

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]
making certain amendments to the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949:

- (1) Notification No. MII-152(59/56 dated the 4th September, 1956.
- (2) Notification No. MII-153(37)/55, dated the 15th September, 1956.
- (3) Notification No. MII-152(37)/55, dated the 19th September, 1956.
- (4) Notification No. MII-152(269)/53, dated the 3rd October, 1956.
- (5) Notification No. MII-157(12)/56, dated the 8th October, 1956.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-443/56].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER SEA CUSTOMS ACT

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following Customs Notifications, under sub-section (4) of section 43B of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 as inserted by the Sea Customs (Amendment) Act, 1953:

- (1) Notification No. 53, dated the 14th July, 1956.
- (2) Notification No. 54, dated the 14th July, 1956.
- (3) Notification No. 76, dated the 22nd September, 1956.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-444/56].

PRESIDENT'S ACTS re TRAVANCORE-COCHIN

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following Acts, under sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Travancore-Cochin State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Act, 1956:

- (1) The Holdings (Stay of Execution Proceedings) Second Amendment Act, 1956 (President's Act No. 6 of 1956). [Placed in Library. See No. S-445/56].

- (2) The Travancore-Cochin Irrigation Act, 1956 (President's Act No. 7 of 1956).

[Placed in Library. See No. S-446/56].

- (3) The Travancore-Cochin Interpretation and General Clauses (Amendment) Act, 1956 (President's Act No. 8 of 1956).

[Placed in Library. See No. S-447/56].

- (4) The Municipal (Amendment) Act, 1956 (President's Act No. 9 of 1956).

[Placed in Library. See No. S-448/56].

- (5) The Travancore-Cochin Compensation for Tenants Improvements Act, 1956 (President's Act No. 10 of 1956).

[Placed in Library. See No. S-449/56].

- (6) The Travancore-Cochin Lime-Shells (Control) Act, 1956 (President's Act No. 11 of 1956). [Placed in Library. See No. S-450/56].

DRAFT CONSTITUTION FOR JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Shri Datar: Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Draft Constitution for Jammu and Kashmir as introduced in the Constituent Assembly of the State. [Placed in Library. See No. S-451/56].

STATEMENT RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the 13th of September 1956, the last day of the last session of the Lok Sabha, I made a statement in the House about the developments relating to the Suez Canal issue. Previous to that, on the 8th August, I had given to the House an account of the developments which followed the action of the Egyptian Government in nationalising the Suez Canal Company.

Over two months have passed since my last statement on this subject in the Lok Sabha, and much has happened, which has been reported in the public press and must be within the knowledge of hon. Members. The matter was taken up by the Security Council, and there was broad approval of certain basic principles which should govern any agreement in regard to the Suez Canal. It was proposed that the chief parties to the dispute, namely, Egypt, the United Kingdom and France, should meet soon after to discuss this subject further on the basis of those principles.

That meeting did not take place. Instead, on the 29th October, Israel launched a sudden and premeditated attack on Egypt, and large concentrations of Israeli troops made deep penetrations into Egyptian territory. The next day, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France sent an ultimatum to Egypt and Israel to the effect that if they did not stop fighting and withdraw their forces to ten miles on either side of the Suez Canal, British and French forces would intervene to stop the fighting. The ultimatum expired on the morning of the 31st October and, soon after, British and French forces commenced aerial bombardment of airfields and military objectives in Cairo and elsewhere in Egypt. This was followed a few days later, by landings of airborne troops near Port Said and heavy fighting there.

As the House knows, India had viewed with grave apprehension the policy of the U.K. and French Governments after the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company. In particular, the massing of troops and aircraft for the purpose of military operations in Egypt appeared to us to be a reversion to past colonial methods and an attempt to coerce Egypt by show of armed might. Indeed, it was stated by responsible statesmen in the United Kingdom and France that the regime in Egypt must be changed and, in particular, the Head of the State and of the Govern-

ment of Egypt should be removed. We had hoped, however, that after the Security Council resolution, more peaceful methods would be adopted to solve this dispute. The starting of military operations against Egypt by the United Kingdom and France and, more particularly, the bombing of parts of Cairo city and other parts of Egypt came, therefore, as a profound shock not only to people in India but also to large numbers of people in other countries including the United Kingdom. This appeared to be a flagrant case of aggression by two strong powers against a weaker country with the purpose of enforcing their will, even to the extent of changing the Government of that country. This led to widespread world reactions against the Anglo-French action, and as the Security Council proved ineffective because of the exercise of the veto by the United Kingdom and France, the U.N. General Assembly, at an emergency session, expressed its disapproval of this action and demanded the stoppage of military operations in Egypt and the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel, France and the United Kingdom, from Egyptian territory. An uneasy armistice followed, and it was declared on the part of the United Kingdom, France and Israel that they would withdraw their armed forces, though this was made subject to certain conditions.

These developments gave some hope that peaceful methods would henceforth be employed and I ventured to say a few days ago that the situation had slightly improved. Today I am by no means sure that this improvement has taken place. There are numerous tendencies which may well lead, unless checked, to a rapid deterioration of the situation and a reversion to warfare. If unfortunately military operations begin again, it is possible that they might extend over a much wider area and might even develop into a major war.

Two days ago, the Prime Ministers of Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon and India issued a joint statement which

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

has already been placed on the Table of the House. That statement gives expression to the views of these Prime Ministers to the recent happenings in Egypt and in Hungary and points out the danger of war inherent in the present grave international situation.

In spite of the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, sporadic fighting continued and there has been no attempt at withdrawal of forces from Egyptian territory. It would appear indeed that these forces have established themselves firmly on Egyptian territory and have no present intention of leaving it. If these foreign forces continue to remain on Egyptian territory, the situation is likely to deteriorate rapidly and bring the danger of fresh military operations nearer.

The Governments of the United Kingdom and France, though apparently accepting the United Nations Resolution, have laid down certain conditions which are not consistent with that resolution. The Prime Minister of Israel has continued to insist that he will not evacuate Gaza. If the foreign forces are not wholly removed from Egyptian territory, this will amount to a clear violation of the United Nations Resolution.

Meanwhile, India has agreed to send a contingent of her armed forces for the United Nations International Force and this contingent is expected to leave India by air today. This United Nations Force will not be concerned with the Suez Canal issue as such, which can only be considered separately after peace has been fully established and all foreign forces removed. The main task of the international force is said to be to ensure that Israel remains within the demarcation lines set by the old Armistice Agreement.

The accounts that have appeared in the newspapers have not indicated that the fighting in and around Port Said was severe. We have received

some accounts of this fighting and these show that the casualties, chiefly among Egyptian civilians were very heavy, running into many thousands. Conditions in Port Said have been distressing in the extreme. We are taking immediate steps to send a large stock of medicines by special aircraft to Egypt for purposes of relief.

The story of the past three and a half months, ever since the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company, is full of tragic drama, and events have happened which I would have thought could not possibly occur in this modern age. I find it a little difficult to deal with this record of unabashed aggression and deception. The explanations that have been given from time to time, contradict one another and exhibit an approach which is dangerous to the freedom of Asian and African countries and to world peace itself. It has brought misery and disaster, hatred and ill-will, with no gain whatever, and, in addition, we live now under the threat of possible world war.

During all the controversies since the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company, Egypt has conducted herself with a large measure of propriety and forbearance. Without the least justification, Egypt was attacked not only by Israel but also by the United Kingdom and France. Whether there was any previous consultation between the aggressor countries, I do not know. But it is obvious that their plans fitted in, and the Anglo-French attack helped Israel's aggression and was itself helped by it. Egypt, the victim of Israeli aggression, was attacked immediately after by the armed forces of the United Kingdom and France. It was only the widespread indignation of peoples not only in Asia and Africa but also in Europe and America and the action taken by the United Nations that put some check on this aggression. But it appears to me that the cease-fire having taken place, there is a tendency to complacency and to allow

matters to drift. Indeed, there has even been some attempt made to minimise and justify this utterly unprovoked and brutal attack on Egypt. Attention has been diverted to some extent to the grave and distressing occurrences in Hungary.

Even as we were distressed by events in Egypt, we viewed with grave concern and distress events in Hungary. It is possible that what happened in one of these countries produced its reactions in the other, and both created a very serious international situation. But it is well to remember that though both deserve serious attention, the nature of each differed from the other. Neither can be held to justify the other.

We are concerned with an attack on freedom anywhere in the world. We are concerned also with strong nations dominating, by armed force, weaker countries. In regard to Hungary, the situation was obscure for some days, and it was only gradually that the story of the tragic events that have taken place there, became known. From the very beginning, we made it clear that, in our opinion, the people of Hungary should be allowed to determine their own future according to their own wishes and that foreign forces should be withdrawn. That has been and is our basic view in regard to Hungary. This has been repeated in the joint statement of the four Prime Ministers.

There was a resolution in the United Nations General Assembly in regard to Hungary, sponsored by Pakistan, Cuba, Italy, Peru and Ireland, against which we voted, and as some criticism has been made in regard to our vote on this resolution, I should like to remove any misunderstanding that may have arisen. The resolution was, in our opinion, improperly worded. But the most objectionable part of it demanded that elections should be held in Hungary under the supervision of the United Nations. We took strong exception to this because we felt this was contrary to the Charter and would reduce Hungary to less than

a sovereign State. Any acceptance of intervention of this type and foreign supervised elections seemed to us to set a bad precedent which might be utilised in future for intervention in other countries. The resolution was voted paragraph by paragraph. We abstained from voting on all the other parts of the resolution. In regard to the paragraph about elections under the United Nations supervision, we voted against it. When the whole resolution including this paragraph was put to the vote, we also voted against it because of that particular paragraph to which we objected strongly.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):
Under instructions?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member would hold his soul in patience. He will get every kind of information which he desires, and much more too.

Shri Kamath: I am prepared for the worst.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This voting on this particular resolution was entirely in consonance with our general policy and instructions. It seemed to us that this resolution, apart from the basic objections we had to a part of it, would not prove helpful to Hungary at all. We were trying to get the Soviet forces withdrawn from Hungary. What was proposed in the resolution would come in the way of that withdrawal and an attempt thereafter to intervene with armed force would have led to a major conflict. It might well have led to Hungary perishing in the flames of war. The people of Hungary had already passed through a terrible ordeal and it was the duty of other countries to rescue them from further warfare and destruction and, at the same time, to create conditions which would enable them to recover their free and separate individuality and to have the government of their choice.

We are arranging to send relief to Hungary as early as possible.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

The tragic dramas that have been enacted almost before our eyes, have demonstrated the inherent dangers of a recourse to arms to settle any problem. The Israeli and Anglo-French attack on Egypt has not only brought infinite suffering to the people of Egypt, but has let loose evil forces which are driving the world towards destruction. The recourse to force and the armed intervention in Hungary have not only cost the lives of many brave men and women, but have also checked a progress towards greater freedom which we had welcomed.

The world appears now to be in the grip of the fevered psychology of war, and I am reminded of the months preceding the last great war. I am convinced that it is not by war and violence that these problems will be settled or freedom established. I am convinced that colonialism, whatever new look it may put on, can revert to its old brutal self, and the only remedy is for it to give place to freedom.

The world stands facing great danger, and it may be that the little wars we have had, are only a first round and bigger conflicts lie ahead. In particular, the ambitions of strong nations imperil weaker countries. The only hope lies in the United Nations, representing the world community, succeeding in putting an end to the law of force and substituting for it a more civilised method of dealing with problems. Today, the choice lies between the hydrogen bomb and the Panchsheel.

POINT RE DRAFT CONSTITUTION FOR JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): I did not want to delay or interrupt the Prime Minister's statement. With regard to item 6 on the Order Paper, may I request you to take note of the fact that in the Press there have been various reports and allegations that the Draft Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir is in some respects not in conformity with the

Indian Constitution, particularly with regard to fundamental rights? Therefore, I would request you to give the House an early opportunity of discussing this Draft Constitution, at least those portions which may not be in conformity with the provisions of the Indian Constitution?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): What is it that the hon. Member is talking about?

Mr. Speaker: He is referring to item 6, Draft Constitution for Jammu and Kashmir.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It has been laid on the Table.

Mr. Speaker: He now makes a suggestion that an early opportunity may be given to the House to consider this matter.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): The Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly has autonomous powers under our Constitution to a large extent. It can deal with the matters which come within its purview. I do not see how we can take up that matter here and discuss its provisions. That will look like an encroachment into the powers of the autonomous Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir. They have those powers under our Constitution. We cannot even interfere in matters concerning our States. Kashmir has larger powers and it will certainly be improper to deal with their Constitution here. We cannot sit in judgment over it. So, I do not see why we should discuss it here.

Shri Kamath: May I suggest to the hon. Minister that as far as I am aware the relations of Jammu and Kashmir vis-a-vis India are regulated by article 370 and the Presidential Order of 1954? If the Draft Constitution is inconsistent with the provisions of article 370 or the Presidential Order of 1954, this House is certainly competent to take notice of that fact