe the treaty obligations which we inherited? Had they been observed, I am sure the situation that has arisen today would not have arisen. If the Dalai Lama had been there when China concluded an agreement with us, the position would have been entirely different. There is no mention in the 1954 agreement about the Dalai Lama being invited or his signature being appended to that agreement. This agreement was signed behind the back of the Tibetan people and the Dalai Lama. That is why I am requesting the Prime Minister, he should have respect for the treaty obligations; otherwise the situations become complicated.

I have been here for the last three years and I am speaking for the first time today on this. The Prime Minister did not today refer to *panchsheel*. He referred to co-existence and non-alignment. He gave a different interpretation altogether. When he spoke about co-existence, he narrowed down the point to the extent of saying that it has relationship with war. There are people who say they want war; the counter-part of it is co-existence.

With regard to non-alignment, he again narrowed down the point and said that it relates to the military alliances. I am sorry to understand this because such a policy would be so narrow that the hon. Members of the House would not be in a position to understand what is going on in respect of foreign affairs.

I would like to know whether *panchsheel* as enunciated by the hon. Prime Ministers of India and China has not fallen to the ground. The first principle is mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity. But both the Prime Ministers of India and China, it is said, are challenging the very validity of the territorial integrity of each other. Then, the other thing is about mutual non-aggression. Our Prime Minister is complaining, and rightly so, that he is not using those words "mutual aggression", but there is a complaint. The third is, mutual non-interference. With regard to this also there are a series of complaints even from the Government. The question is whether the *panch-sheel* that Lord Buddha laid down is entirely different. Those are moral teachings and they will endure. But so far as the *panchsheel* enunciated by the Prime Ministers of China and India are concerned, that *panchsheel* falls to the ground. Therefore, I request and pray to the Prime Minister that he should re-examine his policy and in that re-examination I am sure he will be able to find the weaknesses of his present policy.

Now, Sir, I will make a few suggestions. In order that we should maintain the integrity and the security of this country, what is it that we have to maintain secure? It is the social system and it is the system of Government. By virtue of adoption of our Constitution we have given preference to the parliamentary system of Government. Secondly, if we are really interested in solving the international problems peacefully, then our Government should urge that the authority of the U.N.O. should be strengthened. Once the Prime Minister

said that so many members come and disburse—when there was a debate on Tibet and he was replying—and nobody will take note of it. If that is the position, we should urge that the UNO authority should be strengthened.

Thirdly, I would suggest that there should be more and more researches done in our country. Our country should be made stronger. If there are any scientists in our country they should be well paid and everything should be kept at their disposal to do research work. That is one of the ways—I may say that is the only way—of making our country strong; otherwise there is no escape from the position of degradation that is going on today.

Lastly, with regard to the social system, this is one of the reasons why probably the Chinese Communists are having an eye on the Indian situation. For that also the Prime Minister should consider how we can adopt what may be called a uniform civil code by which we will be one single people even though there may be various religions, castes and so on. If that is done, Sir, I am quite sure that India will be in such a position as to defend herself and, not only that, extend a helping hand to other countries who may be weaker.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the last several months about half a dozen major events have rocked the world—the Disarmament Conference, the Submit Conference, the U-2 Plane and, nearer at home, stirring events in Africa—some of them distressing—the exit of Mr. Menderes from Turkey and the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Japan. Within these six or seven events we have faced a large number of events of great political significance. But the most important of them all is the U-2 Plane. It has already passed into history. It is an extra-ordinary event that has taken place in the history of the world. We have known of stories where great Generals with their armies have been

[Shri Joachim Alva]

pitted one against the other and, perhaps, with battles not fought or, perhaps, fought to the bitter end. There was a Camp David spirit in Washington which was a very commendable thing and on which millions of humanity kept their hopes and aspirations. It is not easy for Mr. Khrushchev to walk behind his party or to set his back against his party, a monolithic party which has been nurtured for 40 years and under a fanaticism and under a fighting creed and to go over to America and to talk on terms of spontaneous friendship and conciliation to President Eisenhower who himself is also a very great and noble man. That having been done, the fact that the fate of humanity should have hung on a mere little thread was indeed regrettable. We in India are to be very careful about this incident. Planes buzz off on the Goa frontier. One single plane came over Delhi in 1951 or 1952, and I remember what a stir it created amongst us. If planes or balloons buzz over our territory, I want to know how much exactly they are flying from any direction. We cannot permit planes to go over Kashmir but since the U.S.-Pakistan military pact was arrived at, those planes cross over to Pakistan into USSR or through Iran.

I am grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for giving me permission to read out a few paragraphs from a letter which I addressed to him on the 12th December, 1956, when he was on the eve of his journey to see President Eisenhower. This is what I humbly wrote to him:

"I have been wanting to draw your attention to air balloons that have been flying in some parts of Europe, with every possibility of them flying in our territory—may be in Kashmir. You may recall that several months ago I put a question to you in regard to the air balloons that had flown in Europe. I did not then specify the countries; but I meant the eastern European countries and

Soviet Russia. I did not want to embarrass you then; nor has it been my intention to embarrass you at any time. My sole intention has been to pinpoint certain matters of importance or stress the angle to a question.

Any weapon used in a cold war in any other part of the world can be used against us. It becomes only a matter of time. Balloons were actively flown in the countries of eastern Europe specified above.

Hence this technique sometime or other can be adopted against us. True, they all say it is a part of the game—everything is fair in propaganda, whether it is waged by this side or that. So far we have not heard of the U.S.A or UK complaining about the balloons in their territory.

After all is said and done, the flames of Hungary did not burst forth in one single day! It was the work of nearly ten long years of intense activity by the powers of the West in the shape of espionage, counter-espionage and other means of sabotage. The USA has voted billions of dollars for this purpose in eastern Europe and finally the walls of Jericho have been fairly well assaulted.

I am humbly concerned about the danger to our own motherland. Pakistan may do anything. It has already violated our air space. Air space above our own land territory is ours and ours only.

Violation of air space is definitely an international offence whether it is done by planes, helicopters or balloons. I am sure this item is on your list of discussions with President Eisenhower. What affects any part of Europe, nay of the world, can definitely affect India."

This, in a sense, is the law of violation of air space. All the space over our heads in our own land is ours. Today, when we are talking of *Panch-sheel*, when we have been following the principles of Mahatma Gandhi, we are helpless, and planes buzz off on the Portuguese territory. They are either Portuguese planes or they have been hired out to Portugal from foreign powers or maybe they are even of our own neighbour Pakistan, which has been very friendly to Portugal. These are very essential matters. Our freedom is in peril and our security is in peril if we do not take care of any balloons flying over us.

When I was in the Soviet Union two years ago they complained that 150 or 200 balloons or something like that flew over their territory and they had protested. When I was in China last year, I was told that they had protested. We too have got to be careful. It cuts both ways: the country who protests and the country which has the unfortunate experience of facing the planes or the balloons. This balloon item is an experiment done by one nation against the other. Whoever started it, whoever is the victim of it, we are in danger and unless we are armed and know our right in this matter, what will happen?

The U-2 plane incident has now passed into history. I am sure the United States of America themselves said so. No one criticised the U-2 Plane incidents as much as Mr. Adlai Stevenson or the Democrats who insisted on having a regular enquiry and the enquiry was not altogether a happy one. We are not concerned about that. But what we are concerned about is that our air space shall not be violated at any time. If we have not got swords sharp enough to bring down these offensive weapons or offensive paper kites that are really offensive as can photograph from enormous distances—then we are up against great danger, and the territory of our country is in danger.

There is another point. Tibet seems to be the hobgoblin with my friends in the Praja Socialist Party. Shri Nath Pai said 75 millions of people had perished in China in a century. Facts must be facts. The sanctity of facts, whether it is on our side or on their side, must not be sacrificed. My friends on the opposite in the P.S.P, and the Swantanta parties are very keen to beat a dead horse so that we can be embraced in the death-knell of war, so that the nation may perish. We cannot afford a war, but we shall make our nation strong in every way. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh also said we shall make our nation strong. We shall always keep ready; we shall keep our economic strength strong. Though we may not make as much agricultural and economic progress as our neighbours, we shall go slowly and the man who goes slowly may win the race.

But these are very important things where facts are concerned. I would like to read from a book written by Professor Fitzgerald, Professor of Law in the Australian National University, Canberra. He has written four or five books: *China: A Short Cultural History*, *The Tower of Five Glories*, *Revolution in China and The Empress Wu*. Here in this book *Flood Tide in China* he says:

“Very widely differing estimates of the number of those slain or imprisoned for counter-revolutionary activity have been made, both by outside observers who are partisans of the Nationalists, and observers within China who are either favourable to the People's Republic or objective in their approach. No certainty is possible, but the most careful and thorough investigation carried out by foreign observers on the spot, whose official position and political standpoint excludes the possibility of Communist sympathies, suggests that 50,000 may be the real approximate total of those put to death through-out China for ‘treasonable acts’. The number is itself great,

[Shri Joachim Alva]

but the percentage of a population which exceeds 560 millions is very small."

What I am concerned is, here is a book written by an Australian professor of law in the Australian University, a book which is well-known and this is what he says.

In regard to the policy on Tibet, on which the Prime Minister is attacked so much, I would do no better than read two last paragraphs on the reflection made by Kinsley Martin in *New Statesman* of April 11, 1959:

"The Tibetan revolt and its suppression by Peking opens a new and dangerous chapter in Asian history. Responsible commentators have begun to understand the reason for Nehru's caution. No wonder that he avoids uttering irrevocable words of condemnation about China or that perhaps, still hoping to act as mediator, he places good relations with China at the head of his admittedly conflicting priorities. For him to abandon his Panch Sila agreement with Chou En-lai and to give up hope of peaceful relations with Peking would be the most tragic of decisions for India and the world.

If all 2,000 miles of frontier have to be armed and fortified; if India must every day fear invasion from China, then Delhi must spend far more on war preparations than the 50 per cent of her budget that already goes in armaments and there will be little hope that India can continue to base her industrial development on democratic principles or make her chief object the improvement of her miserable standard of living. Instead of a peaceful and constructive democracy offering the alternative to both colonialism and communism in the East, India would become a country divided between frightened peo-

ple of property demanding American bombing bases, and Communists exploiting the shocking facts of peasant poverty. They are fools indeed, whether in this country, America or in India who would be glad to see Nehru compelled to abandon Indian neutralism and come forth as a champion in the Cold War."

My friends in the communist party have also very much disappointed us. We have thought it is a great party. There are men there with great patriotism, who were on this side of the House and some of them have suffered great privations, perhaps much more than us. The nation has not forgotten some of the great events. In the last war, they joined their own no-war campaign when we were waging a life and death struggle of the Quit India campaign of non-violence. We have forgotten that. We would like to forget things and would like to go ahead. But in regard to the Chinese incident, all that they have done is not satisfactory to us. There is something like standing by our country in times of distress and sorrow. You cannot strike a line outside that line. You cannot strike a line outside your family. You cannot strike the line outside the walls of your country. Whatever ideological strength and affiliations they may have in Moscow or Peking or any other country, we appreciate that and we understand that point of view. But there are times when the interests of our Motherland should be at the highest and there our communist friends have entirely disappointed us. Whatever it may be, China has occupied our territory. The Chinese have done a great wrong to India. One cannot prattle for ever on chimes of friendship.

18 hrs.

Mr. Chou En-lai made a great and noble statement when he landed in Palam in April, 1960. We expected great things from him. He had con-

ferences with all the Ministers of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister passed him on to others. But what happened was that history lost a great chance, I would say, the Chinese have lost a great chance. If Mr. Chou En-lai had made a statement "we occupy some of your territory; we will vacate it and we shall see that our friendship is strengthened" that would perhaps, have repaired the wrong, which cannot be easily forgotten. Now a wrong has been committed and the friendship is broken, which may take 500 years, 50 years, or, may be, 5 years to repair, a friendship which had lasted for 5,000 years. At least this must have happened after the visit of Mr. Chou En-lai. He came on talking terms and terms of friendship, we were on warring terms, we were passing chits across the frontiers and we will not look at their faces. I may tell you there are people in Peking who are friendly with India, who are leading a very hard life. Be that as it may, a Chinese delegation has now come here and our delegation went there, we talk about the factualities of the McMahon line, because we have got at least a semblance of friendship with them. As a result of that, who knows,—at least I do not know and I cannot foresee what will happen—it may be that the hon. Prime Minister, as a result of the satisfactory working of the talks between the delegations, may go to China to have a settlement. If he goes to China, that will be a unique and historic chance for the Chinese to make up for the wrongs they have committed. And we do hope and pray that something will come out if the Prime Minister will have a mind to go to China, and the breach will be repaired in our friendship and we may be able to carry on the democratic process of economic strengthening undisturbed and we will not be compelled to throw money on the dung hill for war and war preparations. We can still be able to maintain our relations.

One or two small points and I shall finish. Take, Cuba, for example. To-

day, I hope, the Americans realise what Goa means to us. When we told the Americans what Goa meant to us they kept quiet, and when Mr. Dulles came here, I had a very short talk with him about Goa and I told him that even the Catholics want to come out of Goa because of the present situation there. But Mr. John Foster Dulles believed in his massive retaliation and containment. America has, thank God, changed that policy for the better, and is helping us. But we are not happy with their troubles, neither do we gloat over the differences between Cuba and America. What I am saying is that I hope the Americans will realise what it means to us when we say that we want Goa to remain with us.

Today we see that the Monroe doctrine is threatened and today the Chinese and the Russians are pressurising and are working feverishly with their economic activities in South America and are spending a lot of money in that venture. But our delegates and our Embassies in South America are not doing anything about it. South America is a huge land with 24 or 25 countries. We can very well go to South America for our foreign exchange and for increasing our markets. Even the distant Chinese, with all their troubles with Formosa and other ills, want to go all the way to South America to cultivate markets and earn foreign exchange. I wonder why we cannot send our men, men of character and calibre, who will deliver the goods, to South America to see that those countries are friendly with us. Most of the advanced countries have developed their trade with South America by investing money there. Britain has invested huge sums of money in South America. So also Germany. This is a very important point.

I have got many more points to refer, but I shall sit down by saying that we welcome the visit of our hon.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Prime Minister to Pakistan. After all, both sides have now settled down with a spirit of weariness. When the flesh is weak and weariless creeps in, you are hurt and your fanaticism or hatred disappears. I want the mission of the Prime Minister to succeed at any cost. Not that we are going abegging. Already there is a hostile propaganda in some quarters that we are going abegging. Nothing of that sort. President Ayub seems to feel that the hon. Prime Minister did not sufficiently reciprocate his greetings and invitation. As he is going there, we wish him god-speed so that the big problems, the canal water dispute and others, are settled. Perhaps, the question of Kashmir may also crop up

in these meetings. History does not give many chances for a settlement. We want these problems to be settled in our generation. We want also the Chinese problems to be settled in the life time of the Prime Minister, the President and the present great leaders of China.

Mr. Speaker: I hope the Prime Minister will reply tomorrow.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir.

18.05 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 1st September 1960|Bhadra 10, 1882 (Saka).
