

Monday, September 2, 1957

LOK SABHA
DEBATES

SECOND SERIES

VOLUME VI

(26th August to 5th September, 1957)



SECOND SESSION, 1957

(Vol. V contains Nos. 21 to 30)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI.

CONTENTS

COLUMNS

No. 31—Monday, 26th August, 1957—

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1157, 1158, 1160, 1162, 1163, 1165, 1166, 1169, 1171, 1173,
1175 to 1179, 1182, 1184, 1185, 1188 to 1193 and 1197 to 1199. 9901—40

Short Notice Questions Nos. 20 and 21 9941—46

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1159, 1161, 1163, 1164, 1167, 1168, 1170, 1172,
1174, 1180, 1181, 1183, 1186, 1194 to 1196, 1200 to 1203, 1207, 796,
823, 947 and 964 9946—60

Unstarred Questions Nos. 874 to 925 9961—97

Expenditure-Tax Bill—

Report of Select Committee presented 9998

Wealth-Tax Bill and Expenditure Tax Bill—

Evidence tendered before Select Committees laid on the table 9998

Calling attention to matter of Urgent Public Importance—

Air crash in Ging village in Lamakin area 9998—10001

Finance (No.2) Bill—

Motion to consider 10001—10138

Daily Digest

10139—44

No. 32—Tuesday, 27th August, 1957—

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1208 to 1210, 1212, 1213, 1216, 1219 to 1224
1226 to 1229, 1231, 1232 and 1236 to 1238 10145—82

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1211, 1213, 1214, 1217, 1218, 1225, 1233 to 1235
and 1239 to 1242 10182—88

Unstarred Questions Nos. 926 to 953, 955 to 961, 963 and 965 10188—10210

Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—

Explosion of wagons loaded with crackers 10211—14

Re'motion for Adjournment

10214—16

Finance (No.2) Bill, 1957—

Motion to consider 10216—10366

Clauses 2 to 16 and the schedule 10274—10360

Daily Digest

10367—70

No.33—Wednesday, 28th August, 1957 —

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1243, 1244, 1247 to 1252, 1256 to 1258, 1258-A, 1259
to 1261 and 1266 to 1272 10371—10409

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1245, 1253 to 1255, 1264 and 1265 and 1273 to
1279 10410—17

Unstarred Questions Nos. 966 to 973 and 975 to 991 10417—30

Motion for Adjournment—

Deterioration in the food situation in U.P.	10430—32
Death of Shri Rang Behari Lal	10433
Papers laid on the Table	

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions Sixth Report	10433
Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—	

Flood situation in Bihar and U.P.	10433—36
-----------------------------------	----------

Finance (No. a) Bill—

Schedule I and II and Clause 1	10437—80
Motion to pass as amended	10450

Wealth-Tax Bill—

Motion to consider	10480—10567
--------------------	-------------

Half-an-Hour Discussion re Work-Site Camps in West Bengal

10567—80

Daily Digest

10581—84

No. 34—Thursday, 29th August, 1957—

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1280, 1281, 1283, 1285 to 1290, 1292, 1294, 1295, 1308, 1296, 1298, 1299, 1302 to 1305	10585—10621
---	-------------

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1282, 1284, 1291, 1293, 1297, 1300, 1301, 1307, 1309 to 1319, 1319-A, 1320 to 1324	10621—36
---	----------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 992 to 1033, 1035 to 1040	10636—64
--	----------

Motion for Adjournment—

Drought conditions in certain parts of West Bengal	10665—70
--	----------

Papers laid on the Table

10670

Wealth-Tax Bill—

Motion to consider as reported by Select Committee	10670—10811
Clauses 2 to 46, the Schedule and Clause 1	10721—10811

Motion to pass, as amended	10811
----------------------------	-------

Half-an-hour discussion re purchase of tents of displaced persons' camps	10811—22
--	----------

Daily Digest	10823—28
--------------	----------

No. 35.—Friday, 30th August, 1957—

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1325 to 1332, 1334 to 1337, 1339, 1342 to 1344 and 1346	10829—65
--	----------

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1333, 1340, 1341, 1345, 1347 to 1355 and 1357 to 1370	10865—78
--	----------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 1041 to 1049, 1051 to 1068 and 1070 to 1085	10878—10903
--	-------------

Motion for adjournment—

Re : alarming food situation in Chota Nagpur	10903—08
--	----------

Papers laid on the Table	10908—09
--------------------------	----------

Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House—

Second Report	10909
---------------	-------

Statement correcting reply given to half-an-hour discussion	10909
Election to Committees—	
(1) Central Advisory Board of Archaeology	10910
(2) Central Advisory Board of Education	10910—11
Life Insurance Corporation (Second Amendment) Bill—	
Introduced	10911
Railway Passenger Fares Bill—	
Motion to consider	10912—83
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Sixth Report	10983
Resolution re Appointment of a Committee to report on a clear-cut policy for the implementation of the Second Five Year Plan	10983—11306
Message from Rajya Sabha	11017
Business Advisory Committee—	
Eighth Report	11036
Resolution re Nationalisation of Sugar Industry	11036—48
Daily Digest	11049—54
No. 36.—Saturday, 31st August, 1957.—	
Business of the House	11055
Papers laid on the Table	11056
Business Advisory Committee—	
Eighth Report	11064—66
Railway Passenger Fares Bill—	
Motion to consider	11066—11122
Clauses 2 to 6, the Schedule and Clause 1	11076—11119
Motion to pass, as amended	11119
Foreign Exchange Regulation (Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to consider	11121—11186
Clauses 2 to 19 and 1	11167—85
Motion to pass, as amended	11185
Expenditure-Tax Bill—	
Motion to consider, as reported by Select Committee	11186—11241
Half-an-hour discussion re medicinal plants organisation and utilisation of crude drugs	11241—44
Daily Digest	11245—46
No. 37.—Monday, 2nd September, 1957.—	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1372, 1374, 1376 to 1381, 1883 to 1387, 1389 to 1391, 1393, 1395 to 1397, 1400 to 1402	11247—84
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1371, 1373, 1375, 1382, 1388, 1394, 1398, 1403 to 1406	11248—89
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1086 to 1124	11289—11313
Papers laid on the Table	11313

Rules Committee—

First Report	11314
President's assent to Bills	11314
Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—	
Resignation of elected Members of the Jabalpur Cantonment Board	11315-16
Leave of Absence	11316-17
Motion re International Situation	11318-11450
Daily Digest	11451-54

No. 38.—Tuesday, 3rd September, 1957.—

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1407, 1408, 1417, 1409 to 1416 and 1418 to 1423	11455-91
Short Notice Question No. 22	11491-93

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1424 to 1441	11493-11503
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1125 to 1131, 1133 to 1147 and 1149 to 1175	11503-32

Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1957-58	11533
--	-------

Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—

Stoppage of train at Nadia by mob	11533-35
Statement re Air Accident at Dum Dum Airport	11555

Election to Committee—

Committee of Parliament to examine recommendations of Official Language Commission	11536-43
--	----------

Expenditure Tax Bill—

Motion to consider as reported by Select Committee.	11543-11698
Claus 2 to 5	11603-98

Daily Digest	11699-11702
--------------	-------------

No. 39.—Wednesday, 4th September, 1957.—

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1443 to 1445, 1447 to 1453, 1455 to 1460 and 1471	11705-43
--	----------

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1338, 1446, 1454, 1461 to 1470, 1472 to 1477, 1477-A, 1478 to 1484 and 1486 to 1488	11743-58
--	----------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 1176 to 1214 and 1216 to 1260	11758-11804
--	-------------

Motion for Adjournment—

Explosion in Kanpur goods shed	11804-1
--------------------------------	---------

Paper laid on the Table

11812

Expenditure-Tax Bill—

Claus 5 to 41 and 1 and Schedule	11812-93
----------------------------------	----------

Motion to pass as amended	11893
---------------------------	-------

Insurance (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to consider	11893—11921
Clause 2 to 5 and 1	11914—21
Motion to pass	11921

Legislative Councils Bill—

Motion to consider	11921—54
Daily Digest	11957—62

No. 40.—Thursday, 5th September, 1957.—

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos.* 1489, 1491 to 1498, 1500, 1501, 1503 to 1509 and 1499	11963—12000
Short Notice Question No. 23	12000—03

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1490 and 1510 to 1526	12003—13
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1261 to 1302	12013—40

Paper laid on the Table

Minutes of Rules Committee	12041
----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Messages from Rajya Sabha

Petition re Indian Post Office Savings Bank Rules	12041
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—

Amounts payable by India to Pakistan	12041—44
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------

Legislative Councils Bill—

Motion to consider	12044—66
Clauses 2 to 8	12105—66

Discussion re prices paid for locomotives manufactured by Tata Locomotive Works

12166—12224

Daily Digest

12225—30

N. B.—The sign + above a name of a Member on Questions, which were orally answered, indicates that the Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by that Member.

LOK SABHA DEBATES

11247

11248

LOK SABHA

Monday, 2nd September, 1957.

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Border Rivers

*1372. Shri Shree Narayan Das: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India have taken up the question of free use of border rivers between West Bengal and East Pakistan with the Government of Pakistan as suggested by the West Bengal Government; and

(b) if so, the reaction of the Pakistan Government?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) Yes, Sir. The question was first raised at the Indo-Pakistan Conference held at Calcutta in October 1953.

(b) Pakistan Government agreed to examine the proposal but their views on it are still awaited.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: What are the important points on which the West Bengal Government wanted the Government of India to negotiate with the Government of Pakistan?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There are certain river channels which form the border, the frontier between Pakistan and India. It is about the navigability of the river by the boats belonging to both countries.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether any precise suggestions were made by the Government of West Bengal in this respect and, if so, what they are?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It was put on the agenda of the Steering Committee, but that item did not come up and therefore there was no discussion on this particular item when the Steering Committee met.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: May I know whether the Ganga Barrage at Farraka was discussed and, if so, what steps have been taken about it?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: That does not arise here. This deals with the navigability of the rivers on the border between the two States.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: In view of the fact that the river Bhadra is one of the border rivers between the two States and is one of the rivers included in the Ganga Barrage scheme, may I know whether this particular aspect of the matter has been discussed, and what is the attitude of Pakistan?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have already stated that this was put as an item on the agenda of the Steering Committee, but they did not discuss it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: May I know whether this question is going to be taken up in any future conference and, if so, at what date?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I cannot answer that question.

Shri Goray: What is the Government's interpretation of the free use of border rivers?

Mr. Speaker: Generally?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Sir, it depends upon certain international practice with regard to this, and the Government is examining it.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know if after the suggestion was made in Calcutta my indication from the Pakistani Government is available whether this question is going to be considered by them?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I have already said the reply is awaited.

Repatriation of Chinese Nationals from U.S.A.

***1374. Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Chinese Nationals in U.S.A. who have been repatriated so far to China through the assistance of our Missions in the U.S.A.; and

(b) whether any expenditure is involved in it?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) Up till the 1st of August 1957, seventy-three Chinese nationals including children were repatriated to China with the assistance of our Missions in the U.S.A.

(b) The Government of India do not spend anything on this, the entire expenditure being met from funds placed at our disposal by the Chinese Government.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: What were the difficulties experienced by our Mission in this repatriation work?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: We have not experienced any difficulties, Sir.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: May I know the number of Chinese still to be repatriated?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: 73 Chinese nationals including children were repatriated. The remaining twenty-six are assisted.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I reply to this? Nobody knows the number, because the Chinese Government claims a very large number and the United States Government says, "Well, we do not know, we cannot trace odd individuals, so to say". Therefore it is not possible for us to say how many.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: What is the method by which these Chinese are repatriated? That is, do the Chinese nationals have to make an application, or does it also mean that the U.S. Government has to give its permission that such a person can be repatriated?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: They themselves approach the Indian Embassy, because this matter is publicised, and those Chinese nationals who have any difficulty about going to China approach the Embassy and they are given financial assistance, partial or full as they want, and if they have any difficulty with the United States Government that is also taken up by our Embassy.

Sample Survey

***1376. Shri Sanganna:** Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether any sample survey into the causes of failure by the registered persons for re-registration has been undertaken by Government in any State; and

(b) if so, what is the agency employed for the purpose?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) Yes, it is being conducted at Delhi.

(b) The Employment Exchange.

Shri Sanganna: May I know whether the registration of persons made in each State has been carried out with reference to the number of vacancies in each State?

Shri L. N. Mishra: It is being carried out in Delhi and perhaps in Punjab at Ambala only, that is at two places.

Shri Sanganna: May I know how many unemployed out of the persons registered are already in Delhi?

Shri L. N. Mishra: I may say that till March 1957 the people on the live registers were 7.47 lakhs in the country.

भारत में पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्र-जन

*१३७७. श्री वाजरेयी : क्या प्रधान मंत्री २६ जुलाई, १९५७ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या ३७६ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) भारत में जीवितोपाज्जन करने वाले पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्र-जनों की संख्या कितनी है ;

(ख) उनमें से कितने अपने को रजिस्टर वरा चुके हैं और कितने रजिस्टर कराने में असमर्थ रहे हैं ; और

(ग) यहां ठहरने की अवधि के समाप्त होने के पश्चात् भी भारत में रहने वाले पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्र-जनों की संख्या कितनी है और उन के विरुद्ध क्या कार्यवाही की गयी है ?

वैदेशिक कार्य उपमंत्री (श्रीमंती लक्ष्मी मेनन) : (क) और (ख). आसाम, बम्बई, दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश, जम्मू तथा काश्मीर, केरल, मद्रास, मैसूर, राजस्थान, पश्चिमी बंगाल और अंडमान-निकोबार-लकादिव-मिनिकाय द्वीप समूह के राज्यों को छोड़ कर भारत में ४१८६ पाकिस्तानी नागरिक काम में लो हुए हैं। इन राज्यों से अभी सूचना प्राप्त नहीं हुई है।

यह कहना संभव नहीं है कि भारत में कितने पाकिस्तानियों ने 'एफ' श्रेणी के बीजा नहीं लिये हैं। उन्हें ३० सितम्बर, १९५७ तक बीजा ले लेने हैं।

(ग) ४७३७। इसमें आसाम, बम्बई, दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश, जम्मू तथा काश्मीर,

केरल, मद्रास, मैसूर, राजस्थान, पश्चिमी बंगाल, अंडमान-निकोबार-लकादिव तथा मिनिकाय द्वीप समूह को छोड़ दिया है।

—जहाँ से सूचना प्राप्त नहीं हुई है। इन में से ४०४ लोगों को, फारेनस लाज (एमेंडमेंट) एक्ट, १९५७ के अन्तर्गत, एक महीने में भारत छोड़ देने की नोटिसें दी गई हैं। बाकी लोगों के मामले विचाराधीन हैं।

I will give the reply in English also.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: (a) and (b). 4186 Pakistani citizens are in employment in India excluding the States of Assam, Bombay, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Kerala, Madras, Mysore, Rajasthan, West Bengal and Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Laccadive and Minicoy Islands. Information from these States is still awaited.

It is not possible to state the number of Pakistanis in India who have not taken out 'F' category visas. They have till 30th September, 1957, to do so.

(c) 4737, excluding Assam, Bombay, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Kerala, Madras, Mysore, Rajasthan, West Bengal, and Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Laccadive and Minicoy Islands from where no information has been received. Out of these, 404 persons have been served with notices to leave India within a month under the Foreigners Laws (Amendment) Act, 1957. Cases of the remaining persons are under consideration.

श्री वाजरेयी : जिन राज्यों से अभी तक कोई सूचना प्राप्त नहीं हुई है, वह शायद कुछ थोड़े से ही राज्य हैं जिन से कि सूचना मिली है, तो जिन राज्यों से सूचना नहीं मिली है, उन से अब तक सूचना न मिलने का क्या कारण है और उन से कब तक सूचना प्राप्त हो जायेगी ?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It has already been mentioned in the answer that they have till the 30th September to take F category visas. After that we will get the information.

प्रश्नाल मंत्री तथा वेस्ट बंगाल कार्ड भवी श्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : इस का क्या जवाब दिया जाये ? आप पूछते हैं कि उन्होंने क्यों जवाब नहीं दिया ? इस का जवाब यही है कि नहीं दिया उन्होंने ।

श्री वार्षपेयी इस की कोई वजह तो होनी चाहिये कि उन्होंने क्यों जवाब नहीं दिया ।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : उन को मेहनत करनी पड़ती है, वाक्यात जमा करने पड़ते हैं। और वेस्ट बंगाल तो इस में सब से ज्यादा मेहनत कर रहा है। आहिर है, सब से ज्यादा पाकिस्तानी वहाँ काम करते हैं। तो काम तो उन को करना है, हम कैसे उन्हें मजबूर कर सकते हैं इस मामले में ।

श्री वार्षपेयी : मेरा निवेदन है कि देश का बटवारा हुए दस साल हो गए। तब से अगर सरकार ने इस संबंध में कोई सूचना एकत्र की है तो उसे सदन के सम्मुख रखा जाये ।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : इस से दस बरस से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। सवाल तो यह है कि इस बक्त कितने लोग काम करते हैं। दस बरस से कोई संबंध नहीं है। इस बक्त के फिरसे हमें लेने हैं।

श्री वार्षपेयी : मेरा निवेदन है कि जो भी लोग काम करने आते हैं, वह सरकार को सूचना दे कर आते हैं, और इस की सूचना सरकार के पास संग्रहीत होनी चाहिये। वह बीजा ले कर आते हैं ?

Mr. Speaker: Let us not enter into an argument. All the States have been written to and the States are

taking their own time, so far as this matter is concerned.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The matter is engaging our attention. I am not able to understand what the hon. Member wants.

Mr. Speaker: He asks: Why don't you have a register for particulars of people ever since 1947 and just look into it and give the information?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: People come and go. If you want the figures, it is no good giving the figures obtained five years ago. That does not help anybody. It is today's figure that is wanted. The present figures are being enquired into.

Shri Keshava: May I know the number of persons who have applied for Indian citizenship?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They have not been included in this list.

श्री रघुनाथ निहित : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वेस्ट बंगाल के हार्बर में जो डाक्यार्ड है उस में जो १४,००० के करीब पाकिस्तानी लोग इस बक्त एम्प्लाइड हैं, उन का रजिस्ट्रेशन हुआ है या नहीं, या उन को कोई विजा दिया गया है या नहीं। वहाँ क्या सिस्टम है ?

श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू : नए कानून के हिसाब से तो एक नए बात होनी ही चाहिये, जो आप ने फरमाया, और मेरा स्थान है कि या तो वह हो गया होगा या हो रहा होगा ।

Shri Bimal Ghose: May I know whether the Government have no information about the number of Pakistani citizens residing in India without visa?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been answered. Various States are gathering information. Some of them have answered.

Shri Bimal Ghose: So, the Government of India have no information

about the number of Pakistani citizens residing here without visa?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The question is about the number of Pakistani citizens earning livelihood in India. That question has been answered.

Trade Centre in West Asia

*1378. **Shri Shivananjappa:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether India's first permanent trade centre in West Asia has been opened;

(b) if so, where; and

(c) the main objects of the centre?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) and (b). A trade centre has recently been organised in Cairo.

(c) To give visual publicity to India's export products, to stimulate consumer interest and to give trade information and provide facilities for trade introduction to prospective importers.

Shri Shivananjappa: May I know the progress made in the volume of trade transacted?

Shri Satish Chandra: The trade centre was opened on the 30th June, 1957. We have not even received a report so far. It is functioning for the past two months only.

Shri Shivananjappa: May I know the amount spent on this centre?

Shri Satish Chandra: The expenditure already sanctioned for this purpose is Rs. 2,17,965. The exhibits displayed there belong to the exporters, or manufacturers of this country.

Shri Wodeyar: May I know the reasons that prompted the Government in opening trade centre there alone? Has any survey report been received from the Indian Embassy officials there? If so, what are the prospects of the centre?

Shri Satish Chandra: The presumption of the hon. Member is not correct. There are in all about 26 trade centres—show rooms, show windows, show cases etc.—in various countries. This is the latest addition. More show rooms are being opened in some of the Asian countries. The object of the centres is to disseminate information about such exportable products as can be marketed in those countries and thereby earn foreign exchange.

Shri Gajendra Pratap Singh: May I know whether there is any proposal to open more trade centres in Western Asia?

Shri Satish Chandra: Yes, Sir. Six centres are proposed to be opened, out of which two have already been sanctioned and we are just looking out for suitable buildings. Four more centres are proposed to be set up in near future.

Import of Textile Machinery

*1379. **Shri Supakar:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that textile machinery worth over Rupees one crore is proposed to be imported from East Germany; and

(b) if so, the place or places where this machinery is proposed to be set up?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The State Trading Corporation have entered into an arrangement for facilitating the purchase from East Germany on deferred payment of textile machinery by Indian Textile Mills. So far only four mills, one each at Bhavnagar, Calcutta, Tirupur and Ahmedabad, have placed orders for textile machinery worth about rupees 36.5 lakhs.

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: May I know how much in rupee value the automatic looms of the imported machinery will be and on what terms the deferred payment will be made?

Shri Kanungo: The terms are mostly five years' deferred payment. The payment will be in rupee in India to the account of the East German bank.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know the value of the automatic looms in terms of rupee?

Shri Kanungo: Most of it is for automatic looms. Now we have placed orders for goods worth Rs. 36.5 lakhs.

Shri Heda: In view of the fact that textile industry is one of our oldest industries in India, may I know what particular machinery for technological improvements have been imported and what are the details?

Shri Kanungo: For one thing, automatic looms are manufactured in the country. But the production is very low. Secondly, we have to get the machinery in those places as quickly as possible. Therefore, Government have allotted a certain proportion for indigenous manufacture and the rest for imports.

Shri P. C. Bose: May I know whether the machinery proposed to be imported is for new mills or for running mills?

Shri Kanungo: These automatic looms are earmarked for specific purposes of export goods.

Shri Mahanty: It appears from the statement of the hon. Minister that orders have been placed for machinery worth about Rs. 36.5 lakhs and machinery worth about Rs. 1 crore has been ordered from East Germany. May I know how the Government propose to dispose of the balance portion of the machinery?

Shri Kanungo: The arrangements made for it will be forthcoming soon.

Shri Mahanty: May I know whether while allotting this machinery to the various units in India the question of regional disparity will be taken into consideration?

Shri Kanungo: There is no question of regional disparity here because the

automatic looms have been allotted to definite establishments and those imports are to serve those clientele.

Shri Tangamani: The hon. Minister has stated that out of the four mills, which import these machineries, one mill is at Tirupur. May I know how much worth of machineries have been imported for this mill and what is the nature of the machineries?

Shri Kanungo: As I said, they are automatic looms.

Indians in South Africa

+

*1380. { **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:**
Shri Shree Narayan Das:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Indians in South Africa, who have been evicted from Johannesburg, have been provided alternative accommodation; and

(b) if so, the nature of accommodation provided?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

(a) Two Indian group areas, Lenasia and a portion of the farm Rietfontein, about 22 miles from Johannesburg, where plots are available for purchase, have been set apart for occupation by the evicted persons.

(b) Details are not available.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know the number of Indians involved in this eviction and if the alternative accommodation which is going to be provided is at a distance of 22 miles from Johannesburg, as has been stated by the Deputy Minister just now, how they will earn their livelihood there?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The number of Indians involved in Johannesburg is 9,000. Regarding the question how they will earn their livelihood, I think they will have to start anew in the new places.

Mr. Speaker: Because they are uprooted and kept at a place 22 miles

away, he wants to know whether they will be given any help.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: There are no proposals. The African Government may be doing something. We have not got the details.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the Government of India will take any steps through some competent authority like the United Nations etc. to see that the Indians, who are going to be uprooted from Johannesburg, are not at all evicted and, if they are evicted they are going to be settled at a place where they can easily earn their livelihood?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The Government of India has raised this item at the United Nations from time to time, and it will also be put on the supplementary agenda of the twelfth session of the U.N. which is to begin on the 17th September.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: What is the time that has been fixed within which the people of Indian origin in Johannesburg have been asked to vacate?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: In some cases two years, and in some other cases three years.

Praga Tools Corporation

*1381. **Shri Nagi Reddy:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether any proposal has been received by the Government of India from the Government of Andhra Pradesh proposing the transfer of Praga Tools Corporation to the National Industrial Development Corporation; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) and (b). It has been agreed in principle that the National Industrial Development Corporation should take over the management of the Praga Tools Corporation.

Shri Nagi Reddy: When was the proposal made and when is it going to be acted upon?

Shri Manubhai Shah: We have already taken possession of the management, and the Board now is headed by the Secretary of the Ministry.

Shri Nagi Reddy: May I know whether before the management was completely taken over by the Government of India there was any proposal to increase the productive capacity of the Praga Tools Corporation?

Shri Manubhai Shah: That is precisely the purpose why we have taken over, and we intend to invest about Rs. 2 crores in the expansion programme.

Shri Heda: May I know whether the present arrangements, i.e., the recent arrangements, became necessary because the Andhra Pradesh Government asked for a loan for the expansion of the industry and that was refused by the Centre, or was it a straight offer from the Andhra Pradesh Government to the Centre to take it over?

Shri Manubhai Shah: The main reason was that this was a very good factory which was making continuous losses since the time of its inception, and when our experts inspected the machinery, they felt that it could be made much better use of, and the Andhra Government was also considering the matter on the same lines. So, they requested the Centre to take it over and improve and expand the production.

Shri Nagi Reddy: May I know the amount that has been spent during 1956-57 and 1957-58 on improvement?

Shri Manubhai Shah: As far as the Centre is concerned, we have just taken it over, about three months back. It is our intention to invest Rs. 2 crores in the next two years and expend the machinery and the working capital.

Financial Assistance to Bharat Sevak Samaj

+

*1383. **Shri Assar:**
Shri Jadhav:

Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state the financial assistance given in 1956-57 to Bharat Sevak Samaj by the Planning Commission and on whose recommendation?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): Rs. 4,80,000 on the recommendation of the Co-ordination Committee for Public Co-operation.

Shri Assar: May I know what amount has been raised by the Bharat Sevak Samaj from private sources during this year?

Shri L. N. Mishra: That we cannot say. This is the amount given by the Planning Commission to the Bharat Sevak Samaj.

Shri Assar: Apart from the financial assistance, may I know what other facilities involving expenditure are provided to the officials of the Bharat Sevak Samaj?

Mr. Speaker: This only relates to financial assistance.

Shri L. N. Mishra: We have given this amount to the Bharat Sevak Samaj for purchase of tools and implements for carrying out public co-operation work mainly in NES and community project areas, and these implements are to be stored with the community project administration of the zones.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: May I know whether such grants are given to any other organisations or only to the Bharat Sevak Samaj?

Shri L. N. Mishra: As a matter of fact, the Planning Commission invited as many as 25 public social organisations of the country to come forward and help in the implementation of the Plan through public co-operation, and a number of organisations have already submitted their schemes.

They are: The Indian Social Service Conference of Bombay, Gram Mahila Sangh, Bombay, All-India Boy Scouts Association, The Red Cross Society, and The Bar Association of Madras, and their schemes are under consideration.

Shri Jadhav: Is it not a fact that the non-political nature of the Bharat Sevak Samaj has not been maintained?

Shri L. N. Mishra: It is a purely social organisation, and the grant is given only on that basis.

Displaced Persons' Colonies in Delhi

*1384. **Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the existing structures in the displaced persons' colonies like Lajpat Nagar, Kalkaji and Malviya Nagar in New Delhi are exactly in accordance with the original approved plans;

(b) if not, whether Government permit the owners to raise constructions to the extent of the original approved plans of various structures in these colonies; and

(c) how many such permissions have so far been given?

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): (a) Yes, except in the case of 'A' type (double-storeyed) quarters, where only the compound walls have not been provided.

(b) and (c). It is for the owners to approach the local body concerned.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Is the Minister aware that houses have been built where bath rooms and kitchens, which were necessary parts of the original plan were not completed, and these people have sought permission to construct and it has been refused?

Shri Mehr Chand Khanna: In these three colonies, over 10,000 houses and tenements have been built. If any

particular place is brought to my notice, I shall certainly look into it.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: May I know how many applications of this nature have been received by the Ministry?

Shri Mehr Chand Khanna: I have said that it is for the owners to apply to the local bodies. They do not apply to us.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know how many such buildings have been damaged by rains this year and last year?

Shri Mehr Chand Khanna: These buildings were built a very long time ago and practically every one of them is tenanted. Now we are passing on the ownership rights to the lessees.

Handloom Cloth

•1385. **Shri Tangamani:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state the target set for the export of Handloom cloth during the year 1957-58?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): No target has been fixed.

Shri Tangamani: In reply to Unstarred Question No. 103 on 18th July, 1957 the export figures of handloom from 1952 were given from which it can be found that they had gone up from 53 to 80 million yards. May I know why no target at all is fixed for the current year?

Shri Kanungo: A target for a product like this in the export trade would be just unrealistic. We try to export as much as we can, and in the last three years the export figures have been showing an upward trend, and we hope that the current year's export will also be higher.

Shri R. Ramanathan Chettiar: May I know whether there is a proposal under Government's contemplation to take steps to increase the exports of handloom cloth?

Mr. Speaker: Why proposal? That is their business.

Shri R. Ramanathan Chettiar: He said there is no target.

Shri Kanungo: Efforts are being made, and during the last three years they have shown results. Putting a target is not one of the efforts.

Shri Tantia: May I know whether the progress in this regard has been retarded by the facilities given to the power looms?

Shri Kanungo: No, no.

Shri Ranga: May I know whether any efforts are being made by Government to encourage the State handloom co-operative societies to establish direct contacts with other countries in order to export their products, and whether Government are aware that the Madras Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society was already helped to establish certain centres, and whether they are going to help the other societies on these lines?

Shri Kanungo: The Madras Handloom Co-operative Society was entrusted with operating the export scheme. It has been doing it so far, but the scheme will be taken over by the Handloom Fabric Society. The other co-operative and apex societies are free to have their export organisation, but that will be their headache.

Shri Ranga: Are Government prepared to provide the necessary exchange facilities for those societies which are prepared to send their representatives to some of these countries where markets have already been established and where promotion of further exports can be achieved?

Shri Kanungo: Such proposals, if recommended by the Handloom Board, will be favourably considered.

Shri Shankaraiyah: May I know whether any arrangements have been made to study the designs and the varieties that are liked in foreign countries and to take samples to see that they are manufactured by the several co-operative societies in the different States?

Shri Kanungo: Yes, Sir. This question has been answered several times

in this House. Last year we got a team of Americans who advised us on the subject, and we are trying to follow it up.

Shri Tangamani: In reply to a question on the 14th of this month it was admitted on the floor of the House that there is accumulation of handloom stocks in Madras State and that steps are being taken to clear that stock. May I know whether, if at least in the future when export is considered, the question of clearing the stock in Madras State will be taken into consideration?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member must put a question as to what is the stock at present, if some time it was stated like that. Why go on making a suggestion?

Shri Tangamani: Actually in reply to a question it was stated that accumulation was there, that a sub-committee had been appointed by the Handloom Board and that he was awaiting the decisions of the sub-committee.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, the question ought to be: what is the result of the sub-committee?

Shri Tangamani: May I know what is the result of the sub-committee?

Mr. Speaker: Then why does he go on making a suggestion?

Shri Kanungo: The very fact that stock has accumulated means that they are unsaleable. We are making our best efforts. (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Minister will kindly follow the question. He says that on a prior occasion, the hon. Minister replied that a sub-committee was appointed to devise ways and means to dispose of unsaleable or accumulated goods. What is the report of that sub-committee? Has it concluded its labours?

Shri Kanungo: It made certain suggestions which are being followed up. The very fact that there has been accumulation—I wanted to make it clear to the House—is because that particular kind of material is difficult to dispose of.

Small Scale Industries

*1886. **Shri Subbiah Ambalam:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether any market research is being done by the Small Scale Industries Department before selecting particular industries for particular areas; and

(b) if so, whether copies of these research reports will be placed on the Table?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) and (b). Presumably, the Honourable Member is referring to the "Industry Outlook Reports" prepared by the organisation of the Development Commissioner for Small Scale Industries.

Before preparing these reports, comprehensive economic surveys are carried out of selected industries in selected areas. These surveys cover a study of market prospects also.

Five copies of each of the 32 reports are made available in the Library of the House.

Shri Subbiah Ambalam: May I know whether any attempts are being made by the investigators attached to the mobile vans for collecting any data in respect of this research?

Shri Manubhai Shah: Yes, Sir; they collect market as well as consumer preference wherever they go.

Shri Nagi Reddy: May I know whether any investigations have been made in regard to the Kondapally toys in Andhra area—once very famous for small-scale industries?

Shri Manubhai Shah: A survey has been made, but I am unable to say whether it related to that particular area also or not. If you can tell me the particular place, I can indicate it.

Shri Gajendra Prasad Sinha: What steps have been taken to eliminate competition between large and small scale industries? Is there any proposal to demarcate the field of these industries?

Shri Manubhai Shah: The hon. Members are aware of the continuous steps that the Government of India is taking to see that production in both sectors moves harmoniously and speedily. Subsidies and grants are given. Besides, certain preference is given to the products from the small scale industries. Some spheres of production are also reserved as in the case of dhoties and saris for hand-looms.

Shri Nagi Reddy: The place of the Kondapally toys is Krishna District. May I request the hon. Minister to tell me whether it has been surveyed?

Shri Manubhai Shah: No survey was made in that particular place and we shall certainly make a note of that suggestion.

Small Scale and Rural Industries

*1387. **Shri E. M. Rao:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state to what extent the products of small scale and rural industries are finding increased markets in India and abroad as a result of the impetus given to them under the Second Five Year Plan so far?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): Though no exact statistics are available but it is clear that due to the impetus and encouragement given to these small industries by the Government of India and the State Governments, the production of khadi, handloom cloth, handicrafts and numerous products of small scale industries has very greatly increased in the last five years.

Shri Jayachandran Rao: संकड़ फाइबर यीवर प्लान में रुरल एरियाज में जो प्रोडक्शन हुई, उस के लिये किन किन जगहों में मार्केटिंग फैसिलिटीज दी जाती हैं?

Shri Jayachandran Rao: आरे हिन्दुस्तान में बार्लींग फैसिलिटीज एवेक्षण करने की कोशिश की जाती है। किसी एक

ज़रूरीज़र इतिहास के बेल्सेट लाले की कोशिश नहीं की जाती है।

Shri Jayachandran Rao: बहार के कन्ट्रीज —फोरन कन्ट्रीज में कहाँ कहाँ ये फैसिलिटीज दी गई हैं?

Shri Jayachandran Rao: एक दूसरे समझ के बाबाब में यभी मेरे क्लीय साहब ने कहा था कि हम हर एक कन्ट्री के अन्दर, जहाँ जहाँ हो तक, ट्रेड सेन्टर्स, एजारिक्षन्स, और एम्पोरियम लोल रहे हैं प्रौढ़ उन की बचत से इन इडस्ट्रीज को बड़ा इम्पीट्स मिल रहा है।

Shri Jayachandran Rao: क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि इस से बाहर के कन्ट्रीज से कितना कापदा हुआ है?

Shri Manubhai Shah: I can indicate that the exports both in handicrafts and handloom has been rising from year to year. From Rs. 1 crore it has gone up to Rs. 3.5 crores in some handicrafts.

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: Is it a fact that some of the delegates who recently visited this country expressed their choice of a particular type of industrial products from the small-scale industries and that those demands could not be met? What steps does the Government propose to take so that such demands may be met?

Shri Manubhai Shah: Mostly the demands are met. Several delegations express preference for several articles. It is sometimes possible to meet these demands but when these articles are not available, we have to express our inability. But I can assure the hon. Member that every effort is made to meet such demands.

Dr. Sushilla Nayar: During my recent visit abroad, I was told in several places by responsible people that when they placed orders for goods from India, there was considerable delay in meeting the demand.

Very often, the standard and the quality of articles supplied to them the second time was not the same as that of the first supply was. May I know what precautions are being taken to remedy these defects?

Shri Manubhai Shah: I shall divide the question into two parts. As far as delay is concerned, I can say that the complaint is not very true. What the hon. Member says in regard to quality is partly correct. The quality of the small scale industry products does not conform to the same standard which we have once exported. That is why we have instituted what is called certification, marking and quality marking scheme and we hope that this scheme will improve matters in course of time.

श्री प० ला० बाहुपाल क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि ग्रामोद्योग और खादी बोर्ड को भारत सरकार की ओर से जो सहायता दी जाती है, उससे बुनकरों को कितना फायदा पहुँच रहा है?

श्री अनुभाई शाह जो फायदा है, वह सेल्फ-एम्प्लाइड आदियों को ही मिलता है। सरकार इंडस्ट्री को जो सहायता देती है, वह इसी बजह से देती है कि उस में काम करने वालों को फायदा पहुँचे।

श्री प० ला० बाहुपाल क्या सरकार को मालूम है कि इब बुनकरों को पहले से भी कम कीमत मिलता है और जो मुनाफा होता है, उस को खादी बोर्ड वाले अपनी अवस्था में ही सचं कर देते हैं?

श्री अनुभाई शाह यह बात तो मैं ने पहली दफा सुनी है। जो इन्कारमेशन हमारे पास आती है, वहाँ जहाँ हम जाते हैं, वहाँ हम देखते हैं कि हर एक जगह छोटे छोटे कारखानों में काम करने वाले आदमी — जाहे वे खादी का काम करते हों या हैंडलूम का काम करते हों — सरकी कर रहे

हैं, उन का इजाफा हो रहा है और तम्हाह मी बढ़ रही है।

श्री प० ला० बाहुपाल : क्या मंत्री महोदय इस सम्बन्ध में कमीशन नियुक्त कर के जाएं करवायेंगे?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may go and see. We want a commission for everything.

Building for Comptroller and Auditor General's Office

†
*1389. { **Shri Vasudevan Nair:**
Shri Kunhan:

Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state:

- whether the new building intended for the office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India has been completed;
- if so, when;
- the amount spent on the building;
- whether the building has been occupied; and
- if not, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) No, Sir; not in all respects.

- Does not arise.
- Rs. 9,61,000 so far.
- No, Sir.
- The building is not complete in all respects.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Is it true that the Comptroller and Auditor-General had objected to shifting to that building on the ground that work in regard to the air-conditioning of the building has not been completed?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I am not aware of that. But, the building requires another couple of months to be completed and we are informed that the office will move to that building after it is completed.

Shri Purneaose: We are told that the building is not complete in all respects. Can the hon. Minister clarify what this means?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: There had been some subsequent requisitions by the Auditor-General such as a strong room for the cashier, built-in cabinets, partition in rooms, booth for the receptionist, cycle shed, etc. It will take about a couple of months for this building to be completed.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether, since this estimate was made there has been an increase due to the rise in prices in the estimate for the construction of the building and if so the extent of the rise due to the expansion of the building?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Yes, Sir. There has been some increase from the original estimates, partly due to the fact that a deeper foundation had to be laid for the building. The original estimate, I believe was Rs 10,49,000 and I think it would require a little over Rs. 12 lakhs for the building to be completed.

Firing by Portuguese Troops on Indian Patrol

+

Shri Raghunath Singh:

Shri Sonavane:

Shri N. R. Munisamy:

Shri Hem Barua:

*1390.

Shri D. C. Sharma:

Shri Bishwanath Roy:

Shri Fatehsinh Ghodasar:

Shri Achar:

Shri Jadhav:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Portuguese troops fired at an Indian Patrol on the Terekhol border near Goa on the 14th August, 1957 and on the Daman border on the 15th August, 1957;

(b) the loss of life or injury to Indian patrol;

(c) whether it is also a fact that the Portuguese aircrafts landed in

Daman after flying over Indian territory on the 15th August, 1957; and

(d) if so, the action taken in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) Yes. Reports have been received that Portuguese troops fired on Indian patrols near the Terekhol border on the night of August 14/15 and on the Daman border on the night of the 15th August.

(b) There was no loss of life or injury on the Indian side.

(c) No such air violation has been reported.

(d) A strong protest is being sent to the Portuguese authorities.

Shri Raghunath Singh: May I know whether there was a virtual martial law on Independence Day in Goa and Daman?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I suppose there is virtual martial law there in other days also.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Is it not a fact that very recently a very disastrous accident took place, on the 31st August, and an Indian national was run over by a jeep several times by the Portuguese army, and ultimately he died?

Mr. Speaker: After being run over several times, still he was living?

Shri Hem Barua: May I know if Government are aware of the fact that the Daman frontier is being reinforced with white and Negro troops by the Portuguese Government following the Independence Day incident?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The supplementary question asked by Shri D. C. Sharma relates to some incident supposed to have taken place on the 31st August—not the date mentioned in the question. As a matter of fact, many hon. Members have given notices in regard to that and I believe I will be making a statement

on the 5th. I would have made it today, but unfortunately I have not got it here with me, and tomorrow and the day after I shall not be here.

As to the second question, I cannot say what further troops have been brought into Daman. It is obvious that the Portuguese in Daman are in a state of extreme nervousness, and in that state all these things happen, for instance, the incident that happened on the 14th of firing from the air across the border. If you like, I can from memory give an account of what happened on the 31st, or make a statement later.

Mr. Speaker: Later.

Shri N. R. Munisamy: May I know whether it is a fact that monthly rewards are being offered for apprehension of non-residents in Daman, and also whether pro-Portuguese elements have been employed on a rupee per day for reporting the movements of outsiders in Daman?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite understood the question. People have been employed on a rupee a day by the Portuguese Government to report?

Shri N. R. Munisamy: Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no information about how many people they employ and how much they pay. I have no doubt they employ people.

Mr. Speaker: There is also another portion to the question—whether persons who were residents in Daman and who have gone out are being chased with a view to bring them back to Daman. He asked something like that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: How can they be chased in Indian territory to bring them back to Daman?

Shri Hem Barua: May I put one more question?

Mr. Speaker: This has been sufficiently answered and I will go to the next question, unless there is any

other Member whose name appears on the list who wants to ask a question.

Shri Tangamani: In the call attention notice, reference has been made to this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's name is not here. On the same subject, if I disallow the call attention notice, I will add those names.

Shri Tangamani: It is not disallowed. It only referred to this. There is only one question I want to ask.

May I know whether reports have been received of repeated violations, particularly opening of fire on the 28th?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am dealing with that on the 5th.

Shri Hem Barua: Since my name is there, may I ask one more question?

Mr. Speaker: No, I have already allowed him sufficient chance.

Industrial Designs Exhibition

*1391. Shri K. S. Lal: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state how far the arrangements for holding the Industrial Designs Exhibition of the common utility articles depicting the latest designs out of the collections of the Museum of Modern Art, New York have proceeded?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): The Museum of Modern Art, New York, are still selecting suitable exhibits, which are expected to arrive in India in February, 1958. Meanwhile, the National Small Industries Corporation who have been entrusted with the responsibility of organising the exhibitions are going into the details of the arrangements to be made.

Spinning and Weaving Mills,
Shelapur

*1392. Shri Jadhav: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether the situation of the Spinning and Weaving Mills in

Sholapur known as Juni Mill has come to the notice of the Government;

(b) whether it is likely that the management will declare lock-out; and

(c) if so, what steps Government propose to take in the matter?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kattungo): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government have no information.

(c) Does not arise.

Shri Jadhav: May I know whether Government are going to take the mill in possession?

Shri Kattungo: No.

Air Space Violations

*1395. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 480 on the 30th May, 1957 and state:

(a) whether the Pakistan Government has given any reply to the protest made by India in regard to air space violations; and

(b) if so, the nature thereof?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) Not so far.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri D. C. Sharma: How long have we to wait before we get a reply from the Pakistan Government, and has any reminder been sent to them to this effect?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): How long are we to wait? I suppose we have to wait as long as it does not come.

Nuclear Test on Christmas Island

*1396. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether after-effects of an H. bomb test at Christmas Island by

the British Government have been observed and studied by any Indian scientists at official or non-official level;

(b) if so, whether results of such observation and study are available; and

(c) the important findings of such study?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a), (b) and (c). The increase in the radioactivity of the air on 4th, 9th and 10th June at Bombay and 15th June at Delhi, was about 3 to 4 times the average during the month. This may be due to the test explosions at Christmas Island.

No adverse effects are likely so long as the level of radioactivity prescribed as harmful is not reached. According to the presently accepted standards of safe radiation levels, radioactivity so far produced is much below the danger level.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know the agency through which this examination was made and results obtained?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This was made at the Atomic Energy Establishment in Trombay near Bombay.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: May I know whether we have received any reaction to the Resolution that this House passed last session protesting against nuclear and thermonuclear explosions in the Pacific area?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir; we have received nothing.

Shri Mohamed Imam: It was reported sometime ago that they had a red rain somewhere in Malabar and the redness was due to radio-activity. Have Government made any investigation about this?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. The redness may be caused by many reasons, not necessarily radio-activity.

Shri Dasappa: May I know if it is a fact that large quantities of fish were found dead in the west coast of India and that that was ascribed to radio activity?

Mr. Speaker: Shri V. P. Nayar asked a question like that the other day. The Minister said that they were floating from there coming from some other distant place, that during particular seasons a number of fish die and so on.

Shri Dasappa: The Minister was trying to find an explanation. I want to know whether further inquiries have been made, and any satisfactory results had been obtained.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is absolutely no reason to suppose that radio-activity is the cause of all abscesses in the world at the moment, including death of fish.

Australian Trade Delegation

+

*1397. { **Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha:**
 { **Shri Shree Narayan Das:**

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether a second Australian trade delegation has visited the country recently; and

(b) if so, the nature of the subjects discussed with the delegation?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): (a) and (b). No, Sir. Only two Australian officials visited the country for exploratory talks with a view to assessing the scope for negotiating a trade and tariff agreement between the two countries. The discussions of them were naturally of a general nature.

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: May I know whether there is any bilateral agreement between Australia and India existing and whether there have been any changes recently to the advantage of this country?

Shri Kanungo: No, Sir.

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: As Australia and India are both main exporters of raw materials to European countries, may I know whether Government had any discussion with regard to the results of the European common market scheme because Europe is one of the main importers of the raw materials, and with what result?

Shri Kanungo: We had no discussion on this with Australia bilaterally

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: As trade between Australia and India is mainly disturbed due to the non-availability of shipping, may I know whether any discussion took place to provide shipping facilities by Australia to India?

Shri Kanungo: This was one of the difficulties which were discussed; but, we never asked Australia to provide the facilities.

Bharat Sevak Samaj

+

*1400. { **Shri Assar:**
 { **Shri Jadhav:**

Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a sum of money was sanctioned by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting towards printing posters regarding fifteen point programme given by Prime Minister to Bharat Sevak Samaj;

(b) if so, the amount;

(c) how many posters were printed and where they were distributed; and

(d) the amount spent by the Central Information Centre of the Bharat Sevak Samaj during 1956-57 on the Five Year Plan publicity work?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keshar): (a) to

(d). Government made a grant of Rs. 2.69 lakhs for publicity work on Five Year Plan to the Bharat Sevak Samaj, which probably includes a small sum for publication of the posters. Government have no information how many pamphlets etc. they printed. The Samaj being an unofficial organisation does not submit accounts of the details of their work but only give us audited accounts of the sums granted to them. Audited account of the actual figure of expenditure will be available later on.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: The hon. Minister just now stated that the audited accounts would be submitted by the Bharat Sevak Samaj. I would like to know who is the auditor that examines the accounts of this Samaj.

Dr. Keskar: I would require notice.

सेठ अचल सिंह क्या यह उचित नहीं है कि गवर्नमेंट भारत सेवक समाज से रिपोर्ट मांगे कि उन्होंने क्या काम किया है ?

डॉ. केसकर : जी हा, रिपोर्ट काम होने के बाद दी जाती है और कोई इसी तरीके की रकम भारत सेवक समाज या किसी ऐसी स्थाया को देने के पहले वह एक अपनी स्कीम हमारे सामने पेश करते हैं और वह स्कीम मजूर होने के बाद हो उन को कुछ प्राट दो जातो हैं ।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: May I know whether these facilities or financial aid for the submission of schemes given only to the Bharat Sevak Samaj or whether other organisations also are given the same privilege?

Dr. Keskar: This privilege is extended to a number of organisations and will be extended to a still greater number who are interested in doing publicity for the Five Year Plan. In fact, we sent out a circular asking a number of such bodies if they are interested and that we will be ready to give them grants. At present, the Ramakrishna Mission, The

All India Women's Conference and Y.W.C.A. and the Harijan Seva Sangh are the other bodies which are also getting grants.

Pandit J. P. Jyotishi: May I know whether the report of the working of the Bharat Sevak Samaj has been published?

Dr. Keskar: I think there is a report. As I said, they need not submit the report to us. They only submit, for example, the audited account of the sum that they get from us and which they spend.

Forward Trading in Bullion

*1401. **Shri Raghu Nath Singh:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government are proposing to permit forward trading in bullion only in four centres out of more than twenty-five in India?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): The matter is under consideration.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि इन २५ स्थानों में से मिर्क ४ स्थानों में फार्वर्ड ट्रेडिंग परमिट करने का क्या कारण है ?

श्री कानूनगो १९४७ के कानून के अनुसार बम्बई में एक ही एकमनेज बालू है । अब कितनी जगहो पर यह परमिट किया जाय या न किया जाय इसका विचार चल रहा है । २५ जगहो की जो बात कहते हैं तो उत्तर प्रदेश में ही २५ सेटर्स से अधिक होंगे और हिन्दुस्तान में तो और भी अधिक होंगे ?

Shrimati Tarkeahwari Sinha: From the original question and answer it appears that the intention of Government is to restrict forward market in bullion. May I know the reason and purpose of that? Is it a fact that the price of gold has become very fluctuating and that is the reason why Government want to restrict this?

Shri Kanungo: The Parliament passed legislation for controlling forward markets to curb undesirable tendencies in forward trading.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: That is why I ask what is the reason and what is the undesirable tendency that has come in the gold and silver market and which Government propose to restrict?

Shri Kanungo: Like forward trading in all commodities, it lends itself to speculation and various other unethical practices.

Shri Heda: How many bullion exchanges are there in our country and out of them how many exchanges have not behaved properly wherefore an enquiry has been made and they are being stopped?

Shri Kanungo: There is only one authorised bullion exchange in Bombay and the rest are unauthorised places.

पंडित ज्ञान प्र० उरोन्ही : क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि वेस्ट बंगल गवर्नमेंट ने फार्वैड ट्रैडिंग बैन कर दिया है तो भा० कलकत्ते में जट और गन्ने का फार्वैड ट्रैडिंग होता है ?

श्री कानून्गो : जूट का एक्सचेज अभी बन्द है, उगको चालू करने का विचार चल रहा है ?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether Government had any discussion with the Reserve Bank that one way of checking the forward trading in bullion is to restrict the supply of credit to banks?

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member is entering into a discussion. There is no question

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: A discussion took place between the Reserve Bank and the Government of India in this connection and I want to know.....

Shri Kanungo: Not about this matter, but about forward trading.

Nangal Fertiliser Factory

†

*1402. { **Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani:**
Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shri Hem Raj:
Shri Daljit Singh:

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) how much local population has got to be removed with the establishment of the proposed Fertiliser Factory at Nangal (Punjab); and

(b) what is the total acreage, both cultivable and banjar and the total number of buildings that are being acquired by Government for the purpose?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Satish Chandra):

(a) 2920.

(b) 4013.53 acres and 612 dwelling houses in the villages situated on the acquired land.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: May I know if the local displaced persons have sent several representations to the Government demanding land for land and house for house and may I know what scheme for rehabilitating these people is there with Government?

Shri Satish Chandra: When the decision was taken to locate this factory at Nangal, the Punjab Government offered to acquire land and give it to us. All this land is being acquired by the Government of Punjab and we are paying suitable compensation under the Land Acquisition Act. The awards are given by the Punjab Government. In addition to that, the Nangal Company proposes to acquire some more land for developing a colony on which displaced persons can be rehabilitated.

Shri Hem Raj: May I know whether when the possession of the land was taken the crops were standing and whether any compensation was given for them?

Shri Satish Chandra: Punjab Government has given awards under the Land Acquisition Act in which all these things have been taken into account. We have actually paid more than Rs. 21 lakhs for 1493 acres of land for which awards have been given. This comes to about Rs. 1400 per acre. This covers all the items for which compensation is to be paid.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I know whether this work has been entrusted to any special agency and, if so, what is the nature of that agency for rehabilitation of these persons?

Shri Satish Chandra: The rehabilitation of these persons is mainly the responsibility of the Punjab Government. The Nangal Company, however, is prepared to co-operate with the Punjab Government in so far as it can for the rehabilitation of displaced persons.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: May I know to how many people land has been given?

Shri Satish Chandra: Land has not been given. What the company can do is to employ the displaced persons. Actually, some of them have been employed in construction at present, and more will be employed. The Nangal Company also proposes to establish a training school where these displaced persons can be trained to take up jobs when the factory goes into production.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: In view of the fact that these are mostly displaced persons who have been once uprooted and settled, is it absolutely necessary that the factory should be situated at the site from where these people have to be shifted or is there a possibility that the site which is sought to be acquired by the Nangal Company for rehabilitation of these people might be used for the location of the factory itself? Has the Government examined this proposition and, if so, what are the possibilities?

Shri Satish Chandra: Several sites in that vicinity were examined, and after a lot of consultation this was considered to be a most suitable site. In fact, land belonging to 18 villages is being acquired but only six village abadis will be affected. It is proposed to find some additional land where the people can be settled and to employ these people as far as possible in the factory itself.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Nuclear Tests

*1371. { **Shri D. C. Sharma:**
Shri Naushir Bharucha:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Indian delegation to the United Nations Trusteeship Council raised the question of the Administering Authority's right to enter into a pact with the inhabitants of Trust Territories to use their territories as proving grounds for nuclear tests; and

(b) if so, what was the result?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes, Sir, the Indian Delegation did raise this question in respect of Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) Our representative asked that the texts of the agreements by which the Administering Authority claims to have acquired indefinite "use rights" to these Territories should be made available to the Members of the Trusteeship Council. Two such Agreements have since been circulated among the Members of the Council by the Administering Authority and it is possible that the Council will discuss this subject again.

Indo-Japan Peace Treaty

*1373. { Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sishta:
Shri Bishwanath Roy:

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to extend the provisions of Article 2 of the Indo-Japan Peace Treaty of 1952 beyond the 30th September, 1957?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): The possibility of concluding a trade agreement before September 30th is under active discussion with the Government of Japan. The question of extending the provisions of Article 2 of the Indo-Japan Peace Treaty of 1952 for a further period does not arise at this stage.

Export of Iron Ore to Japan

*1375. Shri Ganpati Ram: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the total supply of Iron ore to be made to Japan, the quantity already supplied and the reasons for the delay in supplying the rest of the quantity; and

(b) whether Government are considering any steps to fulfil the commitment in time?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): (a) and (b). The State Trading Corporation has entered into an agreement for the supply of 1.3 million tons of iron ore to Japan during the period July 1957—March 1958. The supplies under the Agreement commenced from July 1957. Recently, at the Japanese request the period of deliveries has been extended upto the end of June 1958. A total quantity of 120593 tons has been shipped upto the 25th August, 1957. Considering Seasonal difficulties, the deliveries hitherto have not been unsatisfactory. The State Trading Corporation are receiving necessary assistance from the Ministries of Railways and Transport and are confi-

dent of delivering the contracted quantities before June, 1958.

Industrial Estate

*1382. Shri Maniyangadan: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state at what stage is the Industrial Estate proposed to be started at Pappanamcode in Kerala State?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): 8 acres of land has been acquired for the proposed Estate. Acquisition proceedings for another 20 acres are in progress. 10 workshops are completed and occupied. 20 more sheds are nearing completion.

Under-Employed Persons

*1388. Shri Damani: Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the number of under-employed persons is on the increase; and

(b) the number of under-employed persons in the country as on the 30th June, 1957?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) and (b). The National Sample Survey is carrying out investigations for gauging the extent of the problem but no estimates are available as yet.

Supply of Shoes to Russia

*1394. Shri B. S. Murthy: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1016 on the 21st August, 1957 and state the value of the contract executed by the units in the cottage industries sector in connection with the supply of shoes to Russia?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): Contracts for the supply of shoes worth Rs. 85,75,000/- were placed with the cottage industry units. Shoes worth Rs. 38,55,075/- have been supplied by these units.

Community Radio Sets

*1396. Pandit D. N. Tiwary: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state whether the scheme for the establishment of a proper organisation for the community receiver installations and for standardisation of their maintenance has since been finalised?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): The scheme is under discussion and is expected to be finalised shortly. It is however to be noted that this is being worked out in collaboration with State Governments and will be their responsibility.

Documentary on Folk Dances

*1403. Shri B. S. Murthy: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether any documentary film was prepared on the folk dances of Sugali in Andhra Pradesh; and

(b) if so, the nature thereof?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) No, Sir

(b) Does not arise.

Implements for Paddy Husking

*1404. Shri Shree Narayan Das: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the result of research carried out so far for evolving suitable implements for paddy husking,

(b) whether such research has led to a successful implement such as paddy separator or a better type of chakki, which can reduce breakage etc.;

(c) if so, the nature, design and the cost of such implements; and

(d) what is the performance of such an implement?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 20].

Breaches in the Sutlej Bund Pakistan

*1405. { Shri Raghunath Singh:
Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Sutlej Bund in Pakistan got breached due to negligence of the authorities in that country and flooded a vast area on the Indian Border near Suleimanke causing damage to property and loss of cattle;

(b) if so, whether the matter was brought to the notice of the Pakistan Government; and

(c) what steps have been taken to prevent such occurrences in future?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):

(a) There was no breach in the bund but according to a preliminary report received from the local officers of the Punjab Irrigation Department an inlet on the Left Marginal Bund on the Sutlej, in the area under unauthorised possession of Pakistan, in the vicinity of Suleimanke Headworks, was left open by the local Pakistan Irrigation authorities. This resulted in the flooding of the area around the Punjab Armed Police Post at Sadiqi and 300 to 400 acres of land under cotton in Pakka village. Full information about the damage caused has not become available yet.

(b) and (c). The matter was taken up by the local Indian Engineer with the Pakistan Engineer concerned and the inlet was closed on August 4th. The Superintending Engineer Ferozepore Circle has written on 12th August to the Superintending Engineer, Dipalpur Canal Circle, Lahore, in this matter and asked him to ensure that there is no such negligence in future. The question of taking up the matter with the Government of Pakistan is under consideration.

Ambernath Woollen Mill

***1406. Shri Assar:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Ambernath Woollen Mill is closed for the last three years;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether any attempt has been made to sell that Mill;

(d) if so, the result thereof;

(e) whether Government are aware that the condition of the machinery of the Mill is deteriorating; and

(f) if so, the steps Government propose to take in the matter?

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): (a) Yes.

(b) Consequent on the termination of the lease of Shri Ambernath Mills Corporation, the ex-lessees brought a series of suits against the Union of India and obtained stay orders restraining the Government from selling the Mills to a party other than the ex-lessees. The restraint order was vacated only on 13th December, 1956, when the High Court dismissed the appeal of the ex-lessees.

(c) and (d). During the pendency of the suits, Government invited offers and called for tenders both for lease and for the outright sale of the Mills, but the response was not satisfactory. Negotiations were also carried on with leading industrialists but without any result. The Government have now entered into an agreement with a party to sell the Mills.

(e) and (f). Every possible care is being taken to keep the machinery in good condition.

Manufacture of Cycles and Spares

1686. Shri M. V. Krishna Rao: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a proposal to have an extension Centre to demonstrate improved technique in the manufacture of cycles and their spare parts at Vijayawada in Andhra Pradesh; and

(b) if so, the stage at which the matter stands at present?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) and (b). The establishment of an extension Centre in Vijayawada has been sanctioned for the demonstration of improved technique and methods in the manufacture of general engineering goods (including cycles and cycle parts) and offering common service facilities for such operations as welding, grinding and electroplating. The scheme was sanctioned in November, 1956 and the Centre will be set up during the current financial year.

Industrial Development of Madras

1087. Shri Dharmalingam: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the industries to be set up in the Madras State during the Second Five Year Plan;

(b) the amount of financial aid asked for by the State Government for these industries; and

(c) whether the amount sanctioned by Government is in the nature of grants or loans?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) to (c). The Second Five Year Plan of Madras State provides for an amount of Rs. 83.75 lakhs for the establishment of the following large and medium scale industries in the State:

1. Four Cooperative Sugar Factories Rs. 76 lakhs.

2. Wood seasoning Plant Rs. 7.75 lakhs.

There is also a proposal to set up an Aluminium Project at Mettur

(Salem District) under the aegis of the National Industrial Development Corporation.

In addition, provision of Rs. 12·19 crores has also been made in the State Plan for the development of Village and Small Scale Industries in the State during the whole of the Second Plan period. Financial assistance to most of the Schemes so far proposed by the State Government within this provision has been sanctioned in the form of both grants and loans.

Commercial Blasting Explosives

1088. Shri Dharmalingam: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the number of foreign firms with which the Government of India have entered into agreements for the production of commercial blasting explosives;

(b) whether there is any such factory in the South similar to the one established in Bihar with the collaboration of Imperial Chemical Industries (India) Ltd.; and

(c) if not, whether there is any proposal for the establishment of a similar factory in the South?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) Only one

(b) No, Sir.

(c) No, Sir.

Radio-Active Rain in Kashmir

**1089. { Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:
Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:
Shri P. K. Deo:**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been invited to the reported statement by Kashmir Government's Director of Fisheries that a large number of fish in Kashmir's springs and lakes have been found dead or dying owing to radio-activity;

(b) if so, what is the extent and source of this pollution; and

(c) what steps Government have taken or propose to take for protection from this menace?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The radioactivity reported by non-official scientists in Kashmir is certainly not sufficient to cause the death of fish. The Department is not aware of any other measurements of radioactivity in Kashmir. Nor has the Director of Fisheries, Kashmir, indicated how he measured the radioactivity of the fish or how he came to the conclusion that radioactivity was responsible for their death. Government are awaiting a detailed report from the State Government. Samples of the affected fish are being obtained and necessary investigations will be carried out. Until the results of these investigations are known, it is not possible to express any definite opinion on whether the fish were killed by radioactivity.

Penicillin

1090. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity of penicillin manufactured annually in India; and

(b) the quantity produced during 1957 so far?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) The Penicillin factory at Pimpri is the only manufacturing unit in the country. It produced 14·12 million mega units in the year 1956, which is the factory's first complete production year.

(b) 11·90 million mega units upto 31st July, 1957.

Illegal Entry of Pakistanis

1091. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons who crossed the border between Punjab and the West Pakistan without passports during 1957 so far;

(b) the number of persons convicted out of those who were arrested; and

(c) the number of cases still pending?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (c). 94 persons crossed the Punjab-West Pakistan border without proper documents between 1st January, 1957, and 30th June, 1957.

Of these, 70 persons were prosecuted, 63 of whom were convicted and four acquitted. Three persons are still under trial.

Cases of 24 persons are under investigation.

Displaced Persons' Claims

1092. Shri Assar: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether there are any instances of displaced persons whose claims though settled and decided in 1951, still remain undisposed of;

(b) if so, the number of such cases; and

(c) the reasons for delay?

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): (a) and (b). No separate figures have been maintained of claims which were verified in 1951. The total number of claims verified under the Displaced Persons Claims Act of 1950 was 3,90,000. The total number of compensation applications filed on the basis of these claims was about 4,50,000. Upto the 31st July, 1957, compensation has been paid in 2,09,088 cases.

(c) Applications for the payment of compensation were invited first in 1953-54 from certain categories of claimants, and in 1954-55 for the residual body of claimants. Since there are over four lakh claimants, payment to all will necessarily take some time.

Sulphuric Acid Factory in Bihar

1093. Shri Gajendra Prasad Singh: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) what progress has been made for starting a Sulphuric Acid Factory in Bihar; and

(b) what will be the share of the State and Union Governments respectively?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) The construction of the factory building and the erection of the Plant have been completed and orders are being placed for import of raw materials.

(b) The factory is wholly owned by the Bihar Government.

Import of Liquid Gold

1094. Shri Vajpayee: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to refer to the reply given to the Unstarred Question No. 13 on the 15th July, 1957 and state:

(a) whether Government have received a memorandum from the Glass Bangle Merchants Chamber of Firozabad in regard to the policy of total ban imposed upon the import of liquid gold; and

(b) if so, the date on which the memorandum was received and the action taken thereon?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The first representation against the total ban imposed on the import of Liquid Gold was received on the 2nd January 1957 by telegram followed by a number of further representations. The Chamber was informed that the import policy for liquid gold cannot be revised due to difficult foreign exchange position and as satisfactory quality of liquid gold was available indigenously.

Local Development Works

1095. Shri Venkatasubbaiah: Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) the amount that has been allotted to various States under Local Development Works Programme for 1957-58; and

(b) the progress of work so far made in each State?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 21]. The question of providing further grants to States according to their performance is under consideration.

(b) Information is being collected from the States and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

Displaced Persons' Colonies at Howaltilla, Assam

1096. Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether medical aid and relief is available to displaced persons at Indian Tea Association colonies, Howaltilla, Assam;

(b) whether any application for medical help was received from the colony, and

(c) if so, the steps taken to give expeditious help?

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): (a) Medical aid is available to displaced persons in these colonies from the dispensaries within a radius of six miles. The question of providing any other kind of relief does not arise as they have been given rehabilitation benefits.

(b) and (c). No. An application for financial assistance was, however, received by the Deputy Commissioner,

Cachar from one individual. She has been offered admission into Silchar Home.

उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों का आर्थिक विकास

1067. श्री सरदू यात्रा :
श्री राम शंकर लाल :
श्री कृष्ण नारायण :

क्या योजना मंत्री बताने की हृषि करेंगे कि :

(क) आने वाले साल में उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों के आर्थिक विकास के लिये क्या उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार से कोई योजना प्राप्त हुई है; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो उसका व्यौरा क्या है?

अम और रोहगार तथा योजना मंत्री के समानांग (श्री ल० न० लिन):
 (क) और (ख). अपेक्षित जानकारी राज्य सरकार से प्राप्त की जा रही है और यथासमय सभा की मेज पर रख दी जायेगी।

आकाशवाणी, जयपुर

1068. श्री ह० च० शमी : क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की हृषि करेंगे कि जयपुर में रेडियो स्टेशन की स्थापना के समय से अब तक राजस्थान के कलाकारों को जयपुर के रेडियो स्टेशन से प्रसारित कितने प्रतिशत कार्यक्रम दिये गये हैं?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (डॉ केतकर): लगभग ६७ प्रतिशत।

Indian Foreign Service

1099. Shri Ramji Verma: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that certain officials have been appointed in substantive capacity in Branch (B) of

Indian Foreign Service though they were not eligible for confirmation in such posts in the Central Secretariat Service;

(b) whether it is also a fact that certain direct recruits who have not qualified in the U.P.S.C. test have been taken in the Branch (B) of Indian Foreign Service; and

(c) what is proposed to be done with such officials as may later have more children than the limit now fixed?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes. There is a quota of permanent posts in the IFS(B). If the person selected has sufficient seniority to be within that quota, he is appointed in a substantive capacity, even though he might not have been immediately eligible for confirmation in the C.S.S.

(b) No. Recruitment to the Indian Foreign Service Branch 'B' has been confined only to persons already in Government employment. Under the rules, direct recruits i.e. candidates from the open market are not eligible for appointment to the new Service at its initial constitution.

(c) The intention is to avoid posting such officers abroad, as far as possible.

Payment of Compensation to Displaced Persons

1100. Shri Sanganna: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether any applications for payment of compensation have been received from displaced persons in the State of Orissa in the years 1955, 1956 and 1957 so far;

(b) if so, the total amount covered by these applications;

(c) how many applications have been allowed; and

(d) how many applications have been rejected and on what grounds?

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): (a) Yes. The number of applications received during each year is as under:—

1955	205
1956	30
1957	8
	—
Total	243

(b) Rs. 7,29,000.

(c) 221.

(d) 22 compensation applications were rejected on the following reasons:—

1. Applicants have shown no further interest in claims	17
2. Applicants who died without heirs.	2
3. Rejected due to suomoto revision	2
4. Applicants who had filed duplicate applications.	1
	—
Total	22

Ambar Charkha Programme

1101. Shri R. S. Lal: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state how much money has been asked for by the Industries Department of the U.P. Government for the Ambar Charkha Programme during 1957-58?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): Rs. 18,01,900.

Dandakaranya

1102. Shri B. S. Murthy: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 488 on the 31st July, 1957 and state the regions of Andhra Pradesh to be included in the Dandakaranya scheme and the area thereof?

The Minister of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): No definite decision about the areas of Andhra to be included in

the scheme has yet been taken. A statement about the areas of Andhra that are being considered for inclusion, is placed on the Table of Lok Sabha. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 22].

Indian Chillies

1103. Shri Shree Narayan Das: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Indian Chillies are facing keen competition in foreign markets;

(b) if so, the nature and extent of such competition and the names of competitor countries; and

(c) the steps taken to retain the present markets and for their expansion?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Due to the difficult supply and price position in the country, export of chillies has not been allowed since May 1956, except for a small quantity for Ceylon to meet that country's urgent requirements. The question of resuming exports during the current half year is under consideration?

Atomic Radiation

1104. Shri Shree Narayan Das: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether any communication has been received from the U.N. Committee on the effects of Atomic Radiation; and

(b) if so, whether a reply has been sent by India?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes

(b) A reply has been sent by the Government of India. The questionnaire received from the U.N. Committee was a confidential document.

Presumably, the information furnished to the U.N. Committee will be disclosed by them when they make their final report to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Indians in Burma

1105. Shri Shree Narayan Das:
Shri B. S. Murthy:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether any and if so, the extent to which difficulties of Indian nationals living in Burma regarding remittances to their dependents in India have been removed; and

(b) whether any and if so, the extent to which it has been possible to settle cases of claims of Indian ex-employees of the Burma Government for pension gratuity, arrears of pay, leave salary etc.?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) These difficulties have been removed only to the extent that recently the definition of the term 'dependents' to whom the remittances can be sent, has in the case of the employees of Government Departments, Quasi-Government Departments and other autonomous Boards and Corporations, been enlarged to include aged parents minor brothers and sisters. In the case of the others, the term 'dependents' continues to mean wife and children only.

(b) There has not been much progress in this regard although there has of late been some improvement in the attention given to the individual cases which have been taken up with the Government of Burma by the Indian Embassy.

काल हिन्दू इप्सर

११०६. श्री भद्र दहौल : क्या अम और रोजगार मंत्री २१ दिसम्बर, १९५६ के तारांकित प्रश्न मेंल्या १४४० के

उत्तर में के संबंध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) इस बीच किन-किन स्थानों पर काम-दिलाऊ बफ्तर खोले गये हैं ; और

(ख) १२५ काम-दिलाऊ बफ्तरों में से , जो कि खोले जाने वाले थे, शेष ६६

बफ्तरों में से प्रत्येक के दैर से दैर का तक सुल जाने की आशा है ?

अब और ऐसाहार तथा योजना मंत्री के सभा-सचिव (श्री ल० न० निधि) :

(क) सूचना भीजे लिखे अनुसार है :—

राज्य	स्वीकृत नियोजन कार्यालय	अब तक खोले गये नियोजन कार्यालय
१. आनंद प्रदेश	अदिलाबाद, निजामाबाद, नालगोन्डा	—
२. आसम	तेजपुर, घुबरी	—
३. केरल	कोइलोन, कोट्टायम	कोइलोन, कोट्टायम
४. उडीसा	रायरंगपुर, जोड़ा, रायगढ़ और बहरामपुर	रायरंगपुर, जोड़ा और रायगढ़ा
५. पंजाब	फगवाड़ा, नानौल	— —
६. राजस्थान	पाली, भीलवाड़ा	—
७. उत्तर प्रदेश	मथुरा, मुजफरनगर, विजनौर, सीतापुर मिर्जापुर, ऐटा, फखराबाद, बुलन्दशहर, टेहरी गढवाल, बन्दा, रिहान्ड बान्ध स्थल, और पौरी	—
८. पश्चिम बंगाल	शीलीगुरी, पुरुलिया, नदिया और मानदा	शीलीगुरी
९. मनीपुर	इम्फाल	इम्फाल

(ख) ३१ मार्च , १९५१.

Mandi Rock Salt Mines

1107. Shri Hem Raj: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state the extent of the deposits in the Mandi Rock Salt Mines?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): The deposits at the Mandi Rock Salt Mines are reported to contain enough crude salt for the

production of 68,000 tons of refined salt per annum for a period of at least 10 years.

Central Schemes in Mysore

1108. Shri Siddiah: Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) the amount allotted to Mysore State to implement the various Centrally sponsored schemes for the years 1954-55 to 1957-58 year-wise;

(b) whether Government had utilised the entire amount in the previous years;

(c) if not, the reasons therefor; and

(d) whether a statement showing the details of expenditure will be laid on the Table?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra):

(a) to (d). Information is being collected from the various Ministries and a statement will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

Government of India Press, Simla

1109. Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that industrial workers of the Government of India Press in Simla have given a 14-day strike notice to the authorities concerned on the 5th August, 1957, of their intention to go on strike from August 20, 1957;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the steps which Government propose to take to avert the threatened strike?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) Yes Such a notice had been given

(b) The demands of the workers were as under—

1. Introduction of Pensionary benefits to all the Press workers without distinction whether industrial or non-industrial;
2. Extension of liberalized leave rules to all press workers;
3. Appointment of Wage Commission with a view to revising the pay structure.
4. Increase of dearness allowance by 25 per cent.

(c) Demands 1 & 3 above have since been met by Government. Demand No. 4 will be examined by the

Pay Commission which has since been appointed. As regards the liberalisation of leave rules, the matter is under examination and would be decided on merits.

The workers have since withdrawn their strike notice.

Design Centres for Small Industries

1110. Shri Subbiah Ambalam: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether any design centres for small industries are being established in the various regions and any attempts have been made to collect modern designs in industrial products from overseas besides the collection received through the Ford Foundation?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): Government propose to establish industrial design centres after obtaining the advice of a foreign expert who is being recruited for this purpose

About 200 common utility articles are being collected from the Museum of Modern Art, New York, for exhibition in different parts of the country to show the effect of good industrial designing

P.M's Visit to Japan

1111. Shri Raghunath Singh: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that he is visiting Japan in the near future?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes Sir.

According to present programme I shall be visiting Japan for about 9 days in the beginning of October, 1957.

Cotton Mills in Madhya Pradesh

1112. Shri Raghunath Singh: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether it is a fact that cotton mills in Madhya Pradesh are running at a loss and cloth

worth rupees five crores has accumulated?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): Some of the mills in Madhya Pradesh are running at a loss. The total stocks of cloth with these mills is about 45,000 bales which is made up, of 28,000 bales of cloth remaining unsold with the mills and 17,000 bales sold but not delivered. The mills in Madhya Pradesh mostly manufacture coarse and medium cloth and at the rate of annas eleven per yard the total value of both sold and unsold stocks of cloth comes to roughly, Rs. 4.5 crores.

Cloth and Yarn Production

1113. Shri Eiswanath Roy: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether the production of cloth and yarn has increased in the first year of the Second Five Year Plan as compared to the year-wise production of the First Five Year Plan?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): Yes, Sir. The production of cloth and yarn from 1950 onwards has shown a progressive increase. A statement showing the production of cloth and yarn from 1950 to 1956 is laid on the Table of Lok Sabha. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 23].

Sales Emporia

1114. Shri Subbiah Ambalam:
Shri Thanu Pallai:

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) where and when sales emporia in big cities have been opened for marketing handloom fabrics in India; and

(b) the progress of the sales in each of them during the year 1956-57?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) The reference to big cities is not quite clear. However, as on the 31st March, 1957, a total of

1418 handloom sales depots had been opened in various parts of the country including cities.

(b) The information in respect of each of these depots is not readily available.

Labour and Employment Schemes

1115. Shri E. M. Rao: Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) at what stage is the implementation of the various schemes that have been formulated by the Ministry of Labour and Employment under the Second Five-Year Plan; and

(b) the steps taken to expedite the implementation of these schemes?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) and (b). Progress of the various Schemes that have been formulated by the Ministry of Labour & Employment under the Second Five-Year Plan is given below:—

1. Barrier Survey in Coal Mines.—Steps are being taken to obtain the required equipments from abroad and to recruit the required staff.

2. Inclusion of families of insured persons for medical care under the Employees' State Insurance Scheme.—Government have approved the scheme. It is expected that families of the insured workers will be covered by the end of 1957-58.

3. Extension of the Employees' State Insurance Scheme to further areas.—About 11 lakhs out of about 20 lakhs insurable persons have so far been covered. The remaining workers are proposed to be covered during the period of the plan.

4. Scheme for the training of Welfare Personnel.—The financial and other details of the scheme are being finalised.

5. and 6. Census of occupational wages in the manufacturing industries and Investigations into the working

conditions of Industrial Labour.—Technical scrutiny of the schemes has been completed. A time table for implementation and the financial and other details of the schemes are being worked out.

7. Fresh Family Budget Enquiries.—Technical details of the scheme have been settled with the State Governments. First phase of the enquiry will be undertaken shortly.

8. Productivity Indices Scheme.—The work of compilation of interim series of the indices will soon be taken up.

9. Agricultural Labour Enquiry.—The enquiry has been in progress since 20th August, 1956.

10. Central Labour Institute.—Fresh site for the construction of building for the institute has been selected. The construction work is expected to start by October, 1957.

11. Regional Museums.—The lands for the Museums to be set up at Calcutta, Coimbatore and Kanpur are being acquired.

12. Workers' Education Scheme and Scheme for training in Trade Union Philosophy and Methods.—As the first step in the scheme a programme for training teacher-administrators is expected to commence at Bombay from 1st January, 1958.

13. Extension of the coverage of Employment Service.—28 new Employment Exchanges were sanctioned during 1956-57 and 28 more Exchanges have been sanctioned so far during 1957-58 against a target of 125 Employment Exchanges for 1956-61.

14. Collection of Employment Market Information.—A pilot scheme was launched in Delhi during 1956-57. It is proposed to extend the scheme to other States in the country. 15 officers from various States have been trained at New Delhi.

15. Youth Employment Service and Employment Counselling of Adults.—Three units under the scheme have been sanctioned so far in 1957-58.

16. Occupational Research and Analysis including preparation of Career Pamphlets and Handbook on Training Facilities.—Occupational Informating Units have been set up in nine States in the country during 1956-57. 26 career pamphlets in English and 8 in Hindi have so far been printed. A Handbook on Training Facilities has also been published.

17. Oral Trade Testing at Exchanges.—“Occupational Specifications and Interview Aids” in respect of Automobile Mechanics has been prepared.

18. Craftsmen Training Scheme.—Sanction has been accorded for 6,500 seats which includes the opening of 19 new Institutes in various States.

19. Pre-Employment in Plant Training (Apprenticeship) Scheme.—It is proposed to start with 1,325 seats this year. The preliminary arrangements to constitute Apprenticeship Committees and arrange facilities with the Industries are being made by the State Governments.

20. Post-Employment Training (Evening Classes) Scheme for Industrial workers.—It is proposed to make a start with 1,300 seats this year reaching a target of 3,050 seats at the end of the plan period.

21 Training of Instructors.—The existing Central Training Institute for instructors at Koni is to be re-organised and a new Central Training Institute is proposed to be set up at Audh temporarily with 144 seats from 1st November, 1957.

22. Establishment for Work and Orientation Centres for Educated Unemployed.—To start with, 3 Centres, one each in Kerala, Delhi and West Bengal have been approved on an experimental basis. While the Centres in Kerala and Delhi are already

functioning, the Centre in West Bengal is expected to start in October, 1957.

23. Miscellaneous schemes viz, Training of Officers and Hobby Training Schemes.—No progress.

24. Tripartite Consultative Machinery.—Steps are being taken to set up industrial committees for selected industries in addition to those already in existence.

Slum Clearance in Andhra

1116. Shri B. S. Murthy: Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) the amounts sanctioned to Andhra Pradesh for slum clearance during 1956-57 and 1957-58; and

(b) the amounts asked for?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). No specific amount was allocated to State Governments in 1956-57 and the Andhra Pradesh Government did not send any scheme for sanction. For 1957-58, a sum of Rs. 6.75 lakhs has been allocated to the Andhra Pradesh Government as the Central Government's share of financial assistance. The Andhra Pradesh Government has sent seven slum clearance projects at an estimated cost of Rs. 34.08 lakhs of which two projects costing Rs. 13.50 lakhs have been sanctioned.

Mica Mine Workers' Union, Andhra Pradesh

1117. Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Andhra Pradesh Mica Mine Workers' Union, Gudur, have submitted a memorandum to Government regarding the non-implementation of the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, Industrial Disputes Act, The Mines Act etc. in the Mica Mines of the State; and

(b) if so, the steps Government have taken on the memorandum?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Export of Tea

1118. Shri Raghunath Singh: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether it is a fact that export of tea to the U.S.A. is falling and India is losing the market rapidly giving place to Ceylon, Indonesia and Formosa?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kapungo): Imports of Indian tea into U.S.A. were lower in 1956 than in 1954 and 1955. Total imports of that country were also lower in 1956 as compared with those years. The position in 1957 cannot be anticipated at this stage.

Labour Co-operatives

1119. Shri B. S. Murthy: Will the Minister of Labour and Employment be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken to encourage Labour Co-operatives for securing contract work in Central Government undertakings; and

(b) the number of such labour co-operatives started in 1956-57?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) and (b). The information in respect of Central Government undertakings is being collected and will be laid on the table of Lok Sabha in due course.

Hides and Skins Industry

1120. Shri N. R. Munisamy: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to lay a statement on the Table showing financial assistance given to various State Governments for their small scale industry schemes relating to Hides and Skins

during the year 1956-57 and 1957-58 and state what is the policy of allocation of Central assistance to State Governments?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): A statement is laid on the Table of Lok Sabha. [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 24].

Fourth All India Handloom Week

1121. Shri S. M. Banerjee: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount spent on the Fourth All India Handloom Week celebrations during this year; and

(b) whether any decisions were taken regarding measures to popularise the Handloom Industry?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) An expenditure of Rs. 2,88,000 was sanctioned for the Fourth All India Handloom Week celebrations which were held from the 5th to the 11th May this year. The figures relating to actual expenditure are not readily available

(b) Steps to popularise the Handloom Industry have been taken from time to time. Details of the measures taken may be found in the Annual Reports of the All India Handloom Board. Copies of these Annual Reports are available in the Parliament Library

Documentary Film

1122. Shrimati Mafida Ahmed: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any proposal from the Government of Assam to produce documentary films on the Martyrs Maniram Dewan and Piali Phukan who were hanged for revolting against British imperialism; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. B. V. Keskar): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity

1123. Shri Jadhav: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the number of employees in the Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity in the year 1951-52; and

(b) their number at present?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. B. V. Keskar): (a) 91.

(b) 370.

विलो में विस्थापित व्यक्तियों को बस्तिया

1124 श्री मोहन स्वरूप : क्या पुनर्जास तथा अल्पसंख्यक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार को यह जात है कि दिल्ली में विस्थापित व्यक्तियों की बस्तियों में सरकार द्वारा बनाये गये मकानों की बड़ी बुरा दशा होती जा रही है;

(ल) क्या यह भी सच है कि दिल्ली में लाजपत नगर और मालवीय नगर की बस्तियों में पिछले दो सालों से मकानों में सफेदी और मरम्मत नहीं कराई गई है; और

(ग) इन मकानों में मरम्मत इत्यादि कराने के लिये सरकार क्या प्रबन्ध कर रही है ?

पुनर्जास तथा अल्पसंख्यक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री मोहर चन्द लम्हा) : (क) उन की कोई बुरी दशा नहीं है।

(ल) जी नहीं।

(ग) गत वित्तीय वर्ष के अन्त तक यानी मार्च १९५७ तक इन मकानों की मरम्मत बाकायदा तौर से कराई जा चुकी है। केवल गत वित्तीय वर्ष के दौरान लगभग साढ़े नौ लाख रुपये इस काम पर

खर्च किये गये थे। इन मकानों में से बहुत से मकान अब विस्थापित व्यक्तियों को हस्तांतरिक किये जा चुके हैं या उन का हस्तांतरण अभी किया जा रहा है। अक्टूबर १९५५ से ऐसे मकानों का किराया नहीं लिया जा रहा है। क्योंकि इन मकानों के स्वामित्व अधिकार हस्तांतरित कर दिये गये हैं, इसलिये पुनर्वास मंत्रालय इन की देखभाल और मरम्मत नहीं करायेगा। इसकी जिम्मेदारी अब नये मालिकों पर होगी। यह मंत्रालय उन मकानों की देखभाल और मरम्मत कराता रहेगा जिन के स्वामित्व अधिकारों का हस्तांतरण विस्थापित व्यक्तियों को नहीं किया जा रहा है।

12 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT
REPORTS OF GOVERNMENTS OF
DELHI AND HIMACHAL PRADESH

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers, under Article 151(1) of the Constitution:—

(1) Appropriation Accounts of the Government of Delhi, 1954-55 and Audit Report, 1956.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-238/57.]

(2) Appropriation Account of the Government of Himachal Pradesh, 1955-56 and Audit Report, 1957.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-239/57.]

**STATEMENT CORRECTING REPLY GIVEN
TO QUESTION**

Mr. Speaker: Shrimati Lakshmi Menon...

Shri Abid Ali: Sir, on behalf of Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, I beg to lay on the.....

Mr. Speaker: I won't allow that. The hon. Deputy Minister is present here. Hon. Ministers or Deputy Ministers who are present here should, as far as possible, lay the papers themselves.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the statement correcting the reply given on the 31st July, 1957 to Unstarred Question No. 408 regarding Migration Certificates.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-241/57]

RULES COMMITTEE

FIRST REPORT

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-rule (1) of rule 331 of the Rules of Procedure, a copy of the First Report of the Rules Committee.

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table the following two Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the Second Session of Second Lok Sabha and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 15th July, 1957:—

1. The Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1957.
2. The Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1957.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-240/57.]

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

RESIGNATION OF ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE JABALPUR CANTONMENT BOARD

Sardar A. S. Salgal (Janjgir): Sir, under Rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Defence to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

“The resignation of five elected members of the Jabalpur Cantonment Board and the situation arising therefrom.”

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): Sir, the information the Government have at present is that, on the morning of the 19th August 1957, which was a holiday on account of Janmashtami, a deputation of about 25 to 30 people called at the residence of the President of the Cantonment Board. They wanted to represent against the “show-cause notices” served by the Cantonment Executive Officer for the erection of stalls on the platforms over the Cantonment drains in contravention of the Bye-laws. The President told them that as it was a holiday he could not do very much in the matter on that day. However, noticing that one of the elected members, Shri N. C. Agarwal, was also among the deputationists, the President agreed to discuss the case with him and took him inside his bungalow and discussed the matter. The President states that he requested Shri Agarwal to stay further proceedings in the matter, if it was possible, and to put it up at the emergent meeting which had been fixed for the 24th August 1957. It appears that Shri Agarwal in answer to his question told the President that he was satisfied. On the same day 5 of the elected members of the Cantonment Board intimated to the President that they were resigning from membership on the ground that the President had behaved “in an ungentlemanly and discourteous manner” towards the elected members of the Board and also towards the public of that Cantonment who had gone in deputation to

represent against the “autocratic and unsympathetic attitude” of the Cantonment Executive Officer, Jabalpur.

The G.O.C.-in-C. Southern Command, has been directed by Government to make detailed inquiries into the incident and submit his report to Government for orders at an early date. Decision regarding the acceptance or otherwise of the resignations tendered by the 5 elected members, and such further action as may be necessary, will be taken by Government after receipt of his report.

The elections in the Jabalpur Cantonment are due to be held in October, 1957.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on Absence of Members from the sittings of the House in their Second Report have recommended that leave of absence may be granted to the following members for the periods indicated in the Report:—

1. Shri Balasaheb Salunke,
2. Shri Lachman Singh,
- 3 Shri Uma Charan Patnaik,
4. Shri S. C Choudhury,
5. Shri Joginder Sen-Mandi,
6. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani,
7. Shri S. C Balakrishnan,
8. Shri Chapla Kanta Bhattacharya,
- 9 Thakor Shri Fatesinhji Ghodas-sar,
10. Shri Chowkhamoon Gohain,
11. Shri Bishanchandar Seth,
12. Shri T. R. Neswi.

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

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Sir, I want to seek one clarification in this connection. Supposing a Minister is absent, should he not also apply

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

for leave of absence from the House, because I see that one of the Ministers never attends the House at all; it is only once in a way that he attends?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are aware that, so far as the House is concerned, under the Constitution if any Member is absent for consecutive meetings of the House for 60 days or more his name can be removed and a motion can be made by any Member in this House that his seat may be declared vacant. So, when, hon. Members take leave, though hon. Members may not lose their seats for the simple reason that once in 60 days they may attend and do not attend for another 59 days, the House loses the benefit of their presence. Therefore, naturally we expect that all hon. Members who would not be here for more than a week or so—one or two days does not matter much—would intimate us, and they are expected to do so. But the Government work is carried on though a particular Minister is absent.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I do not mind if they are absent, there may be pretty good reasons for that. But I have been here for five years now and I have not seen any Minister applying for leave at any time though they are absent on many days. They should set an example.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has entirely misunderstood the position. Absence from Delhi is one thing and absence from the House is another thing. So far as absence from the House is concerned, many hon. Members sit in the hall there and do not come here at all. I do not worry myself about that. Therefore, I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Members will be informed accordingly.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up consideration of the motion regarding international situation for which 5½ hours have been allotted. The time-limit of speeches will as usual be 15 minutes for the Members and 20 to 30 minutes, if necessary, for leaders of groups. We will just conclude by 5.30 or 5.45. I shall call upon the Prime Minister to reply at 5.00 P.M.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, 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."

I am afraid, this has become rather a stock motion which I move regularly and periodically before the House. The international situation naturally changes somewhat from time to time. The present one is not quite the same as it was yesterday and yet, fundamentally it is more or less the same. In the same way, as regards the policy of the Government of India, as this House is aware, we have tried to follow the same basic policy adapting it to changing circumstances.

The two questions that directly affect us in regard to international policy are our relations with Pakistan and with that, of course, is inevitably included, more especially, the question of Kashmir, and secondly, the question of Goa. These two, I say, affect us directly, because they affect the integrity and sovereignty of India; of course, the other questions which are really much bigger in their world significance affect us very greatly, for the simple reason that whatever happens there affects us as it affects the world. In fact, almost all our problems are affected directly or indirectly by what happens elsewhere in the world. If the Suez Canal is closed, we are affected; our Five Year Plan is

affected. If something else happens, our defence budget is affected on account of external factors. If military aid is being given to Pakistan, well, our defence, our position, is affected, and a greater burden is cast upon us if something happens which gives solace and help to Portugal in its holding on to Goa, and that affects us.

So, although the two immediate and important points directly affecting us, affecting the sovereignty and integrity of India are Kashmir and Goa, the real matter, which concerns this House no doubt is this, the international situation which seems to be balancing itself on the edge of some sword for a long time and without finding any solution to its many problems. It is true that there is no immediate crisis of possible war. That is a good thing. But, at the same time, it is also true that no basic problem has been solved. They all remain where they are and suddenly new crisis erupt. In the recent months, the biggest crisis perhaps has been in what is called the Middle East, and in fact since the last year.

Last year, when we discussed these matters, the Suez Canal crisis was dominant. Well, fortunately, the Suez Canal is functioning now, working: not that the problems of all have been solved but they have gone a long way towards a solution, and the declaration that the Egyptian Government has made in regard to Suez Canal appears to us to be a fair and good declaration, acknowledging the Suez Canal as a waterway in which other nations participate and it should function as an international waterway in that sense. And we hope that that declaration will be the basis for the final settlement of this problem if any matters still remain to be settled.

But, after that, we see this crisis shifting a little from the Suez Canal, from Egypt, to Syria and other parts of the Middle Eastern countries. It is not for me to discuss the position in Syria or any other parts of the Middle East, but, I do feel more strongly than ever before that the types of approaches which are made to many of these countries in the Middle East or to other parts of Asia

are approaches which do not facilitate a solution of any problem and which have progressively make conditions worse there.

We have a record of a few years now, a few years of this policy of military pacts—well, these are attempts to gain influence or power over various parts of Asian or African territory, one move leading to a counter-move with the result that instead of some kind of security, insecurity prevails, in Western Asia,—especially the Arab nations which are split up—and generally Asian conditions much worse doubt that conditions in Western Asia than they were two or three years ago. I do not think anybody can doubt that conditions in Western Asia are more insecure than they were two or three or four years ago.

In these years, the chief development has been the development of these military alliances, the Baghdad Pact and the rest. NATO was a little far off; the Baghdad Pact comes nearer to us. The result was, this has been, what we see; these pose in different directions, and because one great power attacks the other, another great power tries to counter that step by some other step that it takes. Unfortunately, this policy continues and these conflicts continue. Behind all this, we see this development of terrible new weapons of warfare. The Disarmament Conference and its committee meet somewhere in London and they work hard and I believe they are earnestly bent on having some way out, but the fact remains that the world really is conditioned today by these rival power conflicts and there are attempts—I would not say balance of power politics, because the old idea of balance of power which existed in the 19th century no longer exists, when there were a number of countries which tried to find some balances with alliances—today, when these two huge countries, very powerful ones, each, if I may say so, with all respect to them, trying to become stronger than the other. There is a phrase now—"negotiating from strength". Well, if one party tries to do so, the other party also tries to do so, and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the result is strength, as measured by the latest type of nuclear or super-nuclear weapons and the piling up of these weapons goes on.

We have just heard of a ballistic weapon which the Soviet Union has produced. A little before, the United States were experimenting with some such weapon. No doubt whatever one country produces in the shape of horrible, weapon, the other will produce a few months later if not sooner. And now, we have got at the stage of what is called the ultimate weapon. Evidently, there is some stage, presumably, in the ultimate weapon but there appears to be no stage about the ultimate folly of human beings!

So, we have to face this, and we have to face this not in a spirit of being wiser than others or in any sense better than others. I would like to make that clear. It is not that we try to tell others what to do. We are very conscious of our own failings and all that, but we are absolutely conscious of this, that in our own interests,—if you like, call it opportunist interests—peace is better than war. We are convinced that for the world, peace is better than war. We are convinced that peace is not going to be preserved by policies which hover round war by these military alliances and the like. And in our own interests, we are naturally concerned with the techniques when cold war comes right up to our borders and attacks us, which it has done as the House knows. It is done because of these alliances.

SEATO—NATO did not concern us—did concerns us; it comes up to our borders on the eastern side. The Baghdad Pact concerns us infinitely much more so, and added to that, when the other bilateral agreements for arming our neighbour country and thus upsetting all the balances that exist there, are made, well, they concern us very much. It is not a question of some kind of theoretical opinion, but it is a practical proposition before us which is concerning us and which is casting great burdens

upon us in the shape of defence and other matters.

So, in this world situation as we see it, all I can hope is that the experience of the last two or three years at least will convince everybody that the approach that has been made through military alliances and through great powers pushing themselves into the concerns of other nations is not successful. In the Middle-East, we find that—I have not a shadow of doubt about it—conditions in the middle-eastern countries would be much better if they were left to themselves. If those countries, either of these great military blocs, whether it is the Soviet Union or whether it is the western nations, if they left matters to take their own course, without military interference or without any other type of interference, things will gradually settle down.

Certainly, they can be helped. But when there is this cold war going on and they declare that if any of these blocs takes a step in the Middle-East or anywhere else, then the other one naturally thinks of taking a similar step itself to counter the other one and so it goes on. Either one party should be powerful enough to crush the other by military means; that means a great war, a world war and that is ruled out. Then, if you rule out a war, if a war is not there, are threats of war going to do it? Surely not. If wars and threats of war have to be ruled out too, why adopt an attitude which just irritates and which induces the other to do something irritating to you, without producing any other good result? So, that is, broadly speaking, if I may say so, the analysis of this continuing crisis, which changes here and there, but basically remains the same.

Last year there was the trouble in Hungary. We understand that this matter is going to be brought up soon before the General Assembly of the United Nations, which is being convened again. In regard to Hungary and in regard to other matters, our

general approach has been one—we have declared our general policy in regard to it. For instance, we said then and we have repeated it often that in our view the rising in Hungary was essentially a nationalist rising; in our view foreign forces should not be kept in a country; in our view, the people of the country should be left to fashion their own destiny. We said it then and we said it repeatedly. At the same time, all our efforts had been bent during the past year to help and not merely to condemn. We want to help Hungary. We want to help the Hungarian people. We want to follow a policy which will help in removing some of the tensions, some of the burdens from which the Hungarian people suffer and not merely to condemn loudly the many things that we do not like.

There are many things happening in the world from year to year, and day to day, which we have disliked intensely; we have not condemned them. Sometimes when circumstances have compelled us, we have expressed our opinion in the United Nations or here or elsewhere. But generally speaking, we have avoided this business of condemnation, whether of small powers or big powers, not because we thought that we would gain anything thereby ourselves, but because when one is trying to solve a problem, it does not help calling names and condemning. Our effort whether in Asia or in Europe has been to the extent we could to do something to create an atmosphere for solution. That has been our general approach to these problems.

That is going to be our approach now if this matter is discussed in the United Nations. I have no idea what form it will take, in what form the discussions take place and in what form the resolutions come up. But the main approach is there. We are not anxious merely to have a discussion there. In fact, when this commission was appointed, we were not clear in our minds if in those circumstances the commission would be very helpful. The commission has now presented a

report, which is an able document, a well-argued document, but which inevitably is a document which is based on a good deal of evidence of one side. It is perfectly true that the other side did not facilitate the enquiry; that is perfectly true. But the fact remains that from a purely judicial point of view they looked at this picture, from the point of the number of refugees. That may, to some extent, vitiate some of their conclusions or not, but that is a small matter. As I said, we ourselves believe that this rising was essentially a nationalist rising; that is the main issue; the other things may follow. But the problem has been before us since the last year.

How can we be of any help? We cannot do much, of course, situated as we are. But we did wish to help to some extent and we have tried in our own way through diplomatic exchanges and in other ways to try to lessen the tensions there and to bring about a normal atmosphere as far as possible. It is obvious that in the circumstances that exist there, a country may go on and condemn the Hungarian Government or the Soviet Government or others. But having condemned, is one going to take armed action? No. It is obvious that by condemnation—it is just conceivable and it depends on how it is done—tensions still further increase and the burdens on the poor Hungarian people become worse, instead of relaxing and lessening. There is that difficulty one has to face in all these matters. So, we shall approach this matter in the United Nations, as we have done in the past, by making our attempts to find a way to help the Hungarian people. We shall express again our views, as we have expressed, that we do not approve of foreign powers remaining there and the people should control their own destinies. I do here also express the hope that the Hungarian Government will also work towards normalising conditions there and lessening the burdens which, to some extent, should exist on many people who are arrested or who are imprisoned and the rest.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Coming back to some of our own problems, I referred to the two major problems that affect us, that is, Pakistan's relations in Kashmir, and Goa. Pakistan's relations means many things, but essentially the question of Kashmir. This question is coming up, I suppose, soon before the Security Council. So, I do not wish to say anything about it, except to repeat what I have said very often and the House knows that very well, that in spite of the confusion about Kashmir that is sought to be introduced, the issue is an exceedingly simple one.

The issue is one of aggression, committed, abetted and continuing aggression by Pakistan. I did fail to understand—I hope I am not rigid in mind not to see an argument against me, to close my mind to an argument against me—but I have yet failed to see an atom of justification even put forward, much less accepted, as to why Pakistan is there except by invasion and aggression. Whatever justifications may be placed about matters, Pakistan's position there is clearly by aggression and invasion. That has been stated repeatedly on previous occasions, and in fact the United Nations Commissions proceeded on that basis. And the resolution they passed was clearly on that basis. The first thing they said was that Pakistan should vacate that aggression. There it is. And all the subsequent arguments—no doubt due to the fact that partly we ourselves were anxious to explore every possible avenue of settlement, and other countries were also anxious to help us—cannot cloud this basic issue. Therefore, there is this basic issue, and I cannot imagine the United Nations, or any country in fact, calling upon us to do something which no self-respecting country can ever do, that is, tolerate aggression and submit to aggression and invasion

Apart from the big arms race that is going on in the wide world, of atomic weapons and all that, we are faced and we have been faced in the last two years with this development

of Pakistan getting very large quantities of military aid; maybe that they get it because they are in the Baghdad Pact and other Pacts, but principally they have got it by bilateral agreements with the United States. According to our information—and our information is fairly accurate in this matter—the aid that they have received is very considerable. It is not a small aid, as is sometimes said; it is very considerable. And we view that with great concern.

Now, we are not going into an arms race with Pakistan or with any other country. Nevertheless, as the House knows, we have been compelled, at a moment of great difficulty, to spend much more than we ever intended to on defence, and the House has accepted it. Because, in some matters one can never take a risk.

I should like in this connection, to show how conditions have changed, to read a sentence or two from the report of Dr. Gunnar Jarring, the U.N. Representative who came here some months back. He wrote:

"In dealing with the problem under discussion as extensively as I have during the period just ended, I could not fail to take note of the concern expressed in connection with the changing political, economic and strategic factors surrounding the whole of the Kashmir question, together with the changing pattern of power relations in West and South Asia"—

that is, these military pacts and this military aid to Pakistan have changed the whole position, the whole pattern of power relations in this area, and changed it in a manner which gives us concern.

So, whatever reasons we had—and we had adequate reasons—to take up a particular attitude in regard to Kashmir, which is our basic attitude, these new developments have strengthened and solidified that attitude. And it seems to me clear that any

person or any organisation like the United Nations considering it must take this factor into consideration.

Now, in regard to Goa I confess that I have not said much—I can say very much—to my satisfaction or to the satisfaction of the House. There can be no doubt that the Indian Revolution will not be complete till Goa is part of India, and we can never accept the fact that Goa or any other part of India can remain or fall into some other power's dominion. Obviously when we talk about Goa, our struggle or our trouble is not with the people of Goa, it is with the Portuguese Government. The people of Goa according to us are, well, our own people. Our quarrel is with Portugal. Now, it should be remembered that because our approach to the question of Goa is a peaceful one, that does not indicate a lack of determination; nor does it indicate that this question is not going to be solved in our favour. It is possible that the Government of Portugal, living in some past century, does not understand modern developments and may not quite understand this; it functions in a peculiar way. But so far as the Government of India is concerned, and I am quite sure so far as every Group and Party in this House is concerned, there is this fixed determination on our part to see that this outpost of Portugal in India must be freed, must be liberated, and that no foreign power should ever be allowed to have any kind of outpost in India.

We have recently, in the last few months, relaxed some of our rules, because we felt that they were bearing down rather heavily on the people of Goa, and we did not want them to suffer, in so far as we could help. Of course, we are not fighting those people. Therefore, as a result of experience, and on compassionate ground, we have relaxed some of those rules. We are continually watching the position and if we think that some other rule has to be relaxed so as to bring some comfort to the people of Goa, we shall do so.

We believe, and I should like to repeat it, we believe in conducting this affair in a peaceful way. We do not want violence, sporadic or other. And it is not merely a question of some high theory or moral approach to this problem, but the very practical approach. Because, Goa may be a very small part, a corner, of India; and Portugal is not considered, obviously, among the Great Powers of the world. But the fact is that all these things get tied up with other international questions. You cannot separate it, and any approach of violence is not a violence limited to that particular issue but is likely to spread and likely to entangle us in all kinds of difficulties. Therefore, even from the point of view, if you like, of narrow practical reasons, we have to do that.

Now, we have been greatly interested in the disarmament, in the efforts made for disarmament. And perhaps this House will remember that it was at our suggestion that the Disarmament Sub-Committee of the U.N. was formed, that is as a result of India's initiative in the General Assembly in 1953. Last year we suggested in the U.N. some initial steps for this purpose. These steps were, firstly, that experimental explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear bombs should be suspended pending their abandonment; secondly, there should be at least total dismantling of some bombs—at least of some bombs—and thus a reversal of the process of piling them up; thirdly, the parties concerned should publicly declare to the United Nations and to the world their willingness not to manufacture any more of these dreadful weapons; and fourthly, military budgets should be published in all countries, no further expansion of military strength should be made and any possible reduction should be immediately effected. These were our suggestions.

It is true that any real settlement about disarmament will have to be a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

comprehensive one. You cannot have it in one corner and leave the other free. But it is equally true that, I think, it is better to have a comprehensive agreement or none at all instead of simply making it difficult to have another agreement. The fact that you have a partial agreement does not rule the comprehensive agreement; it is a step to that; it produces the atmosphere and the confidence to go further. Therefore, we have always suggested that a partial agreement is better than no agreement, provided that is a step towards the larger agreement.

Another thing is that if any agreement on disarmament is tied up with political issues, then we are likely to solve neither the political issue, nor the disarmament issue. Disarmament must be considered separately. Now, we find an extraordinary state of affairs in regard to arms. All kinds of new horrible weapons are coming out one after the other and unless all wisdom has left humanity, some way out has to be found.

I should like, and I am sure the House will agree with me, to welcome the advent of the new independent State of Malaya which came into being day before yesterday. We welcome it for a variety of reasons. We welcome it because this is one more step, slowly and laboriously taken, in freeing Asia, or partly freeing Asia, from foreign control. We welcome it because Malaya is a country which has thousands of years of association with India. Even now, if you go to Malaya like the other places in South East Asia, you will find evidence of India or Indian culture all over the place. And in the past few years also our friendship and co-operation in some matters have grown. Now, that is a good thing, Malaya joining the ranks of independent nations, just like Ghana joining them some months previously.

But we have to remember that there are many other countries still struggling for freedom and the one which comes foremost in this connection is that of Algeria, which has suffered

tremendously in the past two-three years—everybody has suffered at that—in that internecine war. I had always a great deal of admiration for the French nation and the French people, for the past history, struggle for freedom, for their tremendous brilliance and I do earnestly hope that the French people and the French Government will get out of this country, getting out of it by accepting the full freedom of Algeria.

This matter came up last year in the United Nations and will come up again, I suppose. Naturally, we stand for their freedom. What else can we stand for? That does not mean that we are against France or anybody. We are not. But we are for the freedom of Algeria, as we are for the freedom of other countries.

One thing more before I end. I referred to the political aspect of the Kashmir problem. At the present moment, Kashmir is experiencing something which is quite unprecedented in its long history—the new floods that have come there which are tremendous and colossal. So I beg to ask leave of absence for tomorrow and day after from the House to go to Kashmir and I hope—and I am sure you will permit me—to convey to them the feelings of this House, the anxious concern of this House and the assurance of this House that we shall be most helpful. Sir, I move.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is before the House: I have received two notices of amendments from Shri Jaganatha Rao and Shri Raghunath Singh. Shri Raghunath Singh seems to have introduced a number of extraneous matters there. They may now be moved.

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): 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, fully agrees with and approves the said policy."

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): 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 encirclement policy of Asia by the interested powers of the world and the creation of naval bases in Indian Ocean and air bases in foreign territory is leading the world towards a third World War, suicidal race of armament and deteriorating peaceful atmosphere of the World."

Mr. Speaker: Now both the motion as well as the amendments are before the House. A number of hon. Members some 20 or 25 have sent their names to me. I therefore, request hon. Members to be brief and confine their remarks to 15 minutes. The leaders of groups, if necessary, will get 10 minutes more.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central): Mr. Speaker, our debate today is being held at a crucial moment and it takes on an added importance on account of two special circumstances to which the Prime Minister has already made reference. The first is that in a short while the United Nations General Assembly is going to meet and the second is that Malaya has just celebrated the achievement of her Merdeka.

Dark clouds are looming today on the world horizon, particularly with reference to the Arab countries and their freedom and I do wish that the Prime Minister had given us a little more material about the position in that area of the world I say this Sir, because I feel that today particularly it is very urgent that at the United Nations and elsewhere India pulls her weight which, morally at any rate, is formidable. But before I deal with it, I should like to say a few words about Malaya.

We greet the people of Malaya on their freedom and every party and group in this House associates itself

with the sentiments given expression to by the Prime Minister. We wish the Malaya people every success. We are happy that imperialism has been compelled to lose another of its strongholds on Asian soil. And we recall with pride, at the same time, that such defeats of imperialism have always been brought about by the compulsive power of the peoples' resurgence. I feel that we ought to say in this House that it is a wrong reading of history if one thinks that British imperialism, for example, which has just conceded some kind of independence to Malaya, is of a special brand, resilient and wise, parting with power gracefully and willingly to subject peoples. But British imperialism has no intrinsic leaning to the broadening of freedom. On the contrary, it withdraws only when it must and it exacts a price as heavy as it can make it and it keeps to itself whatever it can. When power was transferred, for example, to India and Pakistan, it was not a voluntary and honourable abdication, but an unwilling gesture extracted by our peoples' massive and multi-form upsurge and heavily paid for by partition and its concomitant agonies, a price certainly no less heavy than the price paid by revolutions in many another country.

Malaya today has come into her own principally because her people, Malays, Chinese and Indians all together, have shown for nearly a decade a spirit of relentless struggle. They have shown that they would not suffer imperialist rule any longer. Such people have been branded as bandits by scribes of reaction, and in Malaya many of them continue now to be outlawed.

Whoever cares for freedom and progress in Malaya and elsewhere cannot be blind to the fact that Singapore remains still a centre of British bases in this part of the world. The leaders of the Government in Malaya have agreed that British troops, reinforced by Gorkha recruits who are transported across India, should continue to be stationed. On the 20th August, Mr. Duncan Sandys, one of

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Her Britannic Majesty's Ministers, spoke in Australia of the role in Malaya of British and Australian forces after Malaya's independence, and he announced that numerical diminution will be more than made up by more potent tactical atomic weapon units. The Reuter report uses these words: more potent tactical atomic weapon units.

It is this context of things which our friends in Malaya, naturally rejoicing in newly won freedom, should not forget that, if Malaya with her natural resources and her strategic position is not to be a limb of an imperialist apparatus intended to dominate the Indian Ocean area. Malaya must go ahead with popular and progressive policies. The Malayan Communist Party, for example, whose legalisation has been asked for by the trade union movement there and other forces, should be enabled to function in the open and Malaya will play her rightful role in the Asian fraternity of freedom-living peoples.

More than ever today Asia and Africa cannot remain complacent. Apart from the Middle East which remains a power keg, which imperialist greed and folly may ignite at any moment, there are disquieting reports about the United States trying to turn South Korea into a guided missile base for another war, equipping U.S. occupying troops in Taiwan with atomic tactical bombs as warheads and violating the armistice terms in Indo-China. They all hang together and are a menace to freedom and peace in the Asian continent.

The position is grave particularly in regard to Syria and the Arab countries, for a fantastic fib, a fairy tale of Syria having gone Communist—I wish it had done so, but as a matter of fact, it has not—is made the basis of NATO Council meetings and open United States conspiracy to overthrow the Syrian Government in

pursuance of the notorious Eisenhower doctrine. Mr. Loy Henderson shuttles back and forth between Turkey and the Lebanon, Iraq and Jordan, the idea being to encircle and strangle Syria which, with Egypt, has given voice and force to Arab aspirations. This is not something which I am kind of manufacturing. Statements have been made by the Foreign Minister of Syria himself which emphasize the point which I am making.

Meanwhile Britain has been having her little war in Muscat and Oman—just completed it, but I do not know how long its aftermath will continue. And she has followed it up by aggressive air attacks on the territory of Yemen, the reason being that with Aden as her base, which Britain, being such a very resilient and honourable imperialism, can never, never give up, she must sprawl more firmly into the oil areas regions of the Persian Gulf region. Anglo-American antagonism in this region sometimes peeps through the squalor, but the imperialists have their overall agreements and plan. From this segment of the Arab world, therefore, right up to Algeria where French atrocities continue, there is a concerted drive to suppress freedom and all struggle for it. And so it is that the United States has joined the Military Committee of the Baghdad Pact, and the whole pack of reaction threatens peace and freedom in the Arab world.

It is in this situation that India, as a moral leader of the Afro-Asian countries, should take some real initiative. We have asked for a U.N. debate on South African ill-treatment of people of Indian origin and we should, I emphasize this, together with other Afro-Asian countries, urge discussion of the British aggression in Muscat and Oman and also in Yemen. We should make it a point to focus attention on the evil machinations over Syria and the shooting war on the people in Algeria.

Apart from India's traditional concern for freedom in the former colonial and semi-colonial countries, it is imperative for us to counteract the ugly effort which is being made by Pakistan to exploit the feeling of Islamic brotherhood against India over the issue, for example, of Kashmir. On this issue the whole country is united behind the Prime Minister, but Pakistan is following certain policies which have got to be counteracted, and this talk about the freemasonry of Islamic countries has already begun to be exploited concretely by the Government of Pakistan. It is disquieting, for example, to learn from the Statesman, New Delhi edition of the 27th August, that early this year Morocco and Tunisia, for whose freedom India had raised her voice so stridently, had written to us critically over our Kashmir policy. This is the first fruit of Pakistani propaganda which unhappily is much more efficient than ours abroad. But it is not only in India's interests, but in the interests of all Afro-Asian countries, that we stress heavily the principles of the Bandung conference, and in the United Nations and elsewhere we struggle to safeguard and develop the freedom of our respective countries.

I am sorry to have to say that it was mystifying and also to a certain extent mortifying when we found our Prime Minister rather soft-pedalling on the question of Oman, as he has done earlier on such questions as Kenya and Cyprus. May be, as the Prime Minister said in the other House, the Treaty of Sib dated 1920 is a particularly confusing and equivocal document, but surely British action in Muscat and Oman was by no means equivocal and it deserved full-throated condemnation. I do not agree to the point of view, if that is expressed, that merely by a full-throated condemnation we let off a lot of steam but we produce no results. I do not agree with that at all. On the contrary, there come occasions particularly if these events happen in an area so contiguous to ourselves.

The Persian Gulf area is much more vital to us than it can conceivably be to Britain. Something certainly ought to have been done, and our condemnation should have been much more full-throated. It should not have been somewhat tepid and vacillating. The Prime Minister, of course, did express disapproval, but there was a kind of tepidness about it, there was a kind of go-slow about it which, at least on this occasion, was not called for at all. Let us make up for it in the United Nations by bringing up the Oman issue and the Yemen issue also before that body, and let us actively consult our Afro-Asian friends for convoking a second Bandung conference. It is about time. We find from this end of Asia to the other, from Singapore, from Indo-China, from Korea up to West Asia and North Africa imperialism's preparations are very much going ahead. At this point of time particularly we should try to have another session of the conference which was envisaged at Bandung some time ago.

The coming session of the U.N. Assembly requires of us the utmost possible effort towards ending the deadlock in the disarmament negotiations to which the Prime Minister has already made reference. If the Western Powers had agreed to India's proposal for a stand-still in regard to test explosions, a proposal which the Soviet Union had unqualifiedly accepted, if this proposal which emanated from India had been accepted, then this inter-continental ballistic missile, or whatever it is, could not have been wanted, would not have been perfected.

13 hrs.

Sir, I say it is a good thing for the world that this missile has been perfected first of all in a socialist country, because that socialist country does not proclaim to the world that it is going to destroy other countries, because of its military might. That socialist country has every time proposed that it is willing here and now to ban all test explosions and to ban the use of all kinds of nuclear

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

and thermo-nuclear weapons and all things of that kind. That is why it is a good thing that this missile has been perfected first of all not in a capitalist socialist country. The Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed its support to the idea of banning all nuclear weapons and unconditionally stopping test explosions. Then, we really cannot blame the Soviet Union for advancing in nuclear research, because the Western imperialist powers talk always in terms of global deterrents.

I was reading in the Parliament Library only the other day reviews of a book which is allegedly considered in very high quarters in the United States as of being very great importance and that book says that for the time being we need not fight shy of a little war you can use tactical atomic weapons here and there and later on we can see what happens. This is the kind of thing which is going on. They are talking about a great deterrent; they are flaunting the idea of nuclear superiority. They do not hesitate to start a shooting war, may be a little shooting war, but they are bad enough for the world.

In places like Algeria and elsewhere they do not hesitate to equip their occupying forces in strategic areas with tactical atomic weapons. They generally do not hesitate to try to intimidate socialist countries into submission; they do not hesitate to try to resume their former imperialist position. It is against this menace that willy-nilly the socialist countries have to fortify themselves, but they are willing all the time for a total ban on nuclear warfare and a complete stoppage of test explosions.

Last month a World Conference against Nuclear Warfare was held in Tokyo and it does not need saying that the peoples of the world, in every country of every persuasion political, religious, economic or any other, want to be rid of this enormity and this haunting fear. Now, therefore, more than ever it is necessary for us to raise our voice.

After all, last session in this House the Minister for Defence moved a resolution which we passed unanimously in regard to this subject and though we may be charged as fatuous moral crusaders we should not shirk what is clearly our duty and our responsibility.

Nearer home, I am happy that the situation in Nagaland shows qualitative change for the better and I wish Government pursues the ways that will lead to peace in that part of our country. In regard to Pondicherry, the French Government however seems much too busy suppressing Algeria to conclude the *de jure* transfer, but they should be asked to hurry up. About the Portuguese enclaves, whence comes news of regular violation of our territory and beatings up and killings of Goan patriots the less said the better. The Prime Minister has referred to it, but, Sir, it is a very queer thing that this festering sore should persist and now with Pakistan and NATO and Bagdad Pacts and all sorts of other enormities in the offing, this festering sore is developing into a gangrene.

The other day we saw in the papers an interesting statement purporting to emanate from our friend, the hon. the Minister for Defence, who is reported to have made a suggestion that we should appeal to the United Kingdom, the United States and France in order that Portugal may let go of her hold on Goa on our soil. I cannot quite appreciate this statement in the bald form in which it has come, because I cannot quite believe that the Minister made an appeal to the United Kingdom and the United States for intervention on our behalf in regard to Goa. It is clear that the hint of a whisper of a suggestion from the United Kingdom to Portugal would do the trick. It could have happened just like that, but it has not come.

On the contrary, Britain sends her queen on a friendly visit to Lisbon

and when even our Congress Press gets angry over it, the Prime Minister, who is a stickler for protocol and for chivalry, snubs them like anything. This perhaps is the price of our being Members of the British Commonwealth. As I say these two words "British Commonwealth" I fear I shall be told that the inevitable rabbit is springing out of our metaphorical hat. But there is reason for it. We have so often spoken of it and I shall not elaborate. But surely it is more than time for us to examine carefully, not in the sort of airy manner in which we sometimes discuss things in this House; we should examine carefully whether we really gain by Commonwealth membership or not.

After all soon after the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference concluded the Oman attack took place without even a syllable about it having been confided to our Prime Minister. It was not only an attack on Asian freedom but at the same time it was something like a slap in the face for Commonwealth Countries which have interests in the Persian Gulf region. In 1949 some of our friends here who were Members of the Constituent Assembly seriously discussed the pros and cons of Commonwealth membership. The Prime Minister on that occasion supported it on the ground of its being a profitable business and at the same time good on moral grounds. He said that at any time we could break the Commonwealth link, if we wanted to. I do not ask Government to do anything in a huff. I do not say: leave the Commonwealth tomorrow. If that could be done, if the situation in the country warranted that kind of action, I would have been happy. But the objective situation in the country does not warrant it. I do not say, therefore, to Government to leave the Commonwealth tomorrow, or to do it in a huff. I do not say that. But it is time that real thought is given to this matter, and not in the airy way of discussion across the table which we are going to have now.

We have to ask ourselves whether politically, economically, culturally or in any other fashion, we are gaining by it. Britain is egging on Pakistan against us, Britain is egging on Portugal against us. Britain is the prime mover, the chief culprit, the head of the gang as far as Baghdad Pact and SEATO is concerned. There is no doubt about it. Britain is doing all these things with impunity. Politically we do not gain; Britain does not lift her little finger to help us. The Prime Minister knows it very well; the Defence Minister who has been our High Commissioner in the United Kingdom knows it very well. Britain has not ever cared voluntarily to lift her little finger to help us economically. Today our foreign exchange position is bad. But Britain says that her sterling position is not particularly satisfactory. Has any single suggestion yet emanated from Britain in order to help improve our economic condition?

The Prime Minister was in Britain only the other day, and all the British papers almost without exception seemed to be gloating over the fact that India was finding herself in hot water according to their computation in regard to the working of the Plan. That is the attitude they adopt. In regard to supply of capital goods to our country it was only after countries like the Soviet Union and West Germany agreed to help us in regard to the setting up of steel works that Britain came forward with some kind of tardy assistance.

Now our foreign exchange position is bad. Does Britain ever make a suggestion that she is ready for a moratorium on the export of foreign profits from India to Britain? We have not suggested it. The Finance Minister was angry with me the other day and said we observed all the minute forms of international economic ethics. It is all very good. But have we got from Britain the slightest gesture of friendship in regard to helping us over our economic position?

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

In regard to our cultural position, we have been fighting for this India Office Library being returned. In 1956 a question was asked: what has happened to our request for the return of the India Office Library? Government say: Britain does not say anything. The other day there was a question asked in the last session in May: "what has happened about the India Office Library. Britain has not chosen to give us a reply. What is all this. There must be an end to this kind of thing.

I know that some of us have a soft corner for countries like Britain. Personally speaking, I do have a soft corner for countries like Britain and France. But that is neither here nor there. It is important for us to realise that if our country is going to progress, then surely it is necessary for us to break away from this tie-up which is inhibiting us.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

13-10 hrs.

There are difficulties, but let us try and find out what those difficulties are. Let us try to find out the pros and cons of the situation. Let us weigh the difficulties on one side and the advantages on the other.

The Prime Minister, long years ago when he used to inspire the people all over the country, said that we wanted complete independence not merely as a political gesture, we wanted complete independence not merely to show that we wanted our freedom to be absolutely whole, but because we wanted a break-away from our own old moorings of thought and action. Something like that is wanted today when our Plan is in operation, when we are facing difficulties in regard to the Plan.

It is not by appeals to the U. K. or the U.S.A. that we shall get them to help us over Goa, as the Defence Minister is reported to have said; it is not by appeals to imperialist

powers that we are going to get assistance from them in regard to the execution of our Plan projects; it is by relying upon our own people, it is by remembering that the greatest capital a country possesses is its people; it is by relying on the force of our people; it is by lighting that glow of enthusiasm in the hearts of our people, of which the Prime Minister spoke so wonderfully in early years, it is by that process alone that we can solve the problems that confront us, problems at home and abroad.

It is in that perspective, therefore, that I wish the Prime Minister to apply his mind to problems in the country and problems in relations to the international situation.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do confess to a feeling of admiration for my hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee's eloquence. Therefore, it is not a pleasant thing for me to have to try and answer some of his arguments. But that duty compels me, and I find myself in disagreement with the one and the only strong point of criticism that he has sought to make of the foreign policy that is being pursued by our Prime Minister—and that is in regard to our membership of the Commonwealth.

I wish to assure him, his Party as well as other Members of this House, that so far as I am concerned, I have no soft corner, as he seems to have—I do not know whether he is making any distinction between the British Government and the British people; I have no soft corner for the British Government. Certainly, we all have soft corners for the British people, as we have soft corners for the peoples of all nations in this world. I am certainly not very enthusiastic about our membership of this Commonwealth. I am sure if the British people or anyone on their behalf were to go incognito in this country, to any part of this country, and interview any cross-section of our people, they would find

many people not in favour of continuing this Commonwealth tie. Nevertheless, our Prime Minister, in whom we have faith, in whom the great majority of our people have placed their faith during the last elections, who is expected to know more than any one of us, including individual Ministers in the Cabinet, in regard to the international situation in relation to India, wants us to continue this bond with this Commonwealth for sometime longer, and I am prepared—and I am sure the people in this country are also prepared—to repose our faith in his wisdom and his decision. It is in that manner that I offer my justification for my own support to this Commonwealth link.

I am also of the opinion, along with many other Members, that the Commonwealth, especially England, has not been very friendly towards us in many things in the international situation during the last ten years. Indeed, the very manner in which India was accorded her independence could not be speak of too much goodwill towards India. We would not have had this Kashmir trouble if it had not been for that unwanted partition that was inflicted upon us. We accepted this partition as a kind of price that we had to pay for the freedom that we were to enjoy at the time that we got it. But we did not bargain for the Kashmir trouble. When the Kashmir aggression took place and Pakistan troops rushed into India and we of our own accord made our appeal to the United Nations to see that Pakistan was prevented from continuing to give assistance to those raiders on Kashmir, we knew—we know now—how the United Kingdom Government had behaved. And at that it was a socialist Government that was in power.

Therefore, we could not be expected to be so very happy and so very enthusiastic about this Commonwealth link. Even today, in all the things that are happening in the western countries of Asia, in the recent aggression that had taken place in those small areas of Arabia, the role that

England has been playing is something which is not to the taste of India, to say the least about it.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, wanted to take our Prime Minister to task for soft-pedalling. The Prime Minister has certainly condemned it. He has expressed the opinion of this country against it. We have to be more than satisfied with that. The Prime Minister had expressed himself too strongly, as many on the other side of this House had felt. On an earlier occasion, when worse things had happened in Hungary, nevertheless, at that time the Prime Minister thought that he was voicing the conscience of India. Similarly, he voiced the conscience of India when England and France carried on their aggression on Egypt. Therefore, why find fault with our Prime Minister over this latest aggression that had taken place? As the Prime Minister had stated, the position was confusing. There were all sorts of treaties under which England was supposed to have the right or the duty to intervene there. Therefore, all that could be said and all that could be done had been said and done by our Prime Minister so far as that particular position was concerned.

We are not very enthusiastic about the Commonwealth tie; nevertheless, we would prefer to accept the wisdom and advice, and also the policy of our Prime Minister in regard to this. I trust that Great Britain, and all those who are responsible for the framing of our policy, would take hint from this expression of opinion of a private Member belonging to this House; it does not matter to which particular political party he belongs. I think I have voiced my reaction and that of our own people in regard to this matter.

Secondly, I am extremely unhappy about the role that the USA has been playing. So many friends in this country have been finding fault with the Defence Minister and also the Prime Minister for having been so very soft towards the USSR and all

[Shri Ranga]

those other countries which are associated with them; similarly our friends here from the Communist Party are angry with them because they are supposed to be soft towards the U.S.A. England and all those other countries associated with them. I am sure—and I think I speak for large numbers of people in this country—different sections—that almost the same set of people go on making both these accusations against our Prime Minister. One moment, they accuse him of leaning too much towards the USSR....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We always want to be soft with everybody.

Shri Ranga: Another moment, the same people accuse him again of leaning too much towards the U.K. and U.S.A. Actually the position is this; if they are leaning towards anybody at all, I am convinced about one thing, that they lean towards India, that they are loyal towards India, and it is in the interest of India that I consider they have been taking any particular stand that they have taken during the last ten years on any one of those issues that came up for discussion at the UNO and also at other forums.

Having said that, I would like to warn the U.S.A. that although she has been giving us a tremendous lot of economic assistance, she has, on the other hand, contributed to the unsettledness of things, to the upsetting of political situation, to the unsettledness of political balance of power in this part of the world and India has been obliged to spend very much more than what she has been able to get as economic aid either from the United States or from the United Kingdom or from all the other countries in the world on her Defence. Our Defence Budget has been swelling.

I remember those days—I recall those days—and those discussions which we used to have from these benches as against the British Government that they were spending over too much on our Defence Forces, as much as 50 per cent and sometimes

more. We are doing more or less the same today. All these 10 years, as independent India, we have been anxious to reduce it and in spite of that we have not been able to reduce this proportion of the total national revenues that we have had to spare for our Defence Forces. Why, Sir?

It is not because we are warmongers. We have no designs against any other country. We have gone out of our way to repeatedly make an offer to Pakistan our neighbour of a no war proposal, that we would not go to war against them and let them also say that they are not prepared to go to war against us. It is Pakistan who refused to give the proper response.

In spite of all these things, we have been obliged to spend these funds, precious funds because we are now engaged in the implementation of our Five Year Plan. We want every rupee for that. We are prepared to tax ourselves to the teeth. More than Rs. 100 crores of additional taxation has been imposed on our own people. We have done it willingly but all the same bleeding in our hearts because we are unable to pay all this money. We want to raise more money and all this money we would like to utilise. As Eisenhower at one time had said in support of his own proposal for disarmament and all the rest of it, we want to use it for peaceful purposes, for more schools in our towns and villages, for hospitals in those distant hills and valleys where masses and masses of people have not been reached by modern medical assistance. We want to introduce compulsory elementary education. We want to satisfy the condition laid down in our own Constitution that we should introduce compulsory elementary education within 10 years after the coming into force of the Constitution.

We have not been able to implement it. We want this money and yet we are obliged to spare all this money for Defence. We started with Rs. 107 crores in 1946 and we are prepared to

spare this year Rs. 262 crores. Wherefrom are we to get all this money? We are getting it. Why? Because of the SEATO Pact and the Baghdad Pact, because of the U.S.A. and Pakistan Pact, because of the unsettlement that the United States, according to me in their unwisdom have created, in their zeal, and not in warmongering but in their political foolishness they have created.

Because of that Pakistan and her unwise leaders have begun to talk of going to war with India. They are not ashamed to talk of jihad. In these days of the United Nations and the talk of disarmament and so on, one would think that the responsible leaders of a great nation like Pakistan would be unwilling to mouth this word jihad, they would be ashamed of using it especially when they happen to be on a military pact with U.S.A.

Sir, I am not prepared to blame Pakistan so much as I am prepared to blame the United States of America. They have been angry, many of their newspapers as well as their statesmen are angry that our Defence Minister expressed himself rather strongly. They do not know how much more strongly our people are feeling here in this country. I for one who feel so very much for the speed with which we should raise the economic and social developmental level or our own masses feel so strongly and so bitterly that because of this unsettlement want only brought about by the United States of America, in spite of repeated protests made by this Parliament and also by our Prime Minister, all this money we are obliged to waste on our Defence Forces.

There is disarmament and all the talk about it. We hope that these disarmament talks would succeed. As our Prime Minister reminded us, it was at the initiative of India that these disarmament talks had begun. We want them to succeed. But, is there much of a chance?

My friend is prepared not to be so much dissatisfied with U.S.S.R. having

certainly discovered this new weapon. I am not prepared to trust any country, any nation with such a dangerous weapon, whether it is U.S.S.R. or U.S.A. The other day we were so much against England going on with these tests and indulging in them. There is in this country universal feeling against these tests. Now, has Soviet Russia given not notice that she is going to make any test. She simply does it; that is all. Now, are we to accept this fait accompli?

As our Prime Minister reminded the whole world today it does not take a very long time before a weapon equally strong or may be stronger than this to be discovered. The race goes on. But people would not be so foolish to go on with this race of production. World opinion would not be so very foolish, undignified and barbaric as to think of the total annihilation of the whole human race. But yet they are carrying on this race.

What is there behind it? My fear is, whatever may be behind it, in the meanwhile during these five years of cold war—I do not know how long it is going to last—small nations like us—we may be big in population and size and in our moral courage and moral stature, but from the point of view of power we are small nations—small nations go on suffering because of their economic and social development being retarded. These people suffer from this pall of fear that any day all these strenuous efforts that we are putting out on these great multi-purpose projects which we are building can come to nothing at all, can come to be blown up. All our efforts honestly and sincerely made in our country at terrible sacrifice may all be torn to pieces. That is the fear that the United States and the U.S.S.R. and all these great nations and their satellites today are responsible for

I accuse them for this cold war; I accuse them for this terrible sense of frustration that they are creating. They are responsible for this fear which is eating into the very vitals of millions and millions of people all

[Shri Ranga]

over the world. Therefore, I sincerely hope that they would heed the voice of our Prime Minister.

My hon. friend, one of the leaders of the communist party was good enough to say that India enjoys a very high moral stature today in the world. I attribute it very largely to our Prime Minister. I am proud of it because he happens to be our national leader chosen by the electorate. When would this moral stature be of much use? It is, I agree, used in our country. Will it come to be used in the rest of the world? It will be only when the leaders of these so-called powerful nations come to recognise it. If they do not recognise it, they do so at their peril. That is the voice, as far as I can see, of every self-respecting, every freedom-loving Indian and I sincerely hope that the peoples of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. would heed this voice and would listen to our Prime Minister.

He was hard put to it today to say to the whole world that is mere business, more opportunist politics to go for peace. It is simple truth. We should be all peaceable; we should live now-a-days as nation with nation, individual with individual and society with society peacefully. Such a simple truth has to be said today. And how? In a kind of begging fashion. Please, for God's sake, listen to this voice of reason. It is only opportunism; even if you want opportunism from an opportunistic point of view, it is better than war. This is a slogan. This slogan, I am sure, in a very few months would begin to reverberate all over the world, that peace is better than war from an opportunistic point of view, from a human point of view, from the point of view of the perpetuation and the continuation of the development of civilization that has come to us down the generations, down all these generations from Buddha to Mahatma Gandhi. Sir, I have done.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, events have

moved as rapidly since India attained her independence that we are apt to forget that it was only ten years ago that we got the freedom to mould our own policies, internal or international. In these intervening years many other countries have also become free and today, this morning, the Prime Minister mentioned, and this House supported, the welcome to Malaya as the newest nation which has emerged into freedom.

How has India moulded her foreign policy in these years? There was a time, I remember, in this very House in earlier years, when many scoffed and railed against it and said things, particularly regarding this issue that has been brought up by Shri H. N. Mukerjee, about remaining in the Commonwealth. They said and thought that if we remain in the Commonwealth, an independent foreign policy, our independence in the country itself would not really be a possibility. I think we have shown that this is not true. The foreign policy of India has been so carried out that there is nobody who can say that India being a member of the Commonwealth does not follow the objectives for which she stands and shape her own policy.

Some years back, in 1949, when I was going via England to the United Nations as a delegate I met my old Professor—Professor Harold Laski. This is what he said only two years after India had attained independence:

"May be, you have many ills, many things you have to do; but you are in one aspect the most fortunate country in the whole world, for you are the only country in the world who has at the helm of its affairs not only a man who is an outstanding statesman comparable to the best in the world, but a man of rare vision, and imagination and, therefore, it is from India that we expect the stand, an objective stand to help weaker nations, to bring better understanding in the world."

If he were alive today, I am sure, he would acknowledge that what he had expected of India was not belied. I think that in these few years, to the extent possible, on many questions, in spite of the fact that we have no arms and armaments and nuclear weapons, India has had a soothing influence when tensions were high and has helped those who have struggled and have now won their freedom.

It is true that ticklish problems mainly remain and are charged with dynamite. Such problems the Prime Minister has referred to this morning. I do not want to reiterate those things except to say one thing, that it is strange that my hon. friend Shri Mukerjee when he spoke was able to support certain actions whereas similar actions on other sides he cannot support.

In Western Asia at present it is the vying between the power blocs that has brought the situation to such a pass. It is no use seeing merely one side and not the other, and it is in a humble way that India has been trying to bring this before the world. The Panch Sheela doctrine over which she has taken a leading part has been enunciated by many nations and when it is implemented we shall be able to get out of much that takes place even today.

Sir, in the ultimate analysis, India's policy must be judged by the manner in which she deals with those problems which affect her own vital interests. First of all, as the Prime Minister mentioned today, there is the subject of Goa and other foreign settlements in India. How did we tackle the problem with France? These were small areas which India could have easily taken over, but through peaceful negotiations she has come to an agreement with France. What about Goa? That is a problem which everyone is thinking about. It is natural that the passions of the people are roused in this matter. It is natural, and with the provocation that

lingering remnants of brutal imperialism bring in Goa, we should all feel agitated. But, nevertheless, what is the policy that India has followed? It is not a policy of appeasement. Of course, there are some people who say that it is a policy of appeasement. It is not that. It is that, believing essentially in the doctrine of non-violence, believing essentially that so far as it is possible we must try to come to agreement on a mutually satisfactory way, for ten long years she has waited. And, as the Prime Minister said today, Goa is really a part of India. Although it may be that we are still leaving the path of negotiation open, it does not mean that our determination is weakened in any manner.

Now I want to turn to Pakistan where India has shown the greatest amount of forbearance. A great deal is talked about Kashmir. As the Prime Minister said, Kashmir where Pakistan was the aggressor seems to be lost sight of. That is the most important part of the issue which is lost sight of. Is it deliberate, I ask, because we do not join the military pacts such as SEATO or Baghdad, or is it for any other reason that this Kashmir is raised as a question again and again, and truth is distorted in this way.

I should like to say that there is another issue in the relationship between Pakistan and India which needs to be raised. I do not understand why the world outside, which is so concerned about Kashmir where Pakistan has been the aggressor, does not ever think of concerning itself about the treatment of minorities in the two countries, does not ever think of the fact that year after year, month after month and day after day, people have to flee from Eastern Pakistan to India for shelter and succour. Is that not an issue which the world outside should think about? Some people say, and to some extent it may be true, that, perhaps, our propaganda machinery in this matter has not been as vigilant as it should have been. May be, to some extent

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

that is true, but it is surprising that this matter is never referred to by even those countries who know much about it.

In 1950-51 the Nehru-Liaquat Pact was signed at a time when some disturbances had taken place. There were some Muslims who left India at that time. But each one of them, practically everyone of them, who left India has come back and the Pact has been honoured by India. Has any single Hindu been able to go back to Pakistan, or, is it not that the numbers are more than double and treble of those who have come over here? It is a very important issue, because, today when India faces difficult situations as Shri Ranga was talking about, when we have to develop our country, we have to make arrangements for this fleeting population who have come to India, and give them succour, shelter, and there is no finish to it. Is it not time that Pakistan should be asked either to make such arrangements in her own country that the minorities can live there in safety and honour or to find from her own resources, the funds and that the land that are required for the rehabilitation of those who are sent out to India? It is not an unknown fact and I think the people of East Pakistan know this—that this exodus of the minorities is continuing because of the policy that the Bengali-speaking population of Pakistan must be reduced. That is one of the factors which has its play today. Why is there no election as yet in Pakistan? There will be elections only when West Pakistan is in a majority over East Pakistan. These are the internal problems of Pakistan itself. But, so far as India is concerned, it is a fact that when we are hard pressed for funds, when we have to raise taxes even from those elements of society who find it difficult to pay, when we have to build a nation anew and when we have teeming millions of our own, we have to make provision not only for those who have come over here but we have got to make

provision for future years for those who are yet to come. Surely, the time has come when this cannot be tolerated. The international world must take it up. Many people are not aware that today India pays for her refugees out of her own resources. There are people who come and say "Oh, you get your resources from the UNO, don't you? —or from some other place". They are not aware that nearly 300 crores have been spent by India herself on the rehabilitation of persons who have been deliberately squeezed out of Pakistan. This matter, I think, needs much more attention than the fait accompli like Kashmir where people have decided for themselves through two General Elections and yet this is brought up in the international world time and again. The truth, as I said, is distorted and yet there has not been concern over this problem of minorities' treatment in Pakistan. I would like this House, this country to realise this and I think that it is necessary that this should be brought forcibly before world opinion.

I know that difficulties would face a country that keeps to its objectives, that practises what it preaches. There are great difficulties. Our position is apt to be misrepresented. Sometimes, it is misunderstood and sometimes deliberately misunderstood by many countries, because we have not joined any power bloc, because we keep out of military alliances, as I said before. Is this the reason for this kind of treatment of India? It is strange, and I cannot help referring to it. The history and traditions of the United States—the earlier history—was an inspiration to people in other lands, people struggling for freedom at one time. I cannot understand that this nation which followed a complete isolationist policy through all the years, till practically 1917-18, should not be able to understand India.

First of all, India is free in the modern world where isolation is not possible. But surely if she announces and practises this—that each nation should be left to develop according to

its own desires, that no strings should be attached, that should be understood by people who found their freedom and established it for themselves by keeping themselves entirely aloof. Surely, whichever power bloc is concerned, these nations should understand the stand that India is taking today.

Before I conclude, there is one matter to which I would like to refer. It is rather a sad matter, I think, in a way. Everybody in this world of nations, says that they do not want this experimentation in nuclear weapons to go on, that is something terrible and dreadful. That is true. That is the feeling of the people of all countries, and yet, what do we find? A volume of literature, for instance, from different women's organisations belonging to one power bloc or the other is sent out. Scores of pamphlets are distributed telling us to join them in the issue of supporting a stand where peace can prevail. Yet each one of these pamphlets depending on which power bloc countries these organisations belong accuse and place the guilt on the other. Is this a stand that can help to bring about the stoppage of nuclear experimentation? Is that a stand that can stop warfare in the world? I would appeal through this House to the people of all countries and more especially those belonging to the countries who go in for nuclear experimentation that they should bring pressure on their own countries to stop this. It is that way only that it can be done. It is time that national frontiers and power block frontiers should be over-ridden by men and more especially by women who are the mothers of the race and they should try to bring pressure on every Government that goes on with this experimentation, so that they may stop that experimentation and support the stand that India has taken in this matter led by our Prime Minister—the first lieutenant of Gandhiji. It is in all humility that I say this. I do not say that India is better than other countries. It is not, I am sure, its people are the same

as those of other countries, but there is no doubt that the stand that we have taken in international affairs is one which all right thinking people will support and which is the only that can prevent destruction of mankind and can bring peace and tranquility in the world.

With these words, I support the motion.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I begin with the directive principle of State policy. In article 51 of the Constitution, the chapter on Directive Principles of State Policy—it is said as follows:

"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."

These are abstract principles and they constitute, in a sense, our foreign policy. Now then, this policy of non-alignment is a most welcome thing for a newly emerging nation. That was the case in the United States of America as well. But, at the same time, our foreign policy, which started with a bang, is now thinning into a dim whimper, because we profess too much and we profess almost vaguely on the idealistic plane. Though, of course, professing on the idealistic plane carries us to some extent, it is not the end of the highway. About this aim, namely, maintaining just and honourable relations between nations, which is one of the avowed aims of our foreign policy and of our Constitution too, may I know how far have we succeeded? I do not say that we should play the role of Messiahs of peace. Our Prime Minister condemns this idea of going about lecturing in other countries.

[Shri Hem Barua]

But at the same time, since we are adopting a policy of peace, freedom, democracy and all the valued possessions of mankind, have we been able to rouse the conscience of the world in favour of all these valued possessions of mankind? We have not. I have come across dogmatic and cocksure statements concerning international life, but I am afraid these cocksure and dogmatic statements would not carry us very far.

Let us come to the Middle-East. The Prime Minister has made only a passing reference to the Middle-East, but I want that the reference of the Prime Minister to the Middle-East should be fuller. What is happening today in the Middle-East. We can neglect the Middle-East only at our peril. The Middle-East area, particularly the area around the Suez Canal and the Persian Gulf is like a powder-magazine today surcharged with battery for some ingenious hand to pull the wire; and, ingenious hands are already at work. The petty States in this area, some of them feudalistic in structure, because of the rich deposits of oil therein, have to depend on this power block or that power block. These petty States are today tossed between these power blocks like so many rubber balloons and we have to take note of that. Only a passing reference to the Middle-East question would not solve our problems, because in the Middle-East we find vestiges of colonialism and semi-colonialism.

The Prime Minister made just a passing reference to the Algerian problem. What is happening in Algeria? The people of Algeria are demanding freedom from the shackles of French colonial rule, but France has instituted the most savage tragedy in Algeria. What is the total booty that these French forces claimed in human blood, do you know, Sir? They have so far killed 35,000 men, women and children, and they have so far captured 20,000. So far as the civilian casualty is concerned, 6,000 have been killed, 3,700 wounded and

2,800 missing. When the French security forces killed these patriots, they have found a word for these patriots. They call them 'bandits'. That is the popular word used by the imperialists.

What do we find in Algeria today? The Prime Minister has made only a passing reference to Algeria and that is my quarrel with him. There should have been a fuller reference. We find that in Algeria there is political gangsterism stalking the land, like the giant shadow of death. I venture to say that the rape of Algeria is complete. When the French Foreign Minister M. Pineau visited India, when he came to New Delhi, he introduced a strange argument in favour of France's holding on to Algeria. He has said.

"In Algeria there were over 1.2 million citizens of European extraction who had no home other than Algeria and who would, if they were asked to leave, rise up in revolt....A bitter and terrible civil war would be the result."

This was the logic, the argument put forward by the French Foreign Minister when he came down to New Delhi. The illogical logic of this argument reminds me of the wolf's logic to the lamb. What about us? We, who sympathise with the aspirations of the submerged people of the world? We let down Algeria very badly. We discouraged the Arab League from putting the Algerian question before the Security Council. Instead of organising public opinion, or creating a climate of public opinion in favour of the Algerian people, we simply dissuaded them.

Maybe our Prime Minister has great admiration for French culture and the French people than I can claim to have, but that must not stand in the way of a just cause. But, that is what our Prime Minister did. Our Prime Minister suggested 'direct talks' in the light of the five-fold course for the peaceful solution of the problem in Algeria on the floor of the House on the 20th May, 1956. But what about

these proposals? These proposals were enunciated on the floor of the House, but when these proposals crossed our shores, crossed the seas, and went to Paris, then the French Prime Minister Guy Mollet refused to touch these proposals even with a pair of tongs. That was what we got for these proposals. Yet we pinned our faith to these proposals and suggested direct talks, direct talks between the lion and the lamb. Direct talks between the wolf and the lamb would be better, I suppose, then what we have been suggesting.

Take the question of American military aid to France. It is a fact that American military aid to France had greatly added to Algerian casualties. There is some interest in the Middle-East and in the African countries, in their economic exploitation, so far as the United States is concerned. In spite of this fact, there is public opinion created in the United States as a whole against French tyranny and oppression in Algeria. I may be permitted to quote Senator Kennedy:

"The record of the United States in this case is, as elsewhere, a retreat from the principles of independence and anti-colonialism, regardless of what diplomatic niceties are offered in its defence."

We can substitute the word "India" for "United States" and we can bring the same charge against our Government and our Prime Minister for neglecting the cause of the Algerian people and for supporting directly this colonial policy of the French Government. This has exposed us in respect of our foreign policy. This has exposed our "retreat" most crudely to the world, at least to the world of the submerged people. What about us? We can only mumble words of sympathy for these African and Algerian people; but, when our sympathy is put on the test, it always fails. This is about Algeria.

What about Oman? The British are there with a slaughtering mission

today. The British have brought down their venom jets, fragmentation bombs and heavy artillery into Muscat and Oman, and that too for the purpose of supporting the Sultan of Muscat. The hot deserts of Muscat and Oman are believed to contain large reservoirs of oil. These powers haunt these places for the reason of oil. The British military forces are there. They are using Cyprus as base. At the same time, they are importing soldiers from Kenya. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd gives the following argument to justify this invasion or military intervention in Oman. I am quoting Mr. Selwyn Lloyd:

"We have had friendly treaty relations with the Sultan and his predecessors for the past 150 years. We are giving full support which we think a staunch friend requires."

This is what Mr. Selwyn Lloyd has observed. What about our Prime Minister? Our Prime Minister tried to just glide over it by saying in the Rajya Sabha that the legal and constitutional position in Muscat and Oman is "somewhat complicated". An accomplished skater as he is on ice, he has very successfully glided over the entire issue.

What about the legal and constitutional position in Muscat and Oman? There are some treaty obligations, very antiquated treaty obligations. There is one treaty known as the secret treaty of Sib, on the strength of which, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd has sent the British forces to Muscat and Oman. But what about this secret treaty of Sib? The secret treaty of Sib is so secret that even the British Foreign Office does not know anything about it.

14 hrs.

This treaty was drawn up in 1918 and signed in 1920 by the Sultan of Muscat and eighteen Omani chieftains. Happily or unhappily enough to this treaty on which Mr. Selwyn Lloyd depends entirely for his military

[Shri Hem Barua]

intervention, Britain is not a signatory and that is why public opinion is growing in Britain for the publication of the text of it. The British Foreign Office has refused to publish it; at the same time the Sultan of Muscat has also refused to publish the text of it on the plea that it is a secret document. It was invalidated by the Imam of Oman himself in 1955. This is the treaty and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd takes shelter under this treaty and our Prime Minister also takes shelter under this treaty, and glosses over the entire issue.

Now what is the trouble in Muscat and Oman? It is the concession of mineral possessions. The Iraq Petroleum Company to which a concession has been given is a great producer of sterling oil. It is the oil which is responsible for the situation there and we forget about it. Now there is military intervention in Muscat and Oman. I remember to have read an article written by Sir Hartley Shawcross on Hungary in the Times. May I quote from that article, Sir? He says:

"It is well-established in international law that intervention by a foreign power is inadmissible even if it takes place at the request of a Government engaged in suppressing an armed insurrection or in pursuance of a treaty which is alleged to provide some justification."

My contention is this. If this is true about Hungary why should it not be true about Britain, Britain attacking Muscat and Oman? You cannot have two sets of rule for the same game of cricket. Let us play cricket in politics. Let us not believe in underhand bowling, or bodyline bowling. Here in Muscat and Oman Britain instead of playing cricket is playing, or is taking recourse to all kinds of underhand means and I am sorry to say that our Prime Minister has fallen a victim to it.

Now Mr. Harty who is the representative of the Imam of Oman proposes to place this matter of Muscat

and Oman issue before the United Nations General Assembly on the 17th of September, since it failed in the Security Council. We want to see what would be the attitude of our Government towards this problem, towards this issue that Mr. Harty proposes to place before the United Nations General Assembly. We have once failed the people; let us not fail the people of Oman this time.

Now we have been hearing that the Imam of Oman has appealed to the African and Asian nations for intervention against British operations in Muscat and Oman. I do not know whether an appeal has been received by the Ministry of External Affairs. At the same time we have to see what the attitude of our Government is going to be and how they are going to respond to the appeal issued by the Imam for help. I read Mr. Pierson's article about it. He says that it was an interesting sight to see these people fleeing on the backs of donkeys pursued by Venom jets. That is what is happening in Oman.

There are some people, as the Prime Minister would say, with a diseased mind, who say that it is because of our Prime Minister's association with Britain and his affection for British culture that blurs his sympathy for all these anti-British agitations in areas where Britain has her interests. I will be happy to know that this is a wrong statement. But statement is made by some responsible people.

What about this Middle-east? The Middle-East is a veritable storm centre today. It is because of its oil. What about this oil, Sir? Oil moves the wheels of war as much as it does the wheels of civilisation. The major powers of the world know it. It is said that the Middle-East oil fields, stretching in a great arc from Iran and Iraq around the Persian gulf, comprise collectively the richest and largest deposits of oil in the world. This particular area contains two-thirds of

the oil possessions of, what they say the, free world and that is why everybody has his eye on it.

The Middle-East represents a psychological problem, a political problem and also an emotional problem; at the same time it has great strategic importance. Through this route our trade and commerce flows. I say the Middle-East presents an emotional problem because of the fact that it is in this area that the shrines of three great religions of the world meet,—Judaism, Christianity and Islam. That is why our foreign policy has to be geared up to these objective conditions.

During recent years, somehow or other, we find that our foreign policy has been a little bit halting. It has become a little static; it is losing its dynamism. That is what we feel. There are two major factors in the Middle East. One is the rising tide of Arab nationalism and the other is Arab-Israeli hostility. These are the two factors which should be taken into consideration. The past may be allowed to bury its dead, but we must see that the present or future does not have any dead to bury.

What about this Israel? Israel is surrounded on all sides by six sovereign independent Arab States, which collectively have a population of 40 million. These Arab States have never made a secret of their intentions. Their ultimate intention is to destroy the State of Israel and convert Israel into a homeland of Arab refugees. Israel might be a spring-board of war and if a horrible war is to be stopped and if peace is to be permanently ensured, we must see that that can only be done through international action. I feel that India must play a distinctive role in ensuring permanent peace in this area in avoiding a third world war.

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

Shri Hem Barua: I have a lot to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may have a lot to say.

Shri Hem Barua: I am the first speaker from my party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: For the first speaker also there is a time limit.

Shri Hem Barua: I think I have not crossed it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is the first notice.

Shri Hem Barua: I shall then try to hurry up.

What about India's attitude to Israel? About Israel we have been very unfair, I would say. Israel was born; but we did not approve of the way Israel was born. Gandhiji issued in 1946 a statement about American manipulation and the manipulation of England. Whatever that might be we should see that Israel, since it is an established fact, gets its recognition, but it was an unhappy fact that for three years we did not recognise Israel. Now, in spite of the fact that there has been repeated requests from Israel to establish diplomatic relations between Israel and India we have not paid any attention to this matter. At the same time Col. Nasser, who happens to be our friend, is fanning the flame of Arab-Israeli hostility. If Egypt and India are friends, I would like to know why we are not in a position to persuade Egypt, to persuade Col. Nasser, to give up his hostility to Israel; because, Israel holds the key, the key to peace or disaster. And if there is a disaster, the disaster would not be confined to the Middle East alone, but the disaster will spread all over the world, because of the oil in the Middle Eastern area. The oil in the Middle Eastern countries is in possession of those foreign companies who have their interests in that area. At the same time, these foreign companies are having a monopoly of exploring oil and storing oil in our country. I say if the oil in the Persian Gulf or the Middle East catches fire—because oil is inflammable—, I am very much confident that the fire would spread across the Persian Gulf to us as well.

[*Shri Hem Barua*]

and we will also be consigned into the flames of that conflagration. Therefore, my appeal is that we should see that peace is restored in the Middle East and that it is done in co-operation with the United Nations organisation; because we want our foreign policy not to be negative, we want it to be positive.

Coming to nearer home, we think that our foreign policy has failed miserably so far as Goa is concerned, so far as Kashmir is concerned and so far as Pakistan is concerned. In regard to Pakistan, the Pakistan Prime Minister is issuing all sorts of statements against us. He is carrying on all kind of propaganda against us. And I feel inclined to agree with Mrs. Vera Dean, Professor of History, School of International Studies when she says that Pakistan's public relations work is much better than ours. This is also my feeling and my own experience as well when I was touring in the United States and Europe. In the States I came across a portrait of General Thimayya in a journal called at Atlantic. And that portrait was taken against the background of a railway poster on which was written, "Visit India and Kashmir". They did not do this to create a world opinion that Kashmir belongs to India but because of the good work done by General Thimayya in Korea. But when the journal came, there was a storm of protest from Pakistan. I knew it and I also faced the storm in the States. That shows how active they are. But about us, our cause so far as Pakistan is concerned, suffers from lack on proper publicity and, secondly, lack of proper advocacy. It was badly advocated in the Security Council, I would say. And I rather feel suspicious about it. I do not think that the draft that was prepared was the draft of our Prime Minister or the draft of Mr. Krishna Menon but possibly that of some junior in the External Affairs Department accustomed to litigation. Because, it was improperly drafted. Instead of laying emphasis on certain simple, signifi-

cant and relevant points, some debatting points were there and that created confusion. I remember Winston Churchill's inimitable phrase "Jaw is better than war". Our Mr. Krishna Menon almost broke his jaw by spinning words for hours which rather damaged an otherwise good case.

I think our Defence Minister should devote more of his time here in re-organising the defence and strategy of our country rather than romp about across the seas and the continents in search of the doves of peace, because the blue birds of peace are as elusive as ever.

In this connection I want to thank our Minister of Irrigation and Power, Shri Patil, for giving a five year time limit to Pakistan about the canal water dispute. Mr. Patil looks to me a man of granite—I only wish he has a heart of steel. In that case 1962 is bound to be a turning point in the history of Indo-Pak relationship.

In regard to Kashmir Mr. Suhrawardy says that India is losing friends and the U.N. has pronounced in favour of Pakistan, and most countries including the United States are in favour of Pakistan. Are we really losing friends? I posed that question before me in my own mind. The argument that would be adduced by our Prime Minister will be that we are not losing friends, for if that were so how is it that so many State dignitaries come and pay regular visits to New Delhi or India?—that is the pet argument that he would offer. But I think our Prime Minister admitted that when Mr. Noon said that India has become a Russian base it found headlines in the foreign Press, where as his contradictions did not find any headlines in the foreign Press. This shows that we are losing friends in spite of the fact that foreign dignitaries pay regular visits and we offer them dinners and parties. Because, dinners and parties are given by way of international diplomacy. And possibly it is true to say that the

easiest way to the heart is through the stomach. So many foreign dignitaries come. And Mr. Mahomed Ali when he was the Prime Minister of Pakistan also came here with his pretty Middle Eastern wife, probably Syrian. They came here, did a lot of 'Connaughting', made purchases for personal use, flashed a few "Did-you-Maclean-your teeth" smiles and provided an opportunity to our photographers to shoot them into their lenses. But what happened after that? The drama ended there. And the trail of bitterness—the bitterness that was born on the day Pakistan was born—still continues between Pakistan and India.

In conclusion I would say, Sir, that the thunder clouds are looming large on the Middle Eastern horizon and across our borders in Goa, Kashmir and Pakistan. I would say, in the words of T. S. Eliot, "Listen, what the thunder says". We want our Prime Minister to provide a silver lining to these dark clouds collecting in the Middle East frontier that threaten us with the next World War.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र (बेगू सराय) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह खुशी की बात है कि अब यह सदन विदेश नीति पर दोनों लगा कर केवल एक दिन लगाने जा रहा है। मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जिनका कि यह सवाल रहा है कि हमारी सरकार और हमारा देश विदेशों के पचड़े में ज्यादा न पड़ कर अपने ही सवालों पर ज्यादा ध्यान दे तो अपना भी भला ज्यादा करेगा और दुनिया का भी भला ज्यादा करेगा।

सबसे बड़ा सवाल विदेश के मामले में जो हमारे देश के सामने है और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने भाषण के शुरू में ही वह वह प्राइवेट का सवाल है वह पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध का सवाल है और यह सवाल कुछ ऐसी शक्ति लेता जा रहा है, यह समस्या कुछ ऐसी दुर्घटी जा रही है कि सोगों का सवाल

है और मैं भी इस सवाल के साथ हूँ कि यदि इसका फैसला बहुत जल्द नहीं किया जया, यदि इस सवाल को किसी न किसी किनारे न सगाया गया तो इस देश के लिये और दुनिया के लिये भी कुछ बुरा होने वाला है।

इस देश में ऐसे लोग भी हैं जो कभी कभी आह के साथ यह कहते हैं कि काश, सरदार पटेल जीवित होते तो वह काशमीर का मामला इस क़दर बुरी तरह फ़सा हुआ नहीं रहता। जो भी हो, एक बात है जो आज प्रधान मंत्री ने कही और किसी भी हिन्दुस्तानी को वह बात चिन्ता में डाल सकती है कि पाकिस्तान के पास हथियार दूसरे देशों से बड़ी मात्रा में और बहुत अधिक आ गये हैं। यह ठीक है कि अमरीका कहता है कि हमने जो हथियार पाकिस्तान को दिये हैं वह हिन्दुस्तान से लड़ने के लिये नहीं दिये हैं। हमने वह हथियार पाकिस्तान को इसलिये दिये हैं ताकि जब अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कम्युनिज्म हमला करे तो उसका मुकाबला करने में पाकिस्तान उनका इस्तेमाल करे। लेकिन पाकिस्तान के हाथ में जब वह हथियार आ गये हैं और पाकिस्तान के नेता आज कैसे हैं, कैसे लोगों के हाथ में वहाँ की सरकारें हैं, तो इन बातों को सोच कर अगर हर हिन्दुस्तानी का जी धबराये और दहशत में पड़े तो इसमें कोई आश्चर्य की बात नहीं। उन्ही हथियारों से पाकिस्तान कल को कुछ कर बैठे, हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जंग कर बैठे, हमारे उसके बीच लोहा बज जाय तो अमरीका क्या कर लेगा और अन्य कोई क्या कर लेगा? इसलिये पाकिस्तान को फौजी शस्त्रास्त्रों की सहायता मिलना हमारे लिये बड़ी चिन्ता की बात है और जिस तरीके से यह सवाल पिछले दस वर्षों से टंगा हुआ है, समय आ गया है कि अब इस सवाल को और ज्यादा देर तक टंगा हुआ नहीं रहने देना चाहिये और इसका फैसला जितनी जल्दी हो सके, हो

[भी म० प्र० मिश्र]

जाना चाहिये । और यह पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों के लिये अच्छा होगा और दुनिया के लिये भी अच्छा होगा ।

एक भारतीय सवाल : कैसे ?

भी म० प्र० मिश्र : सबसे बड़ी बात कि काश्मीर की जो जनता है उसके लिये यह ज़रूरी है कि यह सबाल एक किनारे से आय और यह तय हो जाय सदा के लिये कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहने वा रहा है । एक सीमा पर का प्रदेश, उसके लोगों को दस बर्षों से यह मालूम नहीं कि क्ये कहा है । अभी योहा समय हुआ वहां की कांस्टीचुएट असेम्बली ने यह तय कर दिया कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के साथ रहेंगे लेकिन संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने एक दूसरा प्रताव पास किया कि वहां की कांस्टीचुएट असेम्बली का फैसला काश्मीर के भविष्य का फैसला नहीं कर सकता । हमने यह ज़रूर कहा कि हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के इस फैसले को नहीं भानते लेकिन इतना कह देने से वह बात हल नहीं हो जाती है । इसके लिये ज़रूरी है कि हमारे देश ने काश्मीर का सबाल जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सामने रखता था, उसको हमारा देश वहां से वापिस ले ले और साफ साफ कह दें कि जहा तक हमारा सबाल है, काश्मीर हमारा है । लेकिन अगर कहीं हमारे मन में भी कुछ बातें हों, प्रेम के साथ समझौता करने के लिये कुछ गुजाइश हो तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि तब उसमें कोई प्रतिष्ठा व हस्ताक्षत की बात नहीं रहनी चाहिये और पाकिस्तान की सरकर के साथ समझौता करने के लिये सीधे तौर पर या किसी अध्यस्थिता के ज़रिये अथवा किसी पंचायत के ज़रिये सुलह समझौता करने के लिये तैयार हो जाय और प्रतिष्ठा और इज़ज़त की बात छोड़ कर पाकिस्तान से सीधे न सही दो किसी के ज़रिये बातचीत करके इस

मामले को तय कर लें । इस मामले को यूं ही लटकाये रखने से एक और हिन्दुस्तान का फ़ौजी लवं बढ़ता चला जाय जब कि दूसरी पंचायतीय मोजना आग में पड़ी हुई है, मुसीबत और संकट में पड़ी हुई है, इतना तनाव दो पड़ीसी देशों के बीच हो और उसका असर दुनिया पर हो, तो यह कोई अच्छी चीज़ नहीं है । कभी कभी लोग कहते हैं कि दुनिया की जो कमज़ोर जगह है वहां से लड़ाई भड़क सकती है, उसमें हमारा काश्मीर भी आ गया है । इसलिये मैं अपनी सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि बजाय इसके कि दो बर्ष बाद आपको इसका मुकाबला करना पड़े, जब पाकिस्तान के पास और अधिक हथियार और सैनिक सामग्री हो जाय और पाकिस्तान में कोई और लतरनाक नेता आ जाय । अभी भी पाकिस्तान की जिनके कि हाथ में बांदोर हैं, श्री सुहरावर्दी, उनको हर हिन्दुस्तानी बखूबी जानता है कि वे कौन हैं । यह वही सुहरावर्दी साहिब हैं जो कि कलकत्ते के क्रातिल थे जिन्होंने कि हिन्दुस्तान में पहले पहल हिन्दू मुसलमानों के बीच कत्लेयाम कराया था, वही सुहरावर्दी साहिब आज पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री हैं । हर हिन्दुस्तानी उनको खूब अच्छी तरह से पहचानता है और वह अपनी नेतृत्विरी को बनाये रखने के लिये कुछ भी कर गुज़र सकते हैं । इसके लिये वह पाकिस्तान को भी आग में ढाल सकते हैं । इसलिये इस मामले को अब अधिक देर लटका रहने नहीं देना चाहिये और इसका फैसला करना चाहिये जो भी नतीजा हो । अगर पंचायत के ज़रिये इसका निवारा हो, तो हम पंचायत के सामने भी जाय अथवा और जैसे भी सम्भव हो करे । इतना तो दुनिया को और कम से कम काश्मीर की जनता को कह देना होगा कि अब आपका आमला किसी दूसरी संस्था के हाथ में नहीं रहेगा, आप अथवा

मामला कुछ तर्दा कर सकते हैं और वह वहाँ के लोगों ने इस बारे में फैसला कर दिया है और अपना माम्य सदा के लिये हिन्दुस्तान के साथ जोड़ दिया है तो फिर कोई सवाल नहीं है कि काइमीर का मामला इस तरीके से अटका रहने दिया जाय ।

गोवा के बारे में मेरे स्वीकार करता हूं कि अवश्य ही कुछ पेचीदगियाँ हैं और उन पेचीदगियों को समझते हुये गोवा के मामले में कोई भी हिन्दुस्तानी यह नहीं कहेगा कि उसको लेकर के हिन्दुस्तान कोई बड़ी मुसीबत या संकट हुनिया के लिये पैदा करे । लेकिन एक बात जो आज प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने कही, यह मुझे कुछ अच्छी नहीं सगी । प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि हंगरी का सवाल फिर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सामने आने वाला है और अगर वहाँ पर रूस द्वारा हंगरी पर आक्रमण करने की निन्दा की गई तो हम उस निन्दा के साथ नहीं रहेंगे । मुझे अपने प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के भुल से यह शब्द सुन कर बड़ा अफ़सोस हुआ । मिस्र पर जब इंग्लैण्ड और फ्रांस ने आक्रमण किया तब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने यह फिलासफी नहीं रखी कि हम को किसी चीज़ की निन्दा नहीं करनी चाहिये लेकिन जब रूस ने हंगरी पर ठीक उसी सप्ताह में हमला किया तो हमारा रूस कुछ और था और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बात तो अब इतिहास की है कि एक ही सप्ताह के अन्दर पिछले साल ऐसे बाक़यात हुये कि जिनके बाद से हुनिया में सब का परदा फ़ास हो गया । कंजर-वेटिव इंग्लैण्ड और समाजवादी फ्रांस ने मिस्र पर आक्रमण किया और कम्युनिस्ट रूस ने हंगरी पर हमला किया, तीनों ने हमला किया और तीनों ने खुले तौर पर अपने सांसाज्जवादी इरादे हुनिया पर जाहिर कर दिये । उस ऐतिहासिक सप्ताह में हुनिया ने तीनों के झंडे मासूम छून से रंगे हुये देखे । हमारी भाँते इंग्लैण्ड और फ्रांस पर साल हो गई, लेकिन यह कहता

पड़ता है कि रूस पर हमारी भाँते साल भी हुई । मैनेन साहूव के उस समय के आखिर लोगों को याद हैं

उपाध्यक्ष अहोदय : वहाँ कामद पहले ही लाली काफ़ी थी ।

भी ज० ब० जिथ : उसके बाद जब हुनिया में हंगरी के आक्रमण को लेकर आवाज उठी और जब यह कहा जाने लगा कि हिन्दुस्तान के लिये यह योग्य नहीं हुआ कि वह एक आक्रमणकारी की तो निन्दा करे और दूसरे के बारे में चूप हो जाय तब हिन्दुस्तान की नीति कुछ बदली और आज प्रधान मंत्री बहुत बड़ी बात कहते हैं जब वे कहते हैं कि हंगरी के लोगों की जनता की जो लड़ाई थी वह राष्ट्रीयता की लड़ाई थी, आजादी की लड़ाई थी । और जांच आयोग ने वहाँ जा कर पूरी स्थिति देखी थी और उसके बाद संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को अपनी रिपोर्ट दी थी । अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे ही पूछता हूं कि एक मुक़दमा हो और वह जब जज के सामने फैसला के लिये जाय, अगर एक पक्ष कहे कि मैं उस जज के सामने नहीं जाऊंगा तो उस हालत में क्या उस जज को फैसला नहीं देना चाहिये ? वह जज फैसला देगा । अब जज के फैसले को माना जाना चाहिये और अगर एक पक्ष उसको नहीं मानेगा तो यक़ीनन वह छलती कर रहा है । पंदित जी कहते हैं कि वह फैसला भी बड़ा अच्छा है और मैं समझता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान को हंगरी के विषय में अपनी नीति के अधिकार्य को सिद्ध करने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि वह इस मामले में संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की आवाज का साथ दें, जो आवाज यह कहने जा रही है कि रूस ने हंगरी की जनता पर आक्रमण किया, वहाँ की आजादी को दबाया गया ।

फ़ास ने भी आक्रमण किया, कंजर-वेटिव इंग्लैण्ड ने भी आक्रमण किया और

[थी म० प्र० मिश्न]

इसके लिलाक दुनिया की आवाज संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उठी। उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह आक्रमण खत्म हो गया, कांस और इंस्टीण्ड हार गये और मिल बच गया और स्वेज नहर बच गई। लेकिन जब हंगरी के बारे में वहां पर आवाज उठी तो माफ कीजियेगा हिन्दुस्तान की आवाज उस समय नहीं उठी थी। दुनिया की आवाज के आगे हमने देखा कि पश्चिमी साम्राज्यवाद तो झुक गया लेकिन सोवियत साम्राज्यवाद कहिये या कम्युनिस्ट लाल साम्राज्यवाद कहिये और जो नया ताक्तवर साम्राज्यवाद है, वह उस आवाज को मुनने के लिये तैयार नहीं था। और आज भी हंगरी में विदेशी फौज रूस की फौज पड़ी हुई है और आज भी हंगरी में वही जुल्म हो रहे हैं, उससे बढ़ कर जुल्म हो रहे हैं जो कि पिछले साल हुये थे। यही फक्त है, प्रजातंत्र और तानाशाही में।

मेरे मित्र श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी बहुत झरमाते हैं कि ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद की शाकल नहीं बदली, वह आज से दस, बीस वर्ष पहले जैसा था वैसे ही आज भी है और वैसा ही आज भी सूखवार है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बात इतिहास की है, ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद की शाकल बदल गई है, पुराना साम्राज्यवाद मिट रहा है, खत्म हो रहा है लेकिन यह जो कम्युनिस्ट साम्राज्यवाद उठ रहा है इसांकि यह नया साम्राज्यवाद है लेकिन यह ज्यादा ताक्तवर और खूख्वार है। आज सोचना होगा कि दुनिया में कौन सी जीजे हैं जो आज दुनिया की शांति को ज्यादा खतरा पहुचाती है। पश्चिम का डूबता हुआ साम्राज्यवाद या पूर्व का उगता हुआ साम्राज्यवाद?

मैं कभी कभी सोचता हूं कि पहली लड़ाई के बाद और दूसरी लड़ाई के पहले

जो हालत फासिस्ट ताकतों की थी, दुनिया की शांति के मुकाबले, वही हालत दूसरी लड़ाई के पहले —भगवान न करे वह स्थिति आये— दुनियां की शांति के मुकाबले कम-बेक कम्युनिस्ट ताकतों की है। और इसलिये जो लोग बहुत चिल्लाते हैं साम्राज्यवाद, 'साम्राज्यवाद' वह जरा बतायें कि यह जो नया साम्राज्यवाद उठा है, जिस को लाल साम्राज्यवाद कहते हैं, जिस ने संगीतों के बल से हंगरी की जनता की आजादी की लड़ाई को कुचल दिया, जो पोलैंड के सामने झुका तो जरूर, लेकिन जिस की कोशिशों चल रही हैं कि गोमूल्का का राज्य खत्म हो जाये, जिस ने पूर्वी जर्मनी की आजादी छीन ली है, उस के बारे में उन का क्या विचार है। बहुत लोग आवाज उठाते हैं कि जो लोग गुलाम हैं उन की आजादी वापस मिल जाये। बहुत अच्छी बात है, हम सब को इस आवाज में आवाज मिलानी चाहिये। लेकिन, जो पूर्वी योरेप के लोग गुलाम हैं, उनकी आजादी के लिये कोई नहीं चिल्लाता। उनकी आजादी उन को उतनी ही प्यारी है, जितनी हमारी आजादी हमें प्यारी है। इस देश को, इस देश की सरकार को और सब से बढ़ कर इस लोक-सभा को पूर्वी योरेप के देशों के लोगों की आजादी के साथ अपनी सहानुभूति, अपनी हमदर्दी उसी दिलचस्पी के साथ देनी चाहिये, जिस दिलचस्पी के साथ हम ट्रूनिशिया और दूसरे देशों की आजादी के साथ अपनी सहानुभूति पेश करते हैं।

एक सवाल और है निःशस्त्रीकरण के बारे में। मैं बहुत ग्रादब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि यह ठीक है कि लड़ाई होगी या नहीं, यह कोई ज्योतिषी नहीं है जो कह सकता हो, मगर इसे मानना होगा कि आज दुनियां की जो हालत है, उस में

किसी समय लड़ाई छिड़ सकती है। आज बड़े बड़े मुल्क लड़ाई की तैयारी करें, नये नये हथियार रोज गढ़ते आये और आपस में तनाव बना रहे, तो लड़ाई के बारे में कोई नहीं कह सकता कि कब हो जाये। लड़ाई न बुद्धि के साथ लड़ी जाती है और न विवेक के साथ लड़ी जाती है, लड़ाई तभी होती है जब इन्सान अपने हाथ से छूट जाता है, अपने विवेक के हाथों से छूट कर बर्बर विचारों के हाथों में चला जाता है। इसलिये हमें लड़ाई के खिलाफ दुनिया में एक वातावरण पैदा करना चाहिये, शांति का वातावरण पैदा करना चाहिये, और जो लोग ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करते हैं वह संमारके भिन्न हैं और उसका भला चाहने वाले हैं। लेकिन आज की आवहवा में यह बात अच्छी नहीं लगती है कि जब अमरीका और इंग्लैंड तथा दूसरे स्वतंत्र प्रजातात्त्विक देश एक एंटम वम का प्रयोग करे, तब तो हम चिल्ड्राये कि बहुत बुरा हो रहा है, लेकिन चुपके चुपके रूप हर तोसरे राज ऐसे वम फोड़ा करे तो हम कुछ न बोले। यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। यह बहुत जरूरी है कि इन अणु वमों पर रोक लगाई जाये, लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ सिफं हथियारों पर रोक लगाने से ही दुनिया में शांति नहीं होगी। मैं कहता हूँ कि हथियारों पर रोक लगाने से, या फौज में बहुत कमी करने से भी दुनिया में शांति नहीं होगी। दुनिया में शांति पैदा करने के लिये एक नये वातावरण की जरूरत है। आज जो मुल्क चाहता है दुनिया में अपने आप को फैलाना, दुनिया के और और हिस्सों को अपने कब्जे में लेना, अपना प्रभाव बढ़ाना, यह ठीक नहीं है। बड़े मुल्कों की यह प्रवृत्ति खत्म होनी चाहिये। दुनिया के बड़े लोग जो शांति चाहते हैं, इन बड़े देशों से कह दे कि आप दुनिया में अपने को फैलाने की कोशिश न करें। और वह दुनियां का सचमुच दुष्मन हैं जो दुनिया में अपने को फैलाने की कोशिश

करता है। उन्होंने सदा इतिहास में शांति भंग की है और वही आज के इतिहास की शांति को भी भंग करने वाले हैं। इस लिये जरूरी है कि आईन्दा आणविक हथियारों पर रोक लगे, उसके साथ ही देशों की परम्परागत फौजी शक्ति में भी कमी की जाय।

जिन देशों ने राक्षसी सेनाये बना रखी हैं, और खास कर कम्यूनिस्ट देशों ने जो अपनी अपनी सेनाये ऐसी बना ली है, जो अगर इन आणविक हथियारों को हटा दिया जाये, तो सारे योरप पर कब्जा कर सकती है। रूम को योरप पर कब्जा करने में सिर्फ ७ दिन लगें, और चीन को सारे एशिया पर कब्जा करने में कितने दिन लगेंगे, कहा नहीं जा सकता, उन को खत्म करना बहुत जरूरी है। आज वह बहुत जरूरी है कि अगर कम्यूनिस्ट देश शांति चाहते हैं, तो अपनी राक्षसी फौजी को खत्म करें। और वैसे ही पश्चिमी राष्ट्र, इंग्लैंड, अमरीका आदि भी अपनी फौजे हटा दे। हमारे देश के लिये भी यह बहुत जरूरी है कि हम अपनी फौज के खर्चों से छूट्टी पा जायें। इस से हमारा बहुत बड़ा कल्याण होगा। आज हिन्दूस्तान अपने कुल खर्चों का आधे से ज्यादा खर्च कीजो पर करता है। आज हमारा देश बहुत गरीब है, हमारे यहा कारखाने नहीं हैं, उनका और नहरों का बनाना हमारे लिये ज्यादा जरूरी है। इसलिये दुनिया में निःस्त्रीकरण हो, इस से बड़े राज्यों का जो फायदा होगा वह तो होगा ही, उस से हम लोगों का बड़ा फायदा होगा। हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना का जो पूरा खर्च है वह संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमरीका १८ दिनों में अपनी फौजों पर करता है। इसलिये आज दुनिया में जो इतना धन पागलपन पर, वहशियाना बातों पर लगाने के लिये खर्च किया जाता है अपने को फैलाने के लिये, वह बेकार है। बड़े राष्ट्र इस को समझे और इस चीज को रोके तो संसार का बड़ा कल्याण होगा।

[श्री मंग्र० मिश्र]

मैं सिफेर एक बात और निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमारी जो वैदेशिक न ति है, मौलिक रूप से, बुनियादी तौर पर, वह सही है। नये उगते हुये राष्ट्रों के लिये, छोटे राष्ट्रों के लिये यह जरूरी नहीं है कि वे बड़ों के अगड़ों में पड़े। वे राष्ट्र अपना धर बनाये, अपने पैरों पर अपने को खड़ा करें, इसी में उनका कल्याण है। लेकिन मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि अगर पिछले दस वर्षों में नहीं तो कम भी पिछले पांच वर्षों में जिस को हम नानदन्वाल्वमेट या तटस्थिता की नीति कहते हैं, वह हमने अमल में बरती नहीं है। हम आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भाग्यों में इन्वालव हो जाते हैं। हमारे लिये हर छोटे बड़े स्वाल पर राय देना जरूरी नहीं है। हमारे अपने बड़े स्वाल हैं। देश में बनान, समाज के बनाने, गरीबी दूर करने, इन बातों पर हम ज्यादा ध्यान दे। सब बातों पर अपनी राय जाहिर करना, बोलना यह हमारी नानदन्वाल्वमेट भालिसी के अनुकूल भी नहीं है। मुझे युशा है कि यह चीज़ धौरे धौरे हमारों सरकार और हमारे नेता समझने लगे हैं। मुझे इस की भी बड़ी युशा है कि जो भाष्यम का बड़ा इजलास हुआ, उस में वैदेशिक नीति की बात ज्यादा नहीं उठी। मैं यह बात कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर नानदन्वाल्वमेट की नीति ठोक से बरतों जाये तो इस देश का अधिक कल्याण होगा और मसार का भी कुछ कल्याण होगा।

Shri Osman Ali Khan (Kurnool): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I consider it an unique privilege that I should speak on this important subject of foreign affairs, in this my maiden effort before the House.

I have ventured to speak on this subject for two reasons. Firstly because I feel rather strongly on certain aspects of our external affairs, and secondly because I consider this subject to be so very important that I feel even the internal progress of our

country does to a considerable extent depend upon our relations with other countries, and the prevailing conditions of the world.

We are now passing through a critical period in the history of mankind. Invention, the Prime evidence of man's superior power, is being prostituted to the service of competitive destruction. Our technological advancement has resulted in the production of the nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of mass destruction. Even the present stocks of these deadly weapons are enough to completely annihilate and destroy the entire mass of humanity with all its culture, its civilisation and all the good that it has so far produced.

The pulsating wave of cold war is already on, alternating between hope and despair; and is not showing any real signs of abatement. The situation is pregnant with danger and is likely to bring forth shamefully in its wake disease, death and destruction for this family of mankind.

Grim and grave as is the situation, it is for us to put all our efforts doggedly and determinedly to avert the catastrophe that threatens to overtake mankind. Man is a unique being. Great are his powers; great are his capacities and capabilities, in whatever direction he may employ them. He has achieved great success in the building up of the mighty machinery of war. He can achieve greater success in the building up of a mighty machinery for peace. But man has to strive in whatever direction he desires success. So far his attempts have mainly been to develop the method of force as compared to the method of reason for purposes of defence. As has been pointed out by an eminent statesman of our times:

"Traditionally, protection from attack has always been associated in the minds of the people with arms and armaments. Our language and literature are full of analogies drawn from war and warlike preparations. A thousand and one instances

could be cited to prove how the idea of fighting and war has become part of the everyday outlook of the normal person. The immediate reaction to the danger of aggression is the desire to build up so-called defence forces".

While our efforts in the direction of force have culminated in nuclear weapons, our efforts in the direction of peace have crystallised in the form of the United Nations Organisation. But if we compare these two opposing forces, we are sorry to find that the machinery for peace is not able to counteract the forces of destruction. It is because the magnitude of our effort in the direction of force has been times out of number far greater than what has been our effort in the direction of peace. We will have to so intensify our efforts in the direction of peace as to build up a mighty machinery that can successfully counteract the forces of destruction and always maintain an upper hand to be able to solve all the problems of the world in a peaceful manner without resort to force.

Our country has demonstrated by her own example in our struggle for freedom against the imperialist rulers that force need not and should not be conquered by the method of force, if it is to result in any real good. Our unarmed people have achieved their freedom against the then mighty British under the leadership and guidance of Mahatma Gandhi without the use of force, without resort to arms and without violence—unique in the history of the nations of the world. Even after the attainment of our freedom, our progress has been a peaceful progress in our efforts to evolve an ordered socialist society under the leadership of the political heir to the Mahatma, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

In our disputes with other countries, we have always indicated our firm resolve not to resort to force in the settlement of our disputes. The case of Goa is an instance on hand. For a foreign country to hold a small bit of this vast sub-continent under subjugation against the will of its people in the present-day world of the 20th

century, and for us to have tolerated this ugly spot on the map of our motherland these ten years of our freedom against the popular demand of our people to liberate our people there by military action, is an indication of our firm resolve not to resort to force in our disputes with other nations.

The case of Kashmir is yet another instance. Even in the face of grave provocation, we did not resort to war. Communal passions were raised. In fact, Pakistan based her case on the medieval theory that since the State is predominantly Muslim, it should be given away to Pakistan. But the 3½ crores of Muslims in this country along with their fellow countrymen are solidly behind the Government of this country. And I have the least hesitation to say that they are undoubtedly in support of the policy of our Government in its stand on Kashmir. The State of Kashmir having lawfully acceded to India and in the face of naked aggression by Pakistan, when we with our superior might could have thrown out the aggressor from our soil, we did not resort to war and we appealed to the United Nations. In fact, we accepted the cease-fire line with the aggressor on our soil. We did not want to wage war. Our Prime Minister went to the extent even to offer mutual no war declaration with the Government of Pakistan in an effort to rule out war as a means of settlement of this dispute. He did not stop at that. Our Prime Minister went to the farthest extent possible. He could have gone no further with dignity and self-respect than to have offered to discuss with the Government of Pakistan the solution of this dispute on the basis of the present cease-fire line, not because they were in the least entitled even to a bit of this land of Kishmir but because of our keen desire to settle this dispute in a peaceful manner with our neighbouring country of Pakistan. Thus we have demonstrated our faith in the United Nations Organisation which is the only hope for future of mankind.

[Shri Osman Ali Khan]

Our policy of non-alignment together with our efforts to enlarge the area of peace by adopting the principles of Panch Shila has gone a long way in checking the rising tide of tension in the world. It is most regrettable that our neighbouring country of Pakistan instead of helping to enlarge the area of peace has brought the cold war to our very doors. It may be no imagination to hope that the people of Pakistan will realise and will elect such a government in the ensuing elections that will not keep war off its shores but will help the cause of world peace.

Our foreign policy, I have the least hesitation to say, is the most correct and best suited to the present day needs of mankind. However, I have a few suggestions to make which the Ministry of External Affairs may devote its thought to while reviewing its policy from time to time.

Firstly, I would like to say that in keeping with our policy of promoting world peace, it is essential that the people in this country and elsewhere should realise the importance of working for peace. Of course, no reasonable human being believes in the desirability of war, but millions there are who believe in its inevitability. If once you can make the world mind appreciate that evolution may be gained without resort to war, we have accomplished the first great step in the direction of world peace. However noble our goal or correct the policy of our leadership, since the real strength lies in the people, it is very necessary that the Ministry of External Affairs should educate our people in this direction.

Secondly, I would like to point out the great magnitude of effort that is employed for the purposes of Defence. The three commands, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force are equipped with the most modern of weapons. The best human material is employed; persons devote the best part of their lives for this task and the best of training is given to these men for

a number of years. Thus an enormous effort is put in terms of men, money and research. Comparatively what is the effort of any country to develop the alternate method of reason? Practically negligible. So, how can we expect to replace this highly developed method of war with the hardly developed method of peace or reason. It is not possible. We will have to intensify our efforts and develop this science of reason... Apart from the efforts of the countries individually, the United Nations Organisation should undertake this task. The causes for dispute between nations have to be investigated and solutions found. Methods to eliminate suspicion and fear between nations have to be devised. Ways and means of promoting harmony between nations have to be determined. Better methods of conciliation, negotiation and arbitration and world judiciary have to be developed. Several such steps have to be taken. The best of our men have to be trained in the techniques of peace. The more we dig into it, the more we gain and success is certain. So, we have to develop our science of reasons as an alternative to war.

Lastly, I would like to point out that it is very necessary to view things from the world angle. Even the internal progress of our country does to a considerable extent depend upon our relations with other countries and the prevailing conditions in the world. The world has shrunk small. Our Prime Minister says: "We talk of the East and the West, the Orient and the Occident. Yet these divisions have no reality. The world has become too small for such divisions." So, it is but proper to view all our problems from the world angle. The world, today, has enough generals and men of the militia but it is in dire need of the architects for peace. Great as is the need, few are these architects. Our country can legitimately be proud that we have in our Prime Minister the great architect of peace, acknowledged all over the world as such. The world, humanity looks to our Prime Minister for service in its cause. But, I am

sorry to find that so much of his time and attention is being utilized by problems at home. It is a great injustice to him and to humanity. In the interests of humanity he should be spared and his worthy colleagues should undertake the task.

Our country has produced yet another genious, popular all over the world as the right hand man of our Prime Minister. He is Shri Menon. A great diplomat, a born negotiator and man of peace as he is, his services are indispensable for the good of mankind, now more than ever before.

May the vision of man enlarge to comprehend the picture of the world. May the reason of man reign supreme. May the cause for peace triumph ever and ever over the forces of destruction.

Shri V. Raju (Visakhapatnam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it was with attention that I listened to the Prime Minister's exposition of the foreign policy of our country and also the various proposals and policies which the Government of India is pursuing. I feel that the Prime Minister has not been very definite or firm regarding national policy on the Kashmir issue. I know the delicacy and the difficulty that we are going through in this context and I would like to have had a firm formulation of policy by our present Government.

The Jarring Report has merely stated that conditions have changed because of the cold war. I therefore take it that if conditions revert back to normal, the plebiscite may be held. This view, we are given to understand, is basically acceptable to the Government of India. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what he understands by 'normal'. Is it the dropping of the foreign military aid to Pakistan? I agree, we must normalise relations with Pakistan, if necessary by a fresh approach, a direct approach. We must, however, make it clear that in the matter of Kashmir the question of its special status shall not be questioned. But, before you

can do this the internal stability of Kashmir must be ensured and you must categorically withdraw the commitment for a plebiscite, which causes to maintain communal tension in Jammu and Kashmir. Further, civil liberty and normalcy must be ushered into Kashmir.

I would like to ask what the Government proposes to do regarding the formulation that I have now placed before this House. In our relationship on the Kashmir issue, and in so far as much water has flowed under the bridge since the last ten years both in international conferences and also in the statements in our own Lok Sabha by the Prime Minister and in speeches made by the Prime Minister outside this House, an impression has been created that in all matters the handling of Kashmir has been to the best advantage of our country. When I use the expression "best advantage" I do not merely want it to be understood that we have been able to stop aggression by the tribesmen in Kashmir. A private army, or an army of hill-men or a sort of a rebel army entered Kashmir and tried to disrupt the peace of that area. We did right in entering Kashmir and stopping the advance of this disorganised force, and reintroducing peace in Kashmir. But, subsequent on that event a certain definite policy has been developed in Kashmir, which today must be clarified before the people of India.

What exactly is that policy? Is Kashmir a part of India, or is it not? That would be one of the questions that needs answering. If it is part of India, then the separate status and position of Kashmir in terms of administration must be clarified here and now, I feel, because we know that foreign affairs, defence and communications are subjects which Kashmir has surrendered to this Parliament. But, what about other questions? What about the question of civil liberties in Kashmir? What about the question of internal administration in Kashmir? Is it the right of this Parliament to go into such issues or not?

[Shri V. Raju]

These must needs to be answered, because, when we state that Kashmir is part of us, I for one would like it to be understood that not merely do we defend Kashmir against any aggressor, not merely do we pay the very great price of arming our country to defend Kashmir in a war of aggression, but we must have the right of feeling that the internal administration of Kashmir is democratic, is being run with the same ideals, with the same motivations that run the Indian democracy. And, here, I am afraid that conditions in Kashmir internally are not as happy as I would like them to be.

Apart from the fact that we have our own problem with Pakistan, I cannot understand why normalcy has not been introduced into Kashmir territory. Why is an individual still —he, Mr. Sheikh Abdullah may have been the Prime Minister of Kashmir, whatever his antecedents may be—kept in detention without trial? Adequate reason must be given why he is kept in prison without trial. Is this civil liberty? If it is embarrassing to the Government of Kashmir to finalise the affairs I would ask, in view of the fact that we are one people, one nation and Kashmir is part of us, let Mr. Sheikh Abdullah be brought, if necessary, to any part in India and given a fair public trial. What constitutes the essential disagreement between him and the present Government of Kashmir? Such an act by this Government would not in any way endanger the position of Kashmir, would not in any way create a situation wherein our enemies may take advantage of such an act.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Kakinada-Reserved—Sch. Castes): Who is the enemy?

Shri V. Raju: Whoever it happens to be. When I say 'our enemies' as far as Kashmir is concerned, the hon. Member knows that we have in the Kashmir issue our differences with our neighbouring country. If he does not like my using the word 'enemies' as far as Kashmir itself is concerned,

I would say 'our neighbouring country', with which we have at the moment a live disagreement, would not in any way be able to take advantage of this.

The first essence is that the people of Kashmir must feel that not merely do they feel happier to live with us, but that in all matters they obtain the freedom that we give to our own people. Once normalcy is brought into Kashmir, I feel that certain tensions will no longer be there. I have understood that it is the policy of the Government still to think in terms of plebiscite. I do not support this view. So long as we continue to accept plebiscite, we have to accept the fact that there are in this sub-continent two separate racial entities, two separate people belonging to not merely separate religions but of ethnic origin, and as such neither one can live with the other in permanent peace. Therefore, the first thing to remove this illusion is to completely State categorically that the people of the sub-continent are one. We have to accept that all doctrines or all concepts which would allow for the two nation theory to remain in operation must be forthwith given up by us and, to that extent, if the Government of India categorically states that we do not accept the commitment of plebiscite, I do not think we would be making a mistake. On the other hand, we would be consolidating the position of a very large and essential minority which continues within our own country and who are part of our own countrymen, and there is still—

15 hrs.

Shri B. S. Murthy: How can acceptance of plebiscite be construed as giving a fillip to ethnic and racial considerations?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will tell us.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I am asking for clarification.

Shri V. Raju: Therefore, I have made the following formulation, namely, before you can do this, that is, withdraw from plebiscite, the internal stability of Kashmir must be ensured and you must categorically withdraw the commitment of plebiscite which causes to maintain communal tension in Jammu and Kashmir, and agree to a new approach to Pakistan, so long as the question of Kashmir and the question of its special status is not questioned. If the position of Kashmir is not questioned alone, should I expect that we could make a new approach to Pakistan? This is the formulation I have made. I feel that that normal approach can be made only if we withdraw our terms of agreement on the plebiscite.

So far as the problems in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world are concerned, I find that the Government of India has been expressing policies which, on the face of them, are valid and ideologically sound. But if *Panchsheel* is to be effective, what I suggest is this. If the Government of India uses the basis of *Panchsheel*, it should be more effective. It has been using the basis of *Panchsheel* with our neighbour China, and in a mutual agreement on the 22nd June, I think, last year, when the Russian leaders were here, a re-statement of *Panchsheel* was made. And these neighbours have accepted the concomitance of the five points in the programme and policy, namely, mutual respect for each other's integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence. A further clarification was made to point 3—non-interference in each other's internal affairs—when interference was defined as 'no country should interfere in the economic political or ideological character of the Governments concerned'. We have had this *Panchsheel* agreement signed with our neighbour China and also with the Russian leaders. However, it is a matter of regret that the western powers with special reference

to—I do not like to use the word middle east; it is western Asia or only western neighbours—the western neighbours do not seem to accept the commitment of non-interference in the internal, economic and political structure of the countries of western Asia. I believe that our protest has not been strong enough or adequate on this score.

Here, some agreements which the Prime Minister has arrived at, seem to have negatived the position. On the 19th July last year, at Brioni, when the leaders of Egypt, Yugoslavia and our Prime Minister met, this is what article 11 of that agreement said:

"In the middle east, conflicting interests of the big powers have added to the difficulty of the situation. The problems should be considered on their merits, safeguarding the legitimate economic interests, but basing solutions on the freedoms of the people concerned".

I do not know how we are able to reconcile these two positions, safeguarding the legitimate economic interests of the big powers and, at the same time, guaranteeing the solution the people concerned. Because, so far as the countries of Egypt, Lebanon, Transjordan, Saudi Arabia, Syria and the two little countries which have come in the news of late—Muscat and Oman—and all these Sheikdoms are concerned, and as far as guaranteeing their prosperity and the future of those people are concerned, we have to be clear in our mind as to what their historical origin is and who represent the people in those areas. I am sure hon. Members are aware that most of these kingdoms have been carved out after 1920 or thereabouts, when, after the first World War, Turkey's suzerainty in this area came to an end. At that time, it was expected that this whole area, the Arab peninsula, would constitute one nation, but, unfortunately, the great imperialist of this age, the United Kingdom, carved out a number

[Shri V. Raju]

of smaller territories in that area, placed emperors and kings on the thrones of those little kingdoms whether they happened to be Trans-jordan or Iraq or even Iran—I think the present Shah's father was placed on the throne of Iran then. The subsequent history of these areas during the last 25 to 30 years has been one of conflict between these autocratic regimes, one against another, especially in so far as the bartering of legitimate mineral interests are concerned—the oil interests—with the foreign American and British companies. Therefore, when we use the word 'people' in respect of these territories, I do not know if we mean individual kings or sheikhs in those areas or we mean genuinely, the people there who should have democratic representation and expression. In this direction, I would say that India's role in that area, if it is to have historical validity, must support not merely national demands but also people's demands. I want it to be clearly understood that there is difference between a national demand and people's demand, because a Sheikh or King also represents national interests. It is not my interpretation of genuine interests. The distinction has to be made between national demands and people's demands. India's role as peace-maker in the Near West—I use the term Near West—must be positive and not negative. It must not merely maintain good relations with Egypt. I repeat, it must not merely maintain good relations with Egypt, but it must help in the creation of democracy in the near western region and freedom from foreign exploitation.

We must sympathetically view the Syrian experiment. In the Near West, the power vacuum must not be filled either by America or by Russia, either by capitalism or by socialism, but by democratic and socialist forms of Government evolving out of the revolutionary potential that has been created. Here I am very serious. I think the House is aware that after

the overthrow of the feudal regime in Egypt, after that event, the people of the Near West are rising up. Under Col. Nasser's leadership, Egypt is now for the first time, after a few hundreds of years, expressing the viewpoint of the common man. I know it is difficult to estimate the repercussions of the Suez Canal crisis. We are closely involved in that crisis in so far as the Suez Canal happens to be our life-line. Our Five Year Plan is dependent upon the free access of ships, so that vital goods may be brought to our shores.

It must not be forgotten that the imperialist powers attacked Egypt and the effect of that action on the whole of the Middle-East or Near West has been in ferment. The people there are aware of what is happening. Here it is unfortunate that reactionary forces to some extent and also America and Great Britain have not accepted the concomitant of non-interference in the internal affairs of nations. The whole Eisenhower doctrine to some extent is suspected. Why should the power vacuum of that area be filled by American dollars? As I have pointed out, the choice for the people there is not communism or capitalism. The choice of the people must be democracy and socialism. It must be the expression of the common man. Here I believe that our policy should be categorical. We should state our displeasure in no uncertain terms that any doctrine which believes that it should enter into an area and dominate that area politically, ideologically and economically, merely because a rival theoretic concept today exists in the world and tries to catch the imagination of the masses. This would be very necessary, if we are to be effective in this area.

The Prime Minister has raised many other issues in this House. I would like here to state that as far as disarmament is concerned, this House, speaking for myself, would appreciate any move or all moves that go

towards lessening the arms race. It is meaningless for us to try to place the guilt either on America or on Russia or more so, at the foot of science. All the same, I should like the policy of the Government of India to be categorical and should condemn all pacts which allow for the stationing of foreign troops in another country. That condemnation should be there both in reference to the NATO pact and the Warsaw pact. It is only when we are prepared to make such a condemnation actively that I believe that the tensions that are being built up on our own borders would lessen.

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): Mr. Mukerjee, while expressing his general agreement with the foreign policy followed by the Government, was rather critical in respect of two matters, namely, our continuance in the Commonwealth and our relations with Goa. Our continuance in the Commonwealth is to our advantage. According to him, India should have cut off its ties in the Commonwealth because Britain invaded Egypt without previous intimation to India. India did not keep quiet. India raised it in the United Nations and we uphold the sovereignty of Egypt, and ultimately, we were responsible for the cessation of hostilities in the Suez area. Ultimately Britain lost her stand. The prestige of Britain went down and the prestige of India shot up. So, I see no reason why our continuance in the Commonwealth is to the detriment of the country. I think the Government of India policy, the policy followed by the Prime Minister, in this regard is certainly the right one.

In respect of Goa, he means to say that our Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon, should not have appealed to the several powers—America, Britain and France—to ask Portugal to leave Goa. He means to say that we should have occupied Goa by militarism. How can we follow a policy of aggression? Our policy has been one of non-aggression. Our policy has been embodied in article 51 of our Constitution. It is one of

maintaining "just and honourable relations between nations" and maintaining international peace and security. We cannot view the Goa problem as an isolated problem. Using force and taking Goa does not take a long time. But what about the repercussions? It will involve us in a world war. The policy followed by the Government is certainly a right policy and it is not correct for Mr. Mukerjee to say that the Goa problem could have been resolved in another way.

Our foreign policy is one of non-alignment with power blocs and one of non-aggression. It has gained the appreciation of the whole world. India today occupies a pride of place in the comity of nations. We are a member of the United Nations and we are wedded to the principle of international law and peace. We have been responsible for resolving world conflicts in the last ten years. All these we could achieve by sheer reason and, persuasion. Our voice is heard all over the world and our voice is one of reason, justice, human freedom and human rights.

Regarding military pacts, the hon. Prime Minister has been condemning them in unequivocal terms. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter is being availed of by these States. NATO came into existence by virtue of article 51. As an answer to that came the Warsaw Pact; then came the SEATO and Baghdad Pacts, so much so there is mutual distrust and suspicion. The cold war has spread. What is the remedy? As suggested by our Prime Minister more often, it is a policy of peaceful co-existence. That is the only alternative remedy. It is only when the States realise that international security is a universal problem that the United Nations will succeed. Unless this realisation penetrates most of the foreign offices of the world, I am afraid the United Nations will go the way of its predecessor, the League of Nations.

Sir, I find now the need for a revision of the United Nations Charter. Article 51 is the source of all the

[Shri Jagannatha Rao]

mischief. Unless this Charter is revised in a proper form, I am afraid this state of affairs will continue.

Sir, our Prime Minister has been criticising the Eisenhower Doctrine of a "vacuum". What right has America to fill in this vacuum, as he calls it, in the Middle-East? This vacuum is occupied by millions of people. They have their own Government; they are fighting for their own freedom from foreign aggression. What right has America or for the matter of that any other country, to fill in this so-called vacuum in another country? The solution would be to follow the policy of India, one of non-interference and also of peaceful co-existence

Our Prime Minister was the first person to condemn the nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and explosions. Today America and Russia are playing the game of chess with these missiles as pawns. America has produced a long-range missile; Russia has produced inter-continental ballistic missile. Where is the end to this race? If the two countries go on in this way I am afraid the world will come to an end.

Sir, on the whole, the policy that has been followed by our Government right from the day of independence in 1947 to this day has been the correct policy, which has been acclaimed as such by several countries of the world. It is no good for our hon friends in the Opposition saying that our Government should follow a different policy. One hon Member, Mr Hem Barua, has criticised the part played by our Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon in the United Nations. I would only request him to go through the records of the last ten years and see what part he has played. He is a brilliant statesman, with wisdom and farsight and I am surprised the hon. Member has got the temerity to question the correctness and appropriateness of his policy.

I support the policy followed by Government, to which effect I have moved an amendment. I commend my amendment to the House.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have got two or three suggestions to make.

The Prime Ministers of India, China and Russia should meet....

An Hon. Member: And sign a military pact!

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Nobody knows more than the Prime Minister the gravity of the international situation, and especially the danger which confronts this country. He has said this morning about the enormous quantities of arms that America, our friend, has given to Pakistan, which is plotting day and night to loot and devastate us. I do not know how the freedom, independence and territorial integrity of this country can be secured without our entering into an alliance with China and Russia. We seem to have become allergic to military pacts in an age—in a world of nation States. We do not seem to realise the concomitants of the age. I suggest to the Prime Minister that a strict watch should be kept on the activities of all foreigners in this country.

In view of what has successfully been done in Jordan and what was attempted to be done in Syria, I have to make these humble suggestions. Our political thinking regarding Pakistan is based on three assumptions: No. 1: Pakistan is a satellite State of America; No. 2. America does not want Pakistan to invade this country; and No. 3: there is an imminent danger of invasion of India by Pakistan. These three assumptions do not go together. If Pakistan is a satellite State of America, then it cannot wage war against her wishes. If there is an imminent danger of invasion, then something is wrong with our political calculations.

If America does not want war and still Pakistan wants to invade India,

then Pakistan is not a satellite State of America. I maintain, Sir, that I draw this conclusion—Military alliance does not lead to subservience. We will have to revise our notions about the Baghdad Pact.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There will be greater force in his argument, if the hon. Member were to stand erect.

An Hon. Member: The hon. Member's notes are flying; let him pick them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not dignified that the hon. Member should be speaking while he is walking.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:But if we maintain that Pakistan is a satellite State and Pakistan wants to invade India the logic of the argument drives one to the conclusion that America wants Pakistan to invade India. Thirdly, there is no need for wasting money over defence if both the first and the second assumptions are correct, for then there can never be any war. Let us then sleep eternally in peace

I suggest that the Government of India should make an offer of a federal union to both China and Russia, and also an offer of a military alliance to China and Russia, and Egypt and Syria as well. When I speak for a federal union or a military alliance with China, my eye is on South East Asia. When I plead for a federal union or a military alliance with Russia, my eye is on the Middle East. A foreign policy of non-alignment does not take into account South East Asia and the Middle East. India cannot survive as an independent unit if South East Asia goes down under Chinese or American rule, and if the Middle East goes down under Russia or America. We are not outside the range of firing.

I suggest that the Government of India should purchase arms from the Soviet Union. But I have always added a rider that before doing so we should enter into a military alliance with China and Russia. No danger

will accrue to this country if we purchase arms from the Soviet Union after we have entered into a military alliance. I venture to maintain, Sir, that alliance or no alliance with Russia, America cannot win in a limited war in Western Asia. When I suggest that we should enter into a military alliance with China and Russia, it is with a view to preventing Pakistan from invading this country. I want Pakistan to exist as a sovereign State. But I am certain, whether there is any alliance or not, if Pakistan invades this country, Russia will attack and liquidate Pakistan in her own interest. Because, the Baghdad Pact constitutes a threat to the Soviet Union, and a conflict between India and Pakistan will provide a golden opportunity to the Soviet Union to finish this menace.

I want Pakistan to exist as a sovereign independent State, because I am afraid that with the liquidation of Pakistan the whole of the Middle East from Rawalpindi to Constantinople will pass under the Russian orbit of influence. Therefore I want Pakistan to exist as a sovereign independent unit. I do not want the vacuum in the Middle East to be filled by Russia or America. It cannot be filled by the countries of the Middle East themselves. It can only be filled on the basis of a federal union, because Russia will never permit the countries of the Middle East to be integrated. The power position of Russia is such that it can prevent any development from happening in the Middle East which runs counter to her interests. We are also interested likewise in the Middle East, and our interest lies in the maintenance of the freedom and territorial integrity of the countries of South East Asia and the Middle East. Without collaboration with Russia the vacuum in the Middle East cannot be filled. We cannot fight against Russia; and no nation in Western Asia or Middle East or Africa or Europe is in a position to fight and wage a successful war against the Soviet Union. We must be realistic. I am not enamoured

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

of the Soviet Union or China, but I am enamoured of freedom and peace.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is that all?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There should not be such long intervals.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am opposed to the Baghdad Pact. I am not opposed to the Baghdad Pact just because it is a military alliance—for I myself plead for a military alliance with China and Russia. I am against the Baghdad Pact because it constitutes a threat to this country. I am against it because of the presence of an interloper, that is America. The presence of America prevents the political integration of Asia, both in South East Asia and the Middle East. I am also opposed to the Baghdad Pact on the ground that the presence of America will lead to war. Firstly I am opposed to it because the presence of America prevents the political integration of Asia, and secondly because there will be a war if the Baghdad Pact is allowed to continue for some time more.

There is one thing which strikes me, and I think that Members of this House must have also thought over this aspect, namely, why is it that there is always trouble in the Old World, why the danger of war always arises in the Old World and not in the New World? Why is the New World singularly free from all political unrest and turmoil of a nature which may threaten the peace of that Continent? Of course, minor palace revolutions and coups de état always happen there, but there is no danger of war. There are two reasons why this is so. America succeeded in establishing her hegemony over the New World. That was called the Monroe Doctrine. The success of this venture was mainly due to two factors. There was no power strong enough in the New World to challenge the position of the United States of America. And secondly the powers of the Old World were quarrelling among

themselves and did not pay sufficient attention to what was happening in the New World. The position in the Old World is different. Since the last fifty years America has been intervening in the affairs of the Old World. Whenever any nation of Western Europe tried to integrate Europe, they have intervened and prevented the political integration of the Old World. Both during the time of the First World War and the Second World War the Americans came and prevented Germany from integrating Europe. Unless the Old World is integrated there will never be any peace. It is not by resorting to any stock-exchange diplomacy that peace can be maintained in the Old World. The condition precedent to the political integration of the world is the political integration of the old world, and the condition precedent to the integration of the Old World is the political integration of Europe, and the condition precedent to the integration of Europe is the integration of the Middle East, and the condition precedent to the integration of the Middle East is the integration of South East Asia.

I have said many a time on the floor of the House that the depth of the political vacuum in South East Asia is greater than the depth of the political vacuum in the Middle East. America and Russia face each other in Europe. In Europe the power position of Russia is strong, but not strong enough to liquidate America. I now come to the Middle East. Here again, America and Russia face each other, and here again the power position of Russia is superior and stronger, but not strong enough to liquidate America. Therefore, there is a deadlock both in Europe and in the Middle East. Now I come to South East Asia. Here, China confronts America—China which is no match to America. Here the danger of American hegemony is greater. This is the first sense in which I say that the vacuum in South East Asia is deeper.

Now I come to the second reason why I say that the vacuum in South

East Asia is greater than in the Middle East or Europe. There is a danger of a political settlement between Russia and America. If a political settlement is arrived at over our heads, over China and India, ignoring our interests, jeopardising our interests, the Russians will allow the Americans to establish their hegemony over South East Asia. The price that America will pay will be to facilitate the establishment of Russian hegemony in the Middle East. If India and China come together on the basis of a federal union or a military alliance, no power on earth can fill the vacuum in South East Asia. If India and China fill the vacuum, no doors will be left open to Russia to impose itself on India.

There are two alternatives left to the Russians, either to join hands with the Americans or with the Asian people. We must liquidate the first alternative, so that Russia can be compelled to live in peace with the peoples of Asia. The solution to all the problems of International politics lies in the hands of India and China. If India and China come together, India and Russia will have to come together.

Russia is not in a position to integrate Europe because of the danger of attack from two sides, Asia as well as Europe. The Americans are in a position to attack Russia from two sides, but if India, China and Russia join together, they would not attack. The Americans cannot invade Russia. We must stand solidly behind Russia and help Russia to integrate Europe. Unless Europe is integrated, there will never be peace. The road to Rome, Berlin, Paris and London lies via Moscow, Peking and New Delhi.

Shri Vajnik (Ahmedabad): As I listened to our Prime Minister I felt, as most Members in the House felt, that the direction of the foreign policy that he has been enunciating and following is fundamentally sound, but great differences crop up as to the

tempo and the method by which the policy is to be implemented.

I want first to take the question of our nearest neighbours, Pakistan and Goa. In the matter of Goa there is very serious discontent all over the country, and particularly in Bombay State, because Diu, Daman and Goa, the so-called Portuguese possessions, are on our borders. We have skirmishes, we have firings, and there are casualties sometimes, and people feel that after a lot of tempo was generated by speeches from the High Command, nothing more is being done in the matter, and we are still being solaced and comforted with high-sounding phrases and sentences while we see no end to our troubles, no end to the troubles of our brothers and sisters in Goa, Diu and Daman.

In the matter of Kashmir I am sorry to find a sort of hush-hush policy being followed even in this House. As a new comer I am rather surprised to see that hardly any questions or hardly any resolutions, private or governmental, are being brought before the House in the matter of Kashmir when today we have to discuss Kashmir in relation to the questions and conflicts with Pakistan.

We are four square with Government in feeling and asserting that Kashmir is and shall remain a part of India. But at the same time, here again, we have not only to look to the international aspect, but also to the internal aspect. I was thankful to see my friend Shri Raju opening the lid a little bit and referring, however lightly, to the internal administration of Kashmir, because everything that happens in Kashmir is related to our conflict with Pakistan, and the murmurs, the worries, the troubles, the complaints, the oppression or suppression of persons of individuals, incarcerations and detentions not only come here but go across the oceans to the United Nations and they are the object of great propaganda against us.

[Shri Yajnik]

We want normalcy all over. We want that our relations with Pakistan should be brought to normalcy let us bring the conditions in Kashmir also to normalcy. Let alone old past events. Let us concentrate on the present moment. We were all glad that, though we were told that the rumblings of the international storm may affect the time-table for our elections, our elections did go through. At the same time, the Constituent Assembly in Kashmir also sealed its union with India. It was a matter of rejoicing. But having done that, shall we not proceed further? What is the position constitutionally today? Article 370 of our Constitution says that only article 1 and article 370 shall apply to Kashmir.

What did Kashmir accede to? What is the meaning of the accession of Kashmir to India? Certainly it is accession of a government to another government; but it is also the accession of the people of Kashmir to the Constitution of India. And what does the Constitution mean? The Constitution means so many hundreds of articles, out of which only two are applied today. The Constitution envisages the Government of India in three agencies, the executive, the Central Government, this Parliament and the Supreme Court. What are their privileges and powers with regard to Kashmir? We have been told in article 370 that India shall concern itself only with the subjects mentioned in the Instrument of Accession, Communications, Defence and Foreign Policy, and the rest may be laid down by the President in his Orders. The President has issued his Order of 1954, and that Order while applying article 19 and conferring all the seven freedoms that are conferred on the citizens of India also on the citizens of Kashmir, has by adding subsection (7) to article 19 dealing with the freedoms, drastically curtailed the right of the Supreme Court in dealing with complaints regarding infringement of civil liberties in the matter of

the citizens of Kashmir. That provision says:

"The words 'reasonable restrictions' occurring in clauses (2), (3), (4) and (5) shall be construed as meaning such restrictions as the appropriate Legislature deems reasonable".

The word 'reasonable' is justiciable in the context of the citizens of India, but this word 'reasonable' has only to be construed in Kashmir exactly as the Legislature has laid it down, with the result that our Supreme Court, which is the sentinel and the custodian of our liberties, can do nothing in the matter of the citizens of Kashmir.

My submission, therefore, is that if these civil liberties of the people of Kashmir are to be guaranteed, and conditions in that State brought to normal, it is necessary that the whole Constitution, subject to such provisos or exceptions that might be necessary, the whole Constitution, especially the articles dealing with civil liberties, should be applied to Kashmir so that afterwards there may be no complaint about the arrest of a person or suppression of a newspaper, because whether it happens in India, in any other State of India or in Kashmir, everything can go up to the Supreme Court and everybody has confidence in the integrity of the Supreme Court, and when the Supreme Court is seized of any matter and can decide on these issues, then the reasonable grounds in respect of civil liberties in Kashmir, as in the whole of the rest of India, will remain inviolate.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): On a point of order. The hon. Member is discussing the question of the citizenship of the people of Kashmir. We are discussing foreign affairs. I would like to know whether the internal question of the citizens of India is relevant to this discussion.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): That is home affairs.

Shri Yajnik: We are proud of the accession of Kashmir to India. What

does this accession mean? The accession of the people and Government of Kashmir to the people, Government and Constitution of India. And if it is to be made a reality and not merely ending in a phrase, it is necessary that the Supreme Court, like this Parliament, like the Government of India, should have undisputed sway over the people and Government of Kashmir and should also guarantee the same freedom, the same liberty of the citizen that is available to the people of India to the people of Kashmir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is correct, but the only doubt that has been expressed is whether this internal question has anything to do with external affairs which we are discussing.

Shri Yajnik: As I said before, these complaints about the curtailment of civil liberties in Kashmir do not remain merely the property of the people of India. They have wings and they go to the U.N.O. and become the subject of serious complaints and propaganda against us. Therefore, first and foremost everything that happens in Kashmir relates to foreign policy because it is taken over to U.N.O. and becomes an instrument of mud-slinging against us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That would be far-fetched, and the hon. Member may not find time to deal with external affairs.

Shri Yajnik: Secondly, our Prime Minister told us that we could not, and we would not vie with Pakistan in military equipment. We will not run a military race with them. Then we must depend on the unswerving loyalty, regard, friendship and contentment of the people of Kashmir. We should have real moral, political and psychological rearmament of the people of Kashmir if it is to serve as a buttress of their own freedom and also of the freedom of India. That is with regard to this point, and I hope that our Prime Minister, who is going to Kashmir in the next few days, will make thorough inquiries into the mat-

ter and see for himself how he can bring back normalcy to that distressed area.

There are two other problems which have also been discussed from a wide international angle. While agreeing with most of our friends about banning or suspending the tests of A and H bombs and while desiring to destroy them altogether, my feeling is that we would do best at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the U.N.O. to be held this month to follow the broad lead that we have ourselves given and that has recently been reinforced by the conference that met at Tokyo against A and H bombs. That conference cannot be said to have been the instrument of any particular bloc. We all know that that conference in Tokyo had the backing of its own Government and nobody out of bedlam will dream of Japan being a satellite of the Soviet or Chinese Government. There were American delegations there; there were delegations from Asiatic, European and African countries. That conference was greeted and blessed by messages from many Parliaments and Governments. Our Vice-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, also sent a message of greetings. That conference has restated in the clearest terms the demand of the millions and millions of the world for an immediate and absolute cessation of all tests of all nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. I think that would also include all tests of the bellicose ballistic weapons which are called the ultimate weapons.

Now, we will be perfectly on safe-ground. The matter is coming up and I have no doubt that our Government, with the Resolution that we have already adopted in this very House, will do its very best to see that this Resolution is implemented in the General Assembly of the U.N.O. What I am most concerned with is that these A and H bombs do not necessarily spell danger, disaster and death merely for those who are direct objects of these A and H bombs. Today the world is getting smaller every-

[Shri Yajnik]

day and if there is an experiment at one end of the world, we are affected at the other end. Our Prime Minister told us this morning that the proportion of radio-active material has risen, however slightly, but it has risen, even on our shores, though it has not reached the proportion of the danger point. But who knows when it will rise to that level and before it rises to that danger level, it is quite possible that some bad effects might be experienced. Therefore, I say, it is not merely for purposes of the world, but also for our own health, for our own happiness, for our own salvation, we want a complete nuclear ban, not only to place a ban on the tests but ultimately on the production of all these A and H bombs and I hope our Government and its delegation will follow a vigorous policy in the matter.

46 hrs.

In the matter of the Middle East, and West Asia and Eastern Asia, the Far East as it is called, there is only one big point that I want to make. We do not want to dabble into other people's affairs. But, what is the reality of the situation? The fact is that for many years past, especially after the last peace or the last War, Russia and China have been sought to be encircled by the Western Powers. It is not for me to speak about it. You see lots of American magazines and you see the whole chain of bases with which they want to ring round China and Russia. If the British and American Governments and their propaganda machines are attacking the foreign policy of India, it is largely because we have not become their yes-men. We have chosen and we have dared to follow an independent policy. We are not a link in their chain anyhow and that is why they are up in arms against us and want to embarrass us in many ways. They oppose us in the U.N.O.; they oppose us sometimes on the Kashmir issue. They do not want to make it easy for us and they want to make it as difficult as possible in many respects.

There was this old idea of ringing the Soviet Union and Russia with their bases. Now, this is being taken further. And whatever happens to Russia and China today, we are being encircled and who will say no to it? Look at the map of the world; look at what passes all round us from one end to the other, from Japan to Africa; almost everywhere, you see these bases. Japan remains a base in spite of the Conference resolution protesting against the American bases in that country. So also Formosa, I think, South Indo-China, South Korea, Philippines Indonesia is not, but then a part of Indonesia today is being sought to be made a base and where it is a base it is also a base for atomic and strategic weapons. Then, you see Honkong, and Singapore. Ceylon has, probably, escaped from its nets for the moment. That is very good.

Remember that Diu, Daman and Goa are not merely Diu, Daman and Goa. They are not merely Portuguese. They represent the bases of these western powers who want to create a ring of bases round the other countries and round Asia now and our own country, and then take it up with other bases that are sought to be created now in Iran, Oman and Muscat.

Last year there was trouble with Jordan; last year Amman, now Oman. There was trouble in Egypt and Egypt has come out unscathed from this trouble, not altogether unscathed. Then Turkey. Turkey is a big base. You never know when they have strategic or atomic weapons. Remember, therefore, that it is no question of big theories. It is no question of fighting imperialism in the abstract. We have to fight a concrete situation in which we are being encircled from all sides.

What are we today? Do we want to give in? Do we want to adopt our foreign policy in obedience to the dictates of the big powers or do we want

to raise our head as high as we have done and remain independent in our foreign policy? If we want to maintain our high stand, spiritually, morally and culturally in this world, as we have done up till now, it is necessary to be exceedingly cautious about these latest developments, in Oman and Singapore. If we have to speak about Oman, if we have to make a very emphatic protest, it is not because morally we want to be shouting aloud, but we must have a long range view. There is Aden; there are the old bases in Iran, Persia. Iran is also having a base and we draw our oil from that place. In all this context, it must be understood that if we have to fight against the British seizure of Oman or their aggression in Yemen, it is not with a view to fight our old imperialistic enemy, Britain. But it is largely with a view to save ourselves and to save the integrity and freedom of the Asiatic and the African people.

In that sense, I think, it is very necessary that our policy in this matter of Oman or Syria should be positive. I do not say it should be loud all the time but it should be positive and must be firmly and perseveringly followed and here is an opportunity at the U.N.O. At the U.N.O. meeting our Delegation will go. The Imam of Oman has sent out an SOS to all the Bandung Powers and we were in the Bandung Conference. We are associated with the Bandung Resolution and decisions and it is up to us, therefore, to respond to that appeal, to join with our friends of Asia and Africa, join them in a very vigorous protests against the further incursion of Britain into this Arab land and against the massacre of innocent people whose townships have been demolished.

Syria may be a small dot on the map but Syria is a link in their chain. It can also be a link in the chain of freedom as it can be in the chain of slavery. And, therefore, I say that even Oman today or Syria tomorrow, are symbolic of the freedom of our Asiatic people. Though small coun-

tries, they are symbols today of the freedom of the whole of Asia and the whole of Africa, in fact, of all the peoples of the world. I desire and I submit that our Delegation should immediately confer if we have not already conferred with all the Asiatic and African friends in the U.N.O. and carry out a vigorous policy which would compel these western powers to halt, to look and to retrace their steps so that aggression may not be attempted again and normalcy would return with peace in Asia and Africa.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amended resolution, as accepted by the Prime Minister, and in doing so.....

An Hon. Member: Who has accepted?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not accepted so far. The motion and the amendments both are there for discussion; probably, the hon. Member was not here then.

Shri Thirumala Rao: I mentioned about it from what I heard in the lobby, I would like to withdraw it. I rise to support the motion made by the Prime Minister asking this House to take into consideration.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But he can support the amendment.

Shri Thirumala Rao: I do not make much difference between the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Prime Minister has not so far accepted it.

Shri Thirumala Rao: Sir, I am supporting the Prime Minister's proposition.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no proposition by me.

Shri Thirumala Rao: I know there is no positive resolution before the House except that we are taking a particular situation into consideration allowing the House to air its views on the matter.

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

Sir, I now stand before you to say a few words about the foreign policy of our country. After the advent of independence our policy is being directed with a blend of realism and idealism. That has produced substantial results not only to our country but to the Asiatic continent. Sir, my mind goes back to the year 1948 when the Prime Minister addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris, when he had to expound the basic principles of the foreign policy of India before the great assembly of the world nations. Therein he has in so many words expressly stated that our foreign policy is based mainly on rooting out colonialism in the world, establishment of freedom in all freedom lacking countries and extermination of racial superiority in this world.

Now, after ten years of our existence as a free nation, if you look back we can very well assess how far we are justified in our attitude of, what is called, non-alignment in our foreign relations.

With regard to the first item, rooting out colonialism, India, with a sizeable population that accounts for something in international matters, has stood firmly against colonialism of the western nations. Though not entirely due to the efforts that India has made, but on account of the moral stand which this country has taken the colonialism in the east has been largely liquidated. For instance, whatever the reason may be, colonialism of the western type is going to disappear and will likely disappear from the eastern waters.

Another thing is, there is too much of interference by western nations. The habitual traditional interference of the western nations in the affairs of the Asiatic nations has become a chronic habit with those nations. It is very difficult to make them get rid of this habit. Whatever happens in Asia in China, in South-East-Asia, it has been a matter of keen interest and always permanent intrigue for

the western nations. By our attitude in these matters we have been able to rectify circumstances to a certain extent. For instance, Indonesia getting out of the clutches of the Dutch and Indo-China getting out of the clutches of the French have helped in this process and in that India had its own part to play.

Coming nearer home, we have been able to evolve a new pattern of the membership of the British Commonwealth. Our friends have been objecting strongly that we should sever our connections with the British Commonwealth. Of course, there is an amount of feeling in the country too, of which our Prime Minister is aware, that the recent happenings in England, and the attitude of the British public and British newspapers about India, have accelerated the feeling between India and England. But these are the times when we have to show some patience, some forbearance. In an atmosphere of opposition, carping criticism, when leading newspapers in England were criticising our country and our Prime Minister, our Prime Minister took a decision to attend the recent conference of the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth. That requires courage, that requires foresight, that enables us to stand firm when there is emotional disturbance from all sides. Our going to the conference table has created an impression, a position for India which cannot be easily or light-heartedly treated even by the United Kingdom.

There is a feeling that a time may come when we will be dominating the United Kingdom. There were prophets that were not wanting among the British public saying that hereafter the British nation has to turn out to be the tail and the main dog will be India, and the tail cannot afford to wag the dog any more. But we do not aspire to such a position. As long as there is some purpose and some ideal for which we are pursuing, which can be achieved by relieving some of these smaller nations

from the clutches of British Imperialism, there is place for us in the Commonwealth, and it cannot be lightly treated. There are other ties, commercial, military and cultural, with England which may be severed at any moment if you like, but a large amount of cultural and commercial utility can be derived by continuing for some time in the British Commonwealth without any violence to our feelings or the sense of republicanism in the country.

With regard to the attitude taken by our Prime Minister even in an atmosphere of complete hostility in America, he has made bold to travel all the way to the United States to see President Eisenhower and explained to him our real stand. President Eisenhower may be helpless for the time being, he may be outwitted or intrigued against by his own Secretary of State and his Vice President, but still the President of the United States carries a personal prestige for goodness, for honesty of purpose which, I think, must have been properly assessed by world forces. Wherever there is a necessity of clarifying our stand, wherever there is an opportunity of explaining our position and making it clear that there are certain fundamentals on which India stands, we always stand to gain. On such occasions our Prime Minister has not stood on mere personal prestige or pride, but he has gone to the farthest corners of the world to explain the stand of India.

What is our stand? We have taken a stand even before our independence that India is opposed to imperialism, to colonialism, to fascism, to communism. If we are opposed to all these 'isms', what is the ism by which we are standing? Ours is a democratic State with democratic way of life. We, the youngest democracy in this world, have shown how democracy can work smoothly and calmly. Without violence, an electorate of 17 crores—a voting strength equal to the population of Russia and slightly less than the population of the United States—

went to the polls twice within ten years. It has shown how without violence, shootings or murders elections could be carried on to fill thousands of seats in the legislatures of the country. Our Constitution is based on a democratic bed rock. Our legislation is absolutely democratic. Not only that, this strength of the Opposition Party is a standing example of the democratic spirit of our Constitution. Opposition parties in other countries where democracy does not work are completely liquidated.

Now, if there is any misunderstanding about us in the United States or United Kingdom our actions are eloquent testimony of the basic faith in democracy which this country has proclaimed. With all that the country has shown an amount of independence of conduct, independence of judgment and courage of conviction. That has not been cowed down by the atom bomb or hydrogen bomb that Russia and America are producing for mutual destruction, not only of themselves but of the whole world.

Our policy has been wedded to one thing that is peculiar and traditional to this country, and that is the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi. That teaching has fashioned the political life of this country, gave an ideology to this country, that has shown the world that a nation of 35 crores can be emancipated without shedding blood. That is the sheet anchor, the bed rock on which our policy of non-interference, non-alignment and, as far as possible, non-violence in public matters is built up. We are pursuing that policy. We are friends of all. Just now in his opening speech the Prime Minister has said that he wants complete friendship with everybody. He does not want enmity with anybody and so could we not afford to be friends with the Communist China and with Communist Russia and a democratic United Kingdom and democratic America? People in the West are not able to conceive that once you differ from a man you need go the not whole hog in differing from him in every respect. That is the

[Shri Thirumala Rao]

atmosphere in which now the rival powers in the East and in the West and in Russia and the United States are contending for world domination.

In this context, India has refused to take sides. We have told them that we are friends of all because two world wars have created such a consternation for a third world war. If you see the pictures that are now exhibited about the visit of our Prime Minister to Russia and China, if you see the longing eyes and bleeding hearts of the young men who are driven like cannon-fodder to satisfy the war lust of those leaders in those countries, you will understand that the younger generation in every country does not want war but wants peace and they look to the Prime Minister of this country, our leader, who has got the moral stature and courage to stand up and tell those people that 'you should not rake up a third world war with these destructive weapons'. It is a contribution that we have made to world peace. It is the contribution which our policy of non-alignment has made to world peace.

Now, after ten years of freedom, after the first Five Year Plan, we are now thinking of building up this nation by a series of five year plans and building economy in this country. We are greatly interested in peace. No other nation that has won its freedom recently can have greater interest in seeing that a holocaust which will envelop the country in flames should not come, and we say, give us a little respite, peace of mind and an opportunity to pursue our peaceful occupation of development in this country. That is the main interest that influences our attitude of non-alignment and prevention of war in this world and we have to devote our attention to that. In that, we have to make it clear about our friendships. There is no use of anyone misunderstanding it, namely, the geographical position in which we are situate, with two large land masses occupied by 65 crores of Chinese on one side and 17 crores of Russians on

the other side, and ourselves comprising 35 crores of people. This constitutes more than half of the world population. This poses a very big problem for us. We cannot afford to quarrel. We cannot afford to align ourselves thoughtlessly either with the Baghdad Pact or SEATO or NATO or any other military pact in this world. We are as the Prime Minister has put it nicely, walking on the edge of a sword and India is doing that with great care. You cannot afford to incur the displeasure or the enmity of one nation for the doubtful friendship of another nation.

In these circumstances, we are able to say that we are going to develop the country and we are going to stick to the fundamental tenets of our Constitution. If those policies are violated, if we are attacked, if those tenets are sought to be watered down, then the Government and the people of this nation are one in defending it. If there is any doubt about the part India plays when the real test comes, when the real critical situation comes, we will show it. When such a situation came previously, and when a situation arose when others expected that we would align ourselves with one side or the other, we have lived and shown that we stood by our Constitution and we have shown that that we are always by our democratic rights and protected our individual rights and freedom and democratic life and not the autocratic and the totalitarian way of life.

Therefore, this is the time when our diplomacy has got a great and delicate task to perform in telling those people that India will be pursuing the policy of peace and strive towards her economic betterment. There are people who are brave and play their part in shaping the world. In India today, our Prime Minister occupies a high position among the tallest men in the world, and our Shri Krishna Menon, with a mind like a razor-edge has got a

particular mission and purpose to serve in the world set-up today, and our great Vice-President, who is a philosopher-statesman, has to interpret this country to others and allay the doubts and fears about our attitude. These three gentlemen can play a great role in creating world opinion in our favour and in seeing that all the best and good-intentioned friends in the country come to the rescue of this country and make the country stand on its own legs in fulfilling its second Five Year Plan.

Shri Dineah Singh (Banda): I should like, first of all, to congratulate the Prime Minister on his foreign policy, a policy of peace friendship and of non-involvement which has won the respect of all the thinking people all over the world. We might consider our foreign policy in two aspects. One aspect of it may be called the international aspect—our contribution in solving world problems, our aid and advice to other countries and our co-operation in the maintenance of peace and in the betterment of the world in general. If I may say so, we have done admirably well here. Ours is a newly freed country, weak in terms of material wealth and armed forces. As soon as we became free, we were caught up in the cold war that was going on and which continues to go on, a reference to which was made by the Prime Minister himself. We have withstood the storm and we have taken an honoured place in the councils of nations. Our policy, based on the five principles of Panchsheel, may yet offer an alternative to the hydrogen bomb. This is no mean achievement, and I would like once again to pay a personal tribute to the Prime Minister for achieving in such a short time what many nations have not done in their lifetime so far.

The other aspect of our policy is what we might call the national aspect, that is, the understanding and help that we are able to get from other countries in solving our problems. Here also, we have done well.

We have the goodwill of many countries, even of those countries which do not wholly support us. But in this respect, there is, I feel, room for improvement. We have not received much support from the democratic countries whose friendship we should naturally expect. We have also not received support from certain countries for which we have gone out wholeheartedly. What is really wrong, what we are not able to do, is a problem which the Government must consider very seriously. I can only say that in a very small measure the responsibility lies on our representatives who are our spokesmen abroad. Our heads of missions in our missions abroad, our Ministers, our ambassadors, I feel, have not been able to put in such effort as we might expect from them. It is their duty.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may speak a little more loudly. He is not audible to the reporters.

Shri Dineah Singh: As I was saying, I feel that our representatives abroad should take a little more care about what they are doing. They should try to meet all classes of people, try to gather all shades of opinion and try to reach the people who in the democratic countries are the real sovereigns. Even in other forms of Government, totalitarian Governments, the awakening is growing, and we should try to study their problems. We should try to find out how best we can help them. Then only we shall be able to put through our viewpoints once we are able to understand them.

So far as the junior members of our services are concerned, they live in constant discontentment. The Prime Minister himself has mentioned their difficulties and their economic hardships. I feel that if they are made better, they will be able to contribute more for the national cause.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

Another point which I would like to make is that our foreign policy, our defence policy and our economic policy should be an integrated whole. At present our foreign policy is an independent policy based on non-alignment, while our defence policy and our economic policy are dependent on what one might call the 'western bloc'. We have got to procure our supplies from them. So long as we continue to procure our supplies from only one power bloc, we shall always be dependent on them. They are also in a position to know our weakness and our strength, because they have supplied the goods and they know what we need.

This is a very important matter. I do not mean to say that we should join one power bloc or the other, or that we should run in panic to the other power bloc, if we do not get our supplies from one. But we should try to buy them independently from all countries which can supply us. That is our weakness today. We see that our neighbour is being dangerously armed. The Prime Minister himself has mentioned that a certain power bloc is arming our neighbour dangerously. We must consider how our neighbour is being armed. They do not need the guns; all they need is food and clothing. But they are getting military supplies. Why is it that they are getting military supplies? They have no danger of being attacked by either power group. What for are they receiving these huge quantities of arms? Is it because that certain people want to destroy our independent policy? Is it because they feel jealous of us that we are following an independent policy? This situation will continue.

Therefore, it is essential that we buy what we need from all countries which can supply us. We should not be regimented to one pattern. There is the question of strategy also. We are getting our supplies from a certain power group and our personnel

are being trained there. Everything is known to them. If we bring in an element of surprise, if we are able to bring in new goods which are unknown to the other side, we will also be providing a deterrent to them and they will consider twice before they try to attack us. The country which is supplying arms to our neighbour might also think in the matter and might decide that this arms race is futile. They might also consider following, if I may say so, a more reasonable attitude.

Similarly our economic policy is also linked with certain power blocs. Our Finance Minister himself has said that we need a foreign loan for the core of the Plan. If we need foreign loan even for the core of the Plan, it is obvious that we depend upon outside help. If we limit it to one power group, we should be forced to depend on it even for our foreign policy. We cannot pursue this policy of independence unless we achieve independence from one power group. It is with this in mind that I beg to suggest to the Government that we should try to spread our dependence all over the world, so that we are not dependent on any one country or any one group. We are today wanting a loan from the United States of America. It is a very odd thing, if I may say so, that we should go for a loan to a capitalist country, a country wedded to free enterprise, to get loan to build our socialist pattern. Naturally, we should not get it from them. If we want to follow a socialist pattern, we must brace ourselves; we must try to do things ourselves and not base our Plan, especially the core of it, on foreign help.

There has been a reference to the North-east Frontier Agency. That is not strictly speaking part of our foreign policy. But since it has been brought in, since it is under the Ministry of External Affairs, whose policy we are discussing today, I would make a small point in this

connection also. There is considerable trouble there. I believe the trouble is not actually in the NEFA region, but in the Naga Hill districts of Assam. Their basic demand is that they should be taken out from the Hill Districts of Assam and linked to the North-east Frontier Agency. This demand has already being considered by the Government, as we see from newspaper reports and I hope the Government would give it a favourable consideration, so that we are able to stop blood-shed there and free the 17 battalions or so of our Army and many more of our armed police which are engaged there.

I do not wish to take more time of the House. I am in full support of the policy of the Government. I hope that the Government would consider my humble suggestions in the light they are offered.

श्री बाबूरामपुर (बलरामपुर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बात से इनकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि पिछले दस वर्षों में हम ने जिस विदेश नीति का अवलम्बन किया है, उस के कारण सासार में भारत की प्रतिष्ठा बड़ी है। हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जहां कही जाते हैं, करोड़ों व्यक्ति उन का सम्मान करते हैं। उन्हें शान्ति का देवदूत कह कर पुकारा जाता है। जब उन का सम्मान होता है, तो वह प्रत्येक भारतीय को, वह किसी भी पार्टी का हो, भानन्द बेता है। लेकिन मुझे सोच है कि जिस अनुपात में हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रतिष्ठा बड़ी है, शायद उसी अनुपात में हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कठिनाइया भी बढ़ गई है। यदि हम अपने देश की समस्याओं पर विचार करें, तो हम देखते हैं कि हमारी समस्यायें भविकाधिक उलझती जा रही हैं। काश्मीर का प्रदूषण लीजिए, या गोमा का सवाल, या विदेशों में बसे हुए भारतीयों की समस्या हमारे प्रधानमंत्री महोदय की प्रतिष्ठा, उन का मान सम्मान, इन समस्याओं को हल करने में जितना सहायक होना चाहिए या, अभी तक नहीं हुआ है।

हम सारे संसार को अपना भिन्न बनाने चाहे थे, किन्तु आज ऐसी स्थिति हो गई है

कि हम अपने को सर्वेक्षा भिन्नहीन पाते हैं। काश्मीर के प्रदूषण पर जिन देशों से हमें न्यायपूर्ण समर्थन की आशा थी, उनसे हमें समर्थन नहीं मिला है। कुछ देशों की हम ने मदद की, उन की कठिनाइयों को हल करने का प्रयत्न किया वे देश भी काश्मीर के सवाल पर भारत के पक्ष का असंदिग्ध रूप में समर्थन नहीं कर रहे हैं। स्वेच्छा नहर के सवाल पर हम ने मिथ्ये के पक्ष में ऐसा रवैया अपनाया, जिस के कारण ब्रिटेन में हमारे सम्बन्ध टूटने की आशंका पैदा हो गई, लेकिन उस मिथ्ये ने, और उस के प्रैज़िडेंट कर्नल नासर ने अभी तक काश्मीर के प्रदूषण पर भारत के न्यायपूर्ण अधिकार का समर्थन नहीं किया है। यही बात कम्यूनिस्ट चीन के बारे में भी कही जा सकती है। कम्यूनिस्ट चीन को संयुक्त राष्ट्र मध्य में स्वान मिलना चाहिए, इस की हम ने शाएँ दिन बकासत की—और यह ठीक भी है कि उसे राष्ट्र संघ में स्वान दिया जाय। कम्यूनिस्ट चीन ने तिब्बत पर जो आक्रमण किया, उस की ओर से भी हम ने अपनी नज़र हटा ली। लेकिन काश्मीर के सवाल पर कम्यूनिस्ट चीन के नेताओं ने अभी तक हमारा खुला समर्थन नहीं किया है। इतना ही नहीं, पाकिस्तान के समाचारपत्र इस तरह का प्रचार कर रहे हैं—मैं नहीं जानता कि वह कहां तक ठीक है, यह तो सरकार का कर्तव्य है कि वह इस सम्बन्ध में सचाई पर प्रकाश डाले, लेकिन पाकिस्तान के पत्रों का कहना है—कि चीन के राष्ट्रपति, श्री माओ-से-न्तूंग, ने इस प्रकार की भावना व्यक्त की है कि कम्यूनिस्ट देशों को काश्मीर के सवाल पर टाट्स्य रहना चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में हमें रूस की नीति को भी याद रखना चाहिए क्योंकि वह कोई नई बात नहीं है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में हम इस सवाल को ले गए लेकिन जब तक पाकिस्तान ने अपनी के साथ सैनिक गठबंधन करके अपने को खुले हृप में रूस के खिलाफ नहीं कर दिया, तब तक रूस ने काश्मीर के सवाल पर हमारे पक्ष का समर्थन नहीं किया। काश्मीर के सवाल

[श्री वाजपेयी]

पर तो हमारा पक्ष पहले भी स्यायपूर्ण था : जब पाकिस्तान ने अमरीका से गळबंधन नहीं किया था, तब भी हमारा पक्ष स्यायपूर्ण था, मगर उस समय रूस के नेता नहीं बोले। और, अब बोल रहे हैं, हम उस का स्वागत करते हैं, लेकिन जीव के नेता जो नहीं बोल रहे हैं, उस के बारे में हमारे हृदय में शका होना स्वाभाविक है, और मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूँगा कि वह इस का निराकरण करें, मगर वह ठीक समझते हों, तो ।

इस सम्बन्ध में एक बात और स्पष्ट रूप से हमारे सामने आती है। वह यह है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति नीतिकता के आधार पर नहीं चलती है। उस में निष्काम कर्मयोग के लिए स्थान नहीं है। हम हवन करते हुए अपने हाथ जलाये—दूसरों की समस्या को हल बरने में अपने लिए नहीं समस्यायें पैदा कर लें, इस नीति को आज की स्थिति में, जब कि हमें सभी देशों का सहयोग चाहिए, सब का समर्थन चाहिए, सब की सहायता चाहिए, जरा सावधानी से अपनाने की आवश्यकता है। जहां तक भारत सरकार की नीति का प्रश्न है कि हम किसी गुट में नहीं मिलेंगे, हम उस का पूरा समर्थन करते हैं। जहां तक मेरी पार्टी, भारतीय जनसभा, का सवाल है, हम इस नीति से सहमत हैं कि हम को न अमरीकी गुट से और न रूसी गुट से मिलना चाहिए, क्योंकि राष्ट्रीय हितों की यही भाग है। आज हम राष्ट्र के निर्माण में लगे हैं। किसी गुट के साथ अपने को जोड़ कर किसी को नाराज करने की स्थिति से इस समय हम नहीं हैं। लेकिन उस के साथ ही यह भी आवश्यक है कि हम दूसरे देशों के लगड़ों में अपनी टांग न घड़ायें। मगर उन लगड़ों से हमारा सीधा सम्बन्ध नहीं है तो हम उन पर चुप रह सकते हैं। कभी कभी राजनीति में चुप रहना भी आवश्यक होता है और अपने देश के हितों के सबूद्दन की दृष्टि से ही हमें अपना भुह खोलना चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन है कि दुनिया में अनेक समस्यायें हैं और उन समस्याओं के बारे

में हमारा एक विशिष्ट दृष्टिकोण भी है, लेकिन यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि उस दृष्टिकोण को प्रकट ही किया जाय। मैं एक ही उदाहरण दूँगा। रूस के साथ हमारा पंचशील का समझौता है। इस समझौते के अनुसार न वह हमारे देश के अन्दरकी मामलों में दखल दे सकता है, और न हमें वह अधिकार है कि हम उन के अन्दरकी मामलों में दखल दें। पिछले कुछ महीनों में रूस में कुछ आन्तरिक परिवर्तन हुए हैं कुछ मंत्री बदल दिए गए, कुछ स्थान से हटा दिए गए। यह रूस का घरेलू मामला था, मगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने उस के बारे में अपनी राय प्रकट की। यह तो एक आकस्मिक घटना है कि रूस का यह परिवर्तन शायद हमारी दृष्टि से, और सासार की दृष्टि से, लाभदायक होगा, मगर कल रूस में ऐसा भी आन्तरिक परिवर्तन हो सकता है, जो हमारी दृष्टि से हानिकारक हो—लोकतन्त्र की दृष्टि से, विश्व की शान्ति की दृष्टि से हानिकारक हो। उस समय हम क्या कहेंगे? मगर हम उस समय चूप रहेंगे, तो आज हमारे बोलने का कोई अर्थ नहीं रहता, और मगर आज हम बोले हैं, तो उस समय भी बोलने के लिए हमें मजबूर होना पड़ सकता है। रूस में जो भी परिवर्तन होते हैं, वह रूस का घरेलू मामला है। उस के बारे में हमें नहीं बोलना चाहिए। लेकिन दुनिया में जो भी सवाल आते हैं, उन के ऊपर बोलने का लोभ हम सवरण नहीं कर सकते। हमारी—और विशेषकर हमारे आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की—कठिनाई यह है कि वह विश्व के इतिहास के निर्माण में इतना लीन रहते हैं कि भारत के इतिहास के कुछ परिच्छेद उन की आखों से अोझल हो जाते हैं। इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि आने वाली सन्तति हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को विश्व-इतिहास के निर्माता के रूप में याद करेगी, लेकिन ऐसा न हो कि भारत की सन्तति इस बात को भी याद करे कि हम विश्व की समस्याओं में इतने उलझ गए कि हमारी अपनी समस्यायें ठीक तरह से हल नहीं हो पाईं।

उनमें कठिनाइयों पैदा हो रहे हैं। वे समझता हूँ कि अगर हम अपनी जीत में इस दृष्टि से संसोचन करें और सब की मिशन प्राप्त करने का प्रयत्न करें, तो किन कठिनाइयों में भाज हम अपने को पाते हैं, उन से हम अपने को निकाल सकते हैं।

वे ने प्रारम्भ में विदेशों में जो भारतीय वसे हुए हैं, उन का उल्लेख किया है। मुझे सोच है कि उन भारतीयों की ओर हमें जितना व्यान देना चाहिए था, हम वे नहीं दिया हैं।

विदेशों में ५० साल भारतीय हैं। वर्षा में आठ साल हैं और उनकी संख्या कम होती जा रही है। हम वर्षा को हर तरह से सहायता प्रदान कर रहे हैं। हमने उसे कर्ज दिया है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने वर्षा की सरकार को बचाने के लिये बन्दूकों का दान भी दिया था। मगर वर्षा में जो भारतीय हैं उनके साथ ठीक तरह का व्यवहार नहीं किया जा रहा है। संका में वह साल भारतीय है। उनको नागरिकता के अधिकारों से वंचित किया जा रहा है। दक्षिण अफ्रीका की सरकार जो कुछ कर रही है उसको देखते हुए हमने वहाँ की सरकार से सम्बन्ध तोड़ लिए हैं। लेकिन ऐसा करके वहाँ के भारतीयों को हमने वहाँ की सरकार की दया पर छोड़ दिया है। केवल सम्बन्ध तोड़ लेने से वहाँ के भारतीयों की समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है। मौरिशस में ६४ फीसदी भारतीय हैं। वे हमारे अधिक निकट आ सकते हैं। लेकिन मुझे यह देखकर सोच हुआ है कि हमारे जो भी कमिशनर मौरिशस में जाते हैं वे वहाँ के लोगों की पार्टीबन्दी में फंस जाते हैं। वहाँ के अलबार हमारे कमिशनर के खिलाफ तरह तरह के आरोप लगाते हैं। वे आरोप भारत में प्रकाशित होने वाले एक सम्मानित दैनिक पत्र में भी लिपे थे। मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में एक प्रश्न भी किया था लेकिन यह कह कर कि वे आरोप शस्त हैं उस प्रश्न को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया। यदि वे आरोप शस्त हैं तो हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय

को अधिकृत रूप से उसका छंडन करना चाहिये और मौरिशस में जो हमारे कमिशनर महोदय के सम्बन्ध में गलतफ़हमी पैदा हो रही है, उसका निराकरण करना चाहिये। किटिक नायना और किंजी में जो भारतीय हैं वे ४४ फीसदी और ४५ फीसदी हैं। यह सभी भारत माता के पुत्र हैं और समान संस्कृति के उत्तराधिकारी हैं। उन को हमें निकट लाने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये किन्तु उनकी ओर हमें जितना व्यान देना चाहिये उतना व्यान हम नहीं दे पाये हैं। हमारे आंखें जो हम से दूर हैं उनकी ओर अधिक लगी रहती हैं और उनकी कठिनाइयाँ भी इतनी हैं कि आज हम में इतनी शक्ति नहीं है कि हम उनको दूर कर सकें और उनकी समस्याओं को हल कर सकें।

आज के बाद-बिबाद में भव्य पूर्व की चर्चा की गई है और यह कहा गया है कि सीरिया में, शाम में एक नया संकट पैदा हो रहा है। वह संकट पैदा न हो इसके लिये हम जो कुछ भी कर सकते हैं करें। लेकिन एक बात व्यान में रखने साधक है और यह है कि भव्य पूर्व के जितने भी देश है वे दुबले हैं, बीसियों साल की गुलामी ने आर्यिक दृष्टि से उनका शोषण कर दिया है। अब प्रधान मंत्री जी यह कहते हैं कि वहाँ पर जो बैकूम पैदा हो गया है, जो रिक्तता पैदा हो रही है, उसे वहाँ के देश भरें। यह बात सिद्धान्ततः ठीक है, होना ही ऐसा चाहिये। मगर व्यवहार में ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। उन देशों में आज अपने पैदों पर लड़े होने की ताकत नहीं है। जनसंख्या की दृष्टि से सैनिक बल की दृष्टि से और आंशुलिक विकास की दृष्टि से वे इतने पिछड़े हुए हैं कि उन्हें किसी के सहारे की आवश्यकता है। यह सहारा अमरीका वे सकता है या इस वे सकता है और अगर वे देश सहारा देने का प्रयत्न करें तो कठिनाई पैदा होगी। एक तीसरा रास्ता भी है और वह यह कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ वहाँ जो रिक्तता पैदा हो रही है उसमें कुछ सहायक सिद्ध हो सकता है, इस का विचार

[बो चाहेधी]

किया जाना चाहिये । मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूँगा कि केवल इतना कह देने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि वहाँ के लोग उस बैठक को भर सें । प्रश्न व्यवहार का है । लंदूकत राष्ट्र संघ या अन्य एकियाई अफीकी दैह भिन्न कर इस प्रकार कोई व्यवस्था कर सकते हैं किंतु जिसमें मध्य पूर्व के पिछ्के हुए राष्ट्रों को अपना राजनीतिक, आर्थिक दृष्टा भौतिक विकास करने का बीका दिया जाए, सुविधा मिले । इस दृष्टि से इस प्रश्न का विचार होना चाहिये ।

मध्य पूर्व का सवाल आता है तो इजराइल की समस्या भी सामने आ कर लड़ी हो जाती है । कोई भी इस बात से इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि भूमिका में तब तक शान्ति नहीं होगी जब तक अरब राष्ट्र इजराइल के अस्तित्व को स्वीकार नहीं कर लेते और अगर अरब राष्ट्र इस बात पर कमर कस कर बैठे हैं कि इजराइल को खत्म कर दें तो मध्यपूर्व में युद्ध की चिंगारी भटकती रहेगी । कभी शान्ति हो जायेगी यार फिर से कभी अशान्ति की ज्वाला प्रचढ़ हो जाएगी । इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार का जो कर्तव्य था उसका उसम अभी तक पालन नहीं किया है । दुनिया के सभी देशों के साथ हमें दौर्य सम्बन्ध स्थापित कर लिए हैं यार इजराइल से हमारे दूतावास के स्तर पर सम्बन्ध कायम नहीं हुए हैं । क्यों नहीं हुए हैं, इसका क्या कारण है, यह मैं जानना चाहूँगा । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इजराइल का दूत इजराइल की राजधानी मे रहे और वहाँ जो चट्टान-चक छलता है, उसके सम्बन्ध में हमें जानकारी हो । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय अपन प्रभाव का उपयोग करके अरब राष्ट्रों और इजराइल के बीच में सद्भावना उत्पन्न कर सकते हैं और उनको ऐसा करना चाहिये । यार इसके पहले जो कदम हमें उठाना चाहिये वह यह है कि हम इजराइल के साथ दूतावास का

सम्बन्ध स्थापित करे । इस दृष्टि से अभी तक हमारी सरकार ने कदम नहीं उठाया है जिस को उठाने की आवश्यकता है ।

अब मैं गोप्ता के बारे में एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ । जब गोप्ता के सवाल की चर्चा होती है तो कहा जाता है कि हमारी नीति शान्ति की नीति है, अहिंसा की नीति है और हम किसी तरह का नैनिक बल प्रयोग नहीं करेंगे । गोप्ता का सवाल किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है । गोप्ता भारत का यह है, इतना कह देने से काम नहीं चलेगा । पिछले चार सौ सालों से गोप्ता की जनता गुलामी और अत्याचारों के पाटों में पिस रही है और हमें स्वाधीन हुए दस साल हो गए हैं और दस साल बाद भी उसकी गुलामी बरकरार है । हम कहें कि भारतीय क्रान्ति, इंडियन रेबोल्यूशन, तब तक पूरा नहीं होगा जब तक गोप्ता आजाद नहीं होगा तो इससे तो गोप्ता के निवासियों की कठिनाई दूर नहीं होती है । सवाल यह है कि गोप्ता के लिये हम क्या करने जा रहे हैं । कभी कभी जब गोप्ता की चर्चा होती है तो मकामों का उदाहरण दिया जाता है और कहा जाता है कि कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने मकामों में बल प्रयोग नहीं किया है, तो हमें गोप्ता पर बल प्रयोग नहीं करना चाहिये । मेरा निवेदन है कि गोप्ता की परिस्थिति मकामों से पोड़ी सी भिन्न है । गोप्ता मैनलैंड में है, मुख्य भूमि का यह जैविक मकामों पथक है और मकामों को कम्युनिस्ट चीन ने अवैध माल लाने के लिए खोल रखा है । क्या हम यह चाहते हैं कि जो अवैध व्यापार होता है वह जारी रहे । दिल्ली में देसिये गोप्ता से चोरी से आने वाली अद्वितीयों से नहीं और पुरानी दिल्ली की दूकानें भरी पड़ी हैं और इसका हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति पर भी बुरा असर पड़ रहा है ।

गोप्ता के प्रति हमारी नीति वहाँ की जनता का अनोखा तोड़ रही है । गोप्ता के

लोग अगर वह समझें कि भारत की सरकार तथा जनता ने उनके साथ विश्वासमान किया है तो हमें इसकी कोई शिकायत नहीं होनी चाहिये । उनकी गुमाई, उनके काष्टों को भग्न करने के लिये हमने क्या किया है और अगर हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते तो हमें स्पष्ट शब्दों में अपनी असमर्थता प्रकट कर देनी चाहिए, तथा भारिक प्रतिबन्ध जो हमने सभा रखे हैं उनको हटा देना चाहिये और गोमा के निवासी पुतंगाल की गुलामी में किस प्रकार ओड़ी सी सुविधा प्राप्त करें, इसका प्रयत्न करना चाहिये । अगर प्रलयकाल तक हम यही आशा करते रहेंगे कि जैसे फल पेड़ से टूट कर भूमि पर आ गिरता है उसी प्रकार पुतंगाल रूपी पेड़ से गोमा गिर कर हमारी गोदी में आ जायेगा तो वह आशा हमारी कभी पूरी नहीं होगी । इस सम्बन्ध में ब्रिटेन और क्रांस का उदाहरण देना ठीक नहीं है । पुतंगाल एक तानाशाही देश है, वहां पर विरोधी दल नहीं है, वहां पर सरकार की आलोचना नहीं हो सकती है, वहां पर जनमत को वहां के शासकों के खिलाफ नहीं लड़ा किया जा सकता जबकि ब्रिटेन तथा क्रांस में यह परिस्थित नहीं है । ऐसी सूरत में गोमा के साथ होगा, यह में पूछना चाहता है । मुझे याद है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने एक बार भविष्यवाणी की थी कि केवल गोमा ही आजाद नहीं होगा लेकिन पुतंगाल में सालाजार का जो शासन है वह भी समाप्त हो जाएगा । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ज्योतिष में विश्वास नहीं करते । शायद यही कारण है कि उनकी भविष्यवाणी पूरी नहीं हुई । गोदी से गुलामी से मुक्त नहीं हुआ और सालाजार का पुतंगाल में शासन तो खत्म होना अभी दूर की बात है । हमारा सम्बन्ध तो गोमा की आजादी से है ।

इस बारे में, उपायका महोदय, मैं एक बात कहूँगा कि जब हम अर्हिसा और शान्ति की बातें करते हैं तो दुनिया इस बात को देखती

है और चाहती है कि उसका अवहार देश के भीतर भी होना चाहिये, उसका अवलम्बन किया जाना चाहिये । जब हम दुनिया के साथै पंचशील की बात कहते हैं, शान्ति की तथा अर्हिसा की उद्धोषणायें करते हैं तो हम क्यों देश में जनता को दबाने के लिए जाठी और गोली का प्रयोग करते हैं । ऐसी सूरत में अगर दुनिया पंचशील को भोक्ता घर हूँसती है तो यह दुनिया का दोष नहीं है, उसको हम दोष नहीं दे सकते हैं । जिस देश में छोटे छोटे बच्चे पुलिस की गोली का शिकार बना दिए जाते हैं, जिस देश में जेल के फैन्डर लाठी चांद करके शान्तिपूर्ण सत्याग्रहियों को मौत के घाट उतार दिया जाता है, उस देश के प्रधान मंत्री और पालियामेंट के बैम्बर शान्ति और अर्हिसा की बातें करें, इससे बढ़कर विडम्बना कोई नहीं हो सकती । पंचशील देश के बाहर भी चाहिये और भीतर भी चाहिये । अर्हिसा चाहिये तो पाकिस्तान और पुतंगाल के साथ ही नहीं चाहिये बल्कि अपनी जनता के साथ भी उसी अर्हिसा की तथा शान्ति की नीति का अवलम्बन किया जाना चाहिये । सारा देश विदेश नीति के सबाल पर प्रधान मंत्री के पीछे है । हमारे मतभेद भीतर के मतभेद है । लेकिन उस सहयोग को लेने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया जा रहा है और उस सहयोग से जो जनता की शक्ति आगृत होनी चाहिये उसे जगाने की कोशिश नहीं की जा रही है ।

हम तटस्थ रहना चाहते हैं । तटस्थ का मतलब है, तट परस्थित तटस्थ । जो किनारे पर लड़ा है वह तटस्थ है । अब कोन कोरे पर लड़ा रह सकता है ।

छोटा मोटा देश और कमज़ोर आदमी किनारे पर लड़ा नहीं रह सकता । छोटा मोटा पौधा एक ही लहर की लपेट में वह कर खला जायगा । छोटा मोटा पत्थर का टुकड़ा एक ही प्रवाह की आंधी में नदी की ओर चार में जाकर टूट जायगा । किनारे पर वही लड़ा रहता है जिसकी जड़ पाताल से जीवन रस अप्त करती है । जो देश अब उन्माद,

[श्री बाबरेही]

जरीब और गरिमा के साथ और राष्ट्रीय शक्ति चारित्रिक बस और अनुकासन के साथ जनता के समर्थन से आगे बढ़ता है वही देश तटस्थ रहता है। आज आवश्यकता इसी बात की है कि यदि हम तटस्थता की नीति अपनाना चाहते हैं और उस पर जल्दी चाहते हैं तो सब्दे अपनी में हम उसको अपनायें।

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad): May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a point? I find there is an article in the United Nations Charter, probably article 5, which says that any member of the United Nations Organisation or of the Security Council shall not render any kind of military aid to a party whose dispute is pending before the Council. May I know why no action is taken under that article before the United Nations Organisation?

Shri Raghunath Singh: Against whom?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the point that the hon. Member has raised is, I think, due to some misunderstanding.

17 hrs.

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

I have not got the United Nations Charter in front of me. I think it must probably apply to a country against which the United Nations has acted, not in regard to a country about which a dispute is pending.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had the advantage of listening to various viewpoints and comments in regard to our foreign policy. I have been told on the one hand that we should cease to be crusaders or messiahs of peace, and the same hon. Member two or three minutes later said that India should play her role in bringing about peace in the Middle East. Now, it seems to me that there is some slight contradiction between these two statements. Another hon.

Member went a little further and said India's role should not only be to support national interests but to support peoples' demands in other countries.

Now these statements require little consideration. So far as we are concerned, it is entirely wrong, if I may say so with all respect, to say that we go out anywhere as crusaders of peace or with any idea. It is true that when we go out or when we remain in our country, we talk about peace, because that is dear to us, because we consider that of vital importance in the world and to our country.

Now, it so happens that in many parts of the world, indeed I would say, in every part of the world, the idea of peace appeals to people and, therefore, there is talk of it. It is not that we go out to convert people or to carry on any kind of a campaign in regard to it. Because I do not think that that is the right approach to this question, for a Government—I am not talking about people—to adopt, if I may use the word, an agitational role in other countries. If that is so, even in regard to what I might call the propaganda for peace, to which we are so intimately attached, the second idea that we should support peoples' demands in other countries simply means that we should support, encourage and help agitational demands. I am not using the word 'agitational' in a bad sense at all. Of course, obviously it has a good sense, too, but such demands in other countries are presumably made against their governments; obviously, people's demands are made against their governments. Now we are asked by at least one Member here to support people's demands in other countries. How would that hon. Member like some other government supporting somebody's demands in India? If that kind of policy is adopted by governments, that is a policy of continuous and persistent interference, to which we certainly, our Government, would take the strongest

exception; and I am quite sure this House would object. And if that is so, surely we cannot play that part in other countries, apart from the fact that we are not made that way. We have not the resources which other countries may have, but it is not a question of resources; it is a question of doing something which we do not want others to do. It is a bad example to set.

We talk about Panchsheel. In Panchsheel, there is a very definite clause to the effect that there should be no interference—apart from external interference—in the internal affairs of a country. I forget the exact language, but even ideological interference is mentioned there—any kind of interference, including ideological interference.

So that I just do not understand how we are asked to go and support peoples' demands. Let us admit that we in our hearts and minds sympathise with those demands; they fit in with our policy and ideals. I can understand that. And, it is not for me to say what individuals may do or private groups may do but for Government to go about supporting peoples' demands against their Governments in other countries would be really an extraordinary proposition which would land us into great difficulties and land other countries too in difficulties if they do so.

I know and I regret that some countries do this kind of thing, sometimes overtly and sometimes otherwise, and our voice is raised here and elsewhere against this kind of thing and we say that it is far better for the peace of the world that every question of interference is put an end to, interference of one country in another.

There are world forces at play and today they cannot be kept away by any kind of barriers even if Governments want to put up barriers. Thoughts flow, ideals flow and all kinds of things flow; and there are economic forces at play and political

forces at play, and all kinds of forces. Well and good. If we agree with some force we encourage it in our own way but not, I submit, by interfering in the slightest degree in the country's affairs.

If we look at the countries of the world, there are 70 or 80 countries—I forget how many there are—which are supposed to be independent, of all kinds. Some are more powerful, others are, well, more or less strong but middling; many are weak and they have all kinds of Governments. Many or some are communist governments which are supposed to be authoritarian. Others are what are called Parliamentary democracies, a very few of them. Some are called democracies which, on closer analysis, have not much of democracy about them in their country; yet they are called democracies. Some, I need not mention names, call themselves democracies with no elections and nothing. They simply carry on.

Now, we do not go about criticising them. There are monarchies which may be called free monarchies so far as the people are concerned. There are authoritarian monarchies; all kinds of countries and States in the world. Are we to set about telling them which of them is good and which are bad and criticising everybody? That would be extraordinary presumption, apart from its being extraordinary folly. So, we really do not try to criticise other countries. As a Government I am talking about it. If I am Prime Minister, unfortunately I cannot wholly disentangle myself from my position in Government. Even in private I cannot go about criticising other countries because immediately it will be difficult for me to say, "I did so in my private capacity and not as Prime Minister." So that point should be borne in mind.

Our policy has been, as I stated in the morning, to express our viewpoint. When we have to do so, whether in the United Nations or here in Parliament or elsewhere, we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

are trying as far as possible not to criticise other countries. It is true that sometimes we have to do it, inferentially, indirectly, or sometimes even directly. But, broadly speaking, we do not want to do so because there is today far too much not of criticism only but something much worse as between countries, and that has spoiled the atmosphere of any problem being considered objectively

The first thing, therefore, is to remove this tension, this new type of diplomatic and public language which is coming into play and we try to avoid it. I do not say that we are virtuous or that we always succeed or that we are better than others. I certainly do not say this. But, we have had a certain, first of all a certain kind of training in restraint of expression under our leader Mahatmaji. We tried to avoid it in the days of our struggle tried it against our opponents the British, against whom we felt so strongly.

So, now, as a Government surely it is not merely Gandhi's teachings but the normal practice of Government which, I am afraid, is not normally followed now, but still it has been the practice of Government. But, apart from that, looking at it purely from a narrow, personal, our own country's point of view, there is no reason why we should allow ourselves to get entangled in the conflicts and troubles of the world. To some extent we cannot help it, because the world is becoming more and more inter-related, and we have to deal with problems in the United Nations or elsewhere—our chanceries have to deal with them. Nevertheless, we do not wish to get entangled in these problems as far as we can help it. Sometimes it is not possible to keep away from them. We express an opinion. Even then we express an opinion in a more or less restrained language.

The hon. Member who spoke just before me referred to what I sometimes said about me personally—I am sorry to refer to a personal matter—that I am so involved in world issues that I forget my own country. Well, it is not for me to talk about myself or to judge myself. But, my own feeling about this is that I rather not have anything to do with world issues; we have enough problems in our country to solve. And, also, I know very well, and this House knows that, if we want to play any part in world affairs that part is completely dependent not on our loud voices but on the internal strength, unity and conditions in the country. By purely just criticising others we may for a moment create some impression here and there but, ultimately, the country finds its own level and other people know exactly in what depth of water it is and what strength it has, and only attach that much importance to its voice. Therefore, both from the point of view of our primary needs and primary concern being our country and, secondly, from the point of view that if we wish to play any part in world affairs it can only be by developing the strength and unity of our own country, we have to pay the first attention to our own country's affairs.

Having said that, I should also like to say that apart from our general inheritance, in the past it is our inheritance, let us say, against colonialism, in favour of freedom—that is there—we feel that still; we have not forgotten that, and our sympathies go out. Apart from that, it has become obvious that if certain things happen in the world, more especially, of course, if the war occurs, then it does not matter what our internal problems may be; everything is subordinated to this great disaster. All our problems, all our planning etc. go to pieces because the whole world goes to pieces, and we are part of that world. Therefore, it has become necessary and incumbent on us to see what is happening in the world.

The world and world affairs are impinged upon us all the time. It has become impossible for us to take, if I may use the word, a parochial outlook. We cannot understand our own problems if we look at them that way. Therefore, we are interested.

Now, take, for instance, the situation in, what is called, the Middle East, and which really is for us the west, western Asia—those countries. At the present moment, probably, that is the most difficult and explosive part of the world surface. Now, it will be untrue if I said that I am not very much interested in what happens there. I am not only interested as I was interested, as this House was interested, in what happened last year in those very middle-eastern regions, in Egypt etc., in connection with Suez Canal or intervention of other powers, in which we were interested, if you like, emotionally interested, psychologically interested but, ultimately, politically interested, but it affected us—what happened there. Whatever consequences they had, they had far-reaching consequences. So, we tried to help there insofar as we could; there too. Although we took up a fairly clear and unequivocal line we tried to avoid just condemnation of any kind even though we felt strongly about matters. I believe we were of some little help in finding some solution, whether it was subsequently about the Suez Canal or other matters. What happened then affected us. It affected our Five Year Plan and our economy and all that. Something happens, let us say, in the Middle East, in Syria. Even if they are small beginnings of a conflict, it will affect us. But there is hardly such a thing now that we can think of, that is, a small conflict. However, a small conflict has the shadow of a big conflict behind it and the big conflict has a shadow of a world war behind it, and if there is that danger there, we are interested, every Member of this House is interested,

this country is interested, because it will affect us and affect the world.

Therefore, we are concerned about it, and therefore we venture to say, and in this matter it is no good my criticising any country or condemning any country's action. I may have some views but even so, although perhaps I have more information at my disposal than most Members of this House, obviously I do not know what is happening there behind the scene, what has happened or that is happening. Some bits come to us and we have to pick and choose what is true and what is not true, and we form some kind of notion which is checked as we have further knowledge.

But the main thing is that here is a dangerous and explosive situation in Syria. We have seen previously how things happen in the middle-eastern countries and we should be warned by what has happened and what has been happening in the past and other countries should also be warned and should not make any country in the Middle East a plaything of their policy. It is a dangerous thing, dangerous from the larger viewpoint of even major wars developing.

I said this morning there is no immediate crisis in the sense of war. That is true, but, nevertheless, there is plenty of crises brewing all round which may suddenly burst out. And therefore I should like to repeat my appeal which I said in the morning about conditions in the Middle East, that it is unsafe, it is dangerous, for policies to be pursued in which those particular countries become merely playthings, chequer-boards, for other major conflicts to be played out. It is a dangerous policy as things are today. The major power groups are each too powerful to be sat upon by the other. That is a practical fact which you may like or dislike.

If that is so, if something is done by one, the other responds to it by

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

doing something to counter that; and so, step by step, one may be drawn into the conflict. Therefore, we have seen in the past how one led to another; it is quite extraordinary. If you look back at the history of these middle-eastern countries including Egypt and western Asia and the roundabout countries, if you look at their history for the last three or four years,—not very long,—you will find how one step has led to another and how one step which was meant to protect, presumably, the interests of one group of power, has actually led to an injury of that interest, because somebody else is taking some other step and then they are worried and then they take a third step and so it has gone on, step by step, whether it is Baghdad Pact or something else. It has not brought peace or security or any measure of freedom from conflict there. Conditions in the Middle-East countries since three or fours ago may not have been what might be called ideal. They were not ideal. They were not ideal anywhere. But will not everybody admit that conditions today and the last year or two have been worse than before? They have been. So, there has been progressive deterioration.

So, all these things, the Baghdad Pact and various other pacts, intrusions, etc. have worsened the affairs. That is obvious. One might say, "Oh! Yes, it is true, but other facts have occurred too." I admit it. One fact has led to another. One interference has led to another. Here we are, therefore, instead of learning from this and keeping out, leaving those countries to work out their own destiny, with our goodwill, with our help, if you like, but not this military help, not this military intervention, not military threats, not all kinds of pressure tactics being exercised. I do earnestly hope that these words, which I say with all humility and respect, will have some effect on those who may hear them.

We do not wish to interfere in international affairs, except where we feel that we might be able to be of some help, or except where we cannot help it. But where something affects us directly, then naturally, we have to say something. For instance, what has happened in regard to Pakistan, the military help given to it, is not an international matter about which we may have some views. We have views, of course, but that is a matter that has an immediate direct effect, an adverse effect, on us. Then we have to express our views clearly, strongly and unequivocally. Or, when something is said about Goa—Goa affects us. Goa may be a small thing in the world context, but Goa affects us and if something is said in regard to Goa which we think is not only wrong, but offensive to us, well, we have to reply to it.

So, you have to test our policy from that point of view, not a crusading policy or a seer-like policy; we are too humble for that. We know our limitations. We do believe in something stoutly and we express our opinions in a friendly way, but I hope, clearly when occasions arises. Where world peace is concerned, naturally we want to have our say, as a member of the world community. Where India's interests are directly threatened, whether in Goa or in Pakistan, we must have our say, a loud say, a positive say. There we cannot remain quiet. So, you have to balance all these things.

Somebody said about Kashmir. One hon Member said, it has been suggested, "Withdraw your complaint from the U.N." I do not understand this. I should like hon. Members to realise that there is no such thing done. It cannot be done simply. Also, somebody said, "withdraw your plebiscite offer" I do not know where the question of withdrawal comes in, continuing the offer or withdrawing it. Originally the plebiscite offer was made to the people of

Kashmir by us, if I may say so; I do not call them a plebiscite. I am not trying to juggle with words; but in the course of the last few years, we have had two general elections in Jammu and Kashmir State, except that part which is under the illegal and unlawful occupation of Pakistan. I do not call them a plebiscite. But anyhow, the people of those territories have been given a chance to elect their representatives. Some people say that these elections were bogus. Well, I think that charge is wrong. I do not say, and I cannot say naturally, that all those elections were perfect elections; there were no mistakes or no errors committed. I cannot say that. But I do say that by and large those elections were good elections in the circumstances and even now an Election Commission, consisting of some Judge, I believe, is there. I speak from memory—a retired Judge from India has been asked to look into this matter; a High Court Judge, I think. Now election petitions go before them and they will be decided. There can be no doubt at all—barring some irregularities or mistakes—that in the main those elections represent the viewpoint of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. There is not even a shadow of doubt about it. If many of them were uncontested elections, well, I would submit, Sir, that the persons who did not wish to contest had no chance and therefore they did not contest them. Maybe, some people had a chance, but they did not. Whatever the reasons they are there.

What I wish to point out here is that in the course, of the last five years or so, there have been two elections, general elections. On the other side, there have been no elections, no attempt at elections. In fact, conditions in the Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir have been very extraordinary. News does not come very frequently; sometimes it does come and in today's papers there is something about that.

Then again it was said by an hon. Member that the accession of Kashmir

was not only accession of the ruler of the State, but accession of the people. Well, I agree. Further it was said that it was accession to the Constitution of India. That is a wide statement, which is not quite clear to me.

When the accessions took place, not of Kashmir only, but of the other States of India in those days in 1947, the accessions were on three subjects only at that time: defence, foreign affairs and communications. The accession documents of all the major States of India contained only these three subjects. It was then thought certain States, at any rate the big ones, will have their own Constituent Assemblies to frame their Constitution, naturally in line with our Constitution, but not necessarily adopting it completely. That was the original idea. Some months later Sardar Patel discussed this matter and, in fact, some Constituent Assemblies were formed in some of the States.

Some Hon. Members: Mysore.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am told that seven Constituent Assemblies were formed in the other States. Meanwhile, of course, our Constituent Assembly for the whole of India was functioning here. Later Sardar Patel and many of us discussed this matter with the then representatives of the States as they were and it was felt unnecessary, and perhaps, if you like, undesirable, for all these Constituent Assemblies to function, because their representatives had been imported to our Constituent Assembly; they were there. So, the idea of these separate Constituent Assemblies was given up. Their representatives functioned in our Constituent Assembly and helped us in making our Constitution.

While all this was happening something else had happened in Kashmir. First of all Kashmir did not come in before independence or even at the time of independence. Then came the Pakistan invasion and aggression and war was being carried

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

on. It was a completely new situation. Kashmir acceded to us and acceded to us on those three subjects. And in fact, it was made clear even then—I forget now, I am speaking from memory, I hope I do not make a wrong statement—certain provisional matters were even then incorporated in the Constitution in regard to Kashmir.

From the very beginning it was clear that the accession of Kashmir, complete as it was, as the other States' accession was, did not mean that everything in our Constitution automatically applied to it. In the course of the next year or two further amendments and changes were made in consultation with the then Kashmir Government and their representatives. So, that, to say that Kashmir acceded to the Constitution of India is an incorrect statement. The House may remember that subsequently there was a Constituent Assembly in the Jammu and Kashmir State. It really would have functioned long before it did, but because of military operations and other difficulties it was postponed. Ultimately, when nothing came of these talks in the United Nations, we could not leave Kashmir in mid-air and, therefore, with our willing approval, they elected their Constituent Assembly.

The first thing that that Constituent Assembly did was to change the nature of the Head of the State there. The ruling family there of the State was removed—although the son of the Maharaja was elected, was chosen as the Head of the State, the Sadr-i-Riyasat. That is the very first thing they did. And this was reported to the Parliament and to the President, because the President came into the picture; and we made necessary amendments to fit in with that in our own Constitution. Later, other changes came in. As their Constituent Assembly went on making changes, they were reported to us, and we accepted those changes after discussion etc., and they were engrafted on to our Constitution.

Their Constituent Assembly finished their Constitution-making in October last year, I believe—about a year ago, maybe October or November. Meanwhile, of course, that Constituent Assembly had also functioned as a Legislative Assembly and carried out very far-reaching land reforms and other reforms. So that, this Constitution-making has legitimately gone on there in conformity with our Constitution, and we have frequently adopted, made some changes, to fit in with that, in our own Constitution.

At the present moment it has come very near to our Constitution in many matters. Only in a few matters they have kept apart. One matter to which they attach great importance and which has come up in the shape of questions here is about their ownership of land. It is an odd thing against our Constitution. I cannot go and buy land or possess land in Kashmir. It is restricted to, well, if I may use the word, genuine Kashmiris.

Shri Hem Barua: What about you Sir?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They have got, I believe, certain definitions—people, that is generations, who have been there, who have been born there, and all kinds of things. There are two or three groups or classifications of them. I can very well understand this. It is an old rule, not a new rule, from the old Maharajas' time—not this Maharaja, but from his father's or grand-father's time. And the rule was framed, I am told, firstly because of their fear that, Kashmir being such an agreeable place for foreigners, for English people specially, English people will come and practically physically take possession of it, start living there and take property. No Englishman, not even the biggest Englishman—they could go there of course as tourists—could get any property there. A great favour was shown to them about thirty, forty or fifty years ago when they were

allowed at Gulmarg, which was a very favourite place, to build a cottage there for ten years after which it lapsed to the State. Because, I remember one of the Maharajas thirty or forty years ago telling us that he had failed in many ways but at least he had kept out the British people from settling down in Kashmir, because it was such an attractive place climatically. The rule applied, of course, apart from the British, to people from other parts of India, monied people who could go and buy up property there, because Kashmir is a poor place with poor people, and they were afraid these moneyed people would buy all the delectable spots in Kashmir. So, they made this rule, and when this matter was put to us about their desire to continue it, we agreed. We said: 'No, we do not wish to come in your way, certainly continue it'—as indeed in quite another place we ourselves in our Constitution have made a rule, if you remember it. In some of the hill districts of Assam there is a definite rule that land cannot be transferred to outsiders etc., because we wanted to protect that land so that it may remain with the tribal people there.

Therefore, in regard to Kashmir I would beg of this House to remember always that all these nine, ten years there have been two armies facing each other on the cease-fire line. There have been frequent attempts by Pakistan to create trouble inside Kashmir. Recently there have been almost deliberately organised attempts to do so. As the House knows, in answer to some questions I have said so. Because of all this you cannot treat Kashmir as a place which can be completely normal. As a matter of fact, as far as the common man is concerned, normalcy has returned. He does business; he has much more business than he has ever had; he has more food and all; but nevertheless, there is this danger hovering over it of spies, espionage, sabotage and all that, and if the Kashmir Government takes some special measures to meet the situation, I do

not quite see how we can blame them or ask them to remove some of the special powers that they have taken.

There was a reference to Sheikh Abdullah. I have often said in this House that few things have disturbed and pained me so much as the arrest and detention of Sheikh Abdullah. I would not go into the past history. Sometimes we have to take steps which are exceedingly distasteful. This is one of them. I did not take the step, but certainly indirectly—not directly, but indirectly—we were approving or consenting parties. I shall be very happy indeed when this state of affairs is ended.

I was referring to Pakistan. Now, there are two or three matters which I should like to mention. It is really quite extraordinary, the kind of false statements that are made now with greater frequency than before from Pakistan. The other day a statement was made with a great air of secrecy by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that Russian planes were landing in Kashmir, and that Kashmir or India, I forget which—India, I think—had become a Russian base. Now, one would expect of a Foreign Minister some slight adherence to truth. It is really quite extraordinary. India is not a closed land, nor is Kashmir. It is not particularly easy for people to go to Leh. It is physically difficult, and otherwise we do not encourage people going there either, but there are thousands and thousands of tourists in Kashmir and in India, of course. I gave a very specific denial to each single fact. I invite Pakistan, and I am prepared to do the same, to give the names of every foreign person employed directly or indirectly in our defence services or in the construction of anything connected with defence like air fields, like barracks, like anything. I am prepared to give every name, to publish them. Let them publish the names of all the foreigners they are employing there in their defence services, not only actively in the defence services, but—of course, what happens is they do

[**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**]

not have an exact position in the defence—of the advisers, the builders, the trainers, the vast crowds of them that function there.

One thing we can never forget, and that is the exodus from East Pakistan into India, this tremendous exodus which shows the state of affairs in East Pakistan, and in Pakistan generally, a fact which we know very well, but which few foreign countries realise; that mere fact brings out the picture of our relations with Pakistan and the conditions in Pakistan much more vividly than almost any argument that we could put forward.

Some hon. Members said something to the effect that our Defence Minister had said something. What did he say? It is about Goa. The Defence Minister had made some kind of an appeal to the United Kingdom and the United States of America about Goa. I understand from him that he made no appeal. What he had said was—I speak subject to correction—that the case of Goa was such that countries like the UK and US should express themselves clearly as to where they stood. Am I right?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): Did they support colonialism or oppose it?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes. Did they support colonialism there or not? It was a kind of an enquiry. I have said previously in this House that the case of Goa is incontestably a colonial domain of Portugal; it does not matter how long they have been there. It is colonialism functioning, and functioning very badly.

Now, when people in other countries talk about colonialism vanishing and their being opposed to colonialism, we are justified in asking them, in all politeness: how does this fit in with your anti-colonial declarations, this continuation of Portugal in Goa? We are entitled to ask them this question. Apart from the major questions with regard to Goa, one continuing pain

and torment for all of us is the continuation of hundreds and hundreds of Goans in prison there. There are a few Indian nationals too still there, whose nationality is challenged by the Portuguese. I think there are about 5 or 6. But there are hundreds of Goans suffering tremendous, long terms of imprisonment, quite apart from those who have been put to death or who have had to submit to all kinds of torture in the past. It is a horrible thing and it surprises me that this is ignored by these great powers and small powers.

It does not surprise me that in the context of world events Pakistan and Portugal in Goa are closely knit together and are close friends. And yet, it is rather extraordinary. There was the Bandung Conference which talked about colonialism and all that. And partly Pakistan had actually supported it. We did not expect Pakistan to stand out as a crusader of anti-colonialism. They could well have remained silent over the issue. But no, they have gone out of their way to support Portuguese dominion in Goa. Their newspapers supported it. The present Prime Minister, before he became Prime Minister, was the advocate for Portugal—I believe the legal adviser and advocate for Portugal. It is an extraordinary thing that simply because of their hatred of India they should descend to such levels.

An hon. Member referred to Indians abroad, Burma, East Africa and Mauritius. In some places Indians have to suffer some disabilities, I think, in Burma, except the one common factor in many places about facilities for sending money which are not easily granted. Now, we do not grant them easily to others. So we cannot very well complain. Most of these countries are in difficulties about foreign exchange and we can hardly call upon them to adopt a policy in regard to Indians which they are not adopting for their own people.

But the major fact is that Indians spread out in the past because they were to some extent more adventurous people, whether they were business people or others or they went in search of employment. And, wherever large numbers of people go to another country, a certain problem arises there subsequently. Everywhere there is this question of unemployment and the tendency of that country is to reserve its employment for its own nationals. It is difficult to criticise that tendency. And, Indians get into some difficulties. The way we look upon it is this. Where the country has slightly to face difficulties we advise our countrymen to put up with those difficulties, the other country's difficulties. We cannot ask for special privileges. But where any unfair treatment is given to our countrymen, then, of course, we protest. But even there we have to protest in a friendly way; we cannot issue any threats. We refuse to do that. That is not the way to deal with such matters because there is a case. And again where there are Indians abroad, we have left it to them entirely whether to continue to remain Indian nationals or to adopt the nationality of that country. It is entirely for them to choose.

If they remain Indian nationals, then all that they can claim there is favoured alien treatment. They are aliens and they should get as good treatment as any other alien gets. They cannot vote there. Obviously, the aliens have no right of vote. But they have all the civic privileges; they have the privileges as friendly aliens. If they adopted the nationality of that country, then, they should be treated as citizens with all the rights of citizenship. But, then, we have no concern with them. Sentimental concern, of course, there is; but politically, they cease to be Indian nationals and we have no concern. The problem is of people who are not Indian nationals.

There are two clearly. There is the problem of Indian nationals. Admittedly, Indian nationals who have gone

there with visas, many of them have come back. Now, if Indian nationals who went there for a period are asked to go back we cannot object. We can say, well, do this in a phased way. Do not push too many people back. But they are people with visas and the Government concerned has the right not to renew the visa. But we ask them to exercise that right in a way so as to cause the least inconvenience and injury to the people concerned.

Then, there are the other people; that is, those whom we do not consider our nationals, who have been there 50, 60, 30 or 40 years, whatever the period may be, and they have settled down and many of them have been born there. Their problem is there. So far as we are concerned, strictly, legally and constitutionally, it is none of our problem. They are not our nationals. It is a problem of Ceylon. But we do not take up that particular attitude although it is the correct attitude because we are interested in their welfare and we are interested in finding a solution because there is a history behind this.

For the last 30 or 40 years, before we became independent and before Ceylon became independent, all kinds of agreements and other things were being made. We are independent. But fundamentally it is a problem of Ceylon dealing with its own people.

Finally, Sir, Shri Mukerjee again appealed to us to break the old moorings of thought and action which tie us to the Commonwealth. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat what I have previously said. It is perfectly true that there are certain old moorings of thought which necessarily affect our action sometimes, not in regard to England only but in regard to so many things. Those old moorings have carried us to this Parliament, which is largely modelled after the British parliamentary system. There are so many other things. That is true, but so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, I think that it should be considered

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

entirely apart from any sentimental point of view—that is, our association—but purely from the point of view of whether it is good for us and for world peace or not, whether we can balance the advantages or not. I feel I have been convinced, and I am still convinced that our association with that serves some useful purpose for ourselves and for the larger causes that we support in the world. That has grown. The fact of new countries coming in like Ghana, like Malaya, possibly a little later Nigeria—I do not know—brings about continuous changes in the complexion of the Commonwealth and makes it, I think, even more desirable and necessary for us to remain associated with it.

One of my young colleagues, I believe, in the course of his maiden speech here, said something about the Nagas. Of course, this is not a problem of international affairs at all. It is entirely a domestic problem for us and, therefore, the question does not arise. But, since he mentioned this I should like to say to this House what I have said previously, that our approach to this Naga question is, has always been, one of friendship and of dealing with our own countrymen, some of who may have gone astray but whom we have to win over and make friends. Even if they are not our friends today we propose to continue that approach.

Recently some kind of a convention was held at Kohima. It was held with the permission of the governmental authority, otherwise it could not be held, and large number of representatives or delegates of the Naga Tribes came to it. They, ultimately, after two or three days passed a number of resolutions. I have received some brief telegraphic information about them, and I was asked if I would accept a delegation from those Naga representatives. I replied that I would be glad to receive them,

talk to them, discuss matters with them. Presumably, in the course of the next few days, I do not yet know when, such a delegation will come here, we shall discuss matters in a friendly manner and I have every hope that these discussions will lead to satisfactory results for us, for them and for India.

Sir, we discuss these various matters, internal and external, especially external matters, and I have no doubt that every Member of the House feels their importance. It is not merely a question of our discussion or of our indulging in debate and answering each other's points, but the basic realisation that for us and, perhaps, for other countries also it is a question of survival of what happens in the world, what happens in our country. It is from that point of view that we have to look at it and bend our energies so that we might survive and nothing may happen in the world which affects our survival and other people's survival.

May I say that I gladly accept the amendment moved by Shri Jaganatha Rao?

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the amendment to the vote of the House

The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: So, for the original motion this motion is substituted and the amendment by Shri Raghunath Singh is barred.

17.56 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 3rd September, 1957.

[Monday, 2nd September, 1957]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS		COLUMNS
S.Q. No.	Subject	11247-84
1372	Border Rivers	11247-49
1374	Repatriation of Chinese Nationals from U.S.A.	11249-50
1376	Sample Survey	11250-51
1377	Pakistani Nationals in India	11251-55
1378	Trade Centre in West Asia	11255-56
1379	Import of Textile Machinery	11256-58
1380	Indians in South Africa	11258-59
1381	Praga Tools Corporation	11259-60
1383	Financial Assistance to Bharat Sevak Samaj	11261-62
1384	Displaced Persons' Colonies in Delhi	11162-63
1385	Handloom Cloth	11263-65
1386	Small Scale Industries	11266-67
1387	Small Scale and Rural Industries	11267-70
1389	Building for Comptroller and Auditor General's Office.	11270-71
1390	Firing by Portuguese Troops on Indian Patrol	11271-74
1391	Industrial Designs Exhibition	11274
1393	Spinning and Weaving Mills, Sholapur	11274-75
1395	Air Space Violations	11275
1396	Nuclear Test on Christmas Island	11275-77
1397	Australian Trade Delegation	11277-78
1400	Bharat Sevak Samaj	11278-80
1401	Forward Trading in Bulion	11280-81
1402	Nangal Fertilizer Factory	11282-84
WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS		11254-11313
S.Q. No.	Subject	11254-11313
1371	Nuclear Tests	11284
1373	Indo-Japan Peace Treaty	11285
1375	Export of Iron Ore to Japan	11286
1382	Industrial Estate	11286
1388	Under-Employed Persons	11286
1394	Supply of Shoes to Russia	11286
1398	Community Radio Sets	11287
1403	Documentary on Folk Dances	11287
1404	Implements for Paddy Husking	11287
1405	Breaches in the Sutlej Bund Pakistan.	11288
1406	Ambernath Woollen Mill	11289
U.S.Q. No.	Subject	11289-90
1086	Manufacture of Cycles and Spares	11289-90
1087	Industrial Development of Madras	11290-91
S.Q. No.	Subject	COLUMNS
1088	Commercial Blasting Explosives	11291
1089	Radio-Active Rain in Kashmir	11291-92
1090	Penicillin	11292
1091	Illegal Entry of Pakistanis	11292-93
1092	Displaced Persons' Claims	11293
1093	Sulphuric Acid Factory in Bihar	11294
1094	Import of Liquid Gold	11294
1095	Local Development Works	11295
1096	Displaced Persons' Colonies at Howaltilla, Assam	11295-96
1097	Economic Development of Eastern Districts of Uttar Pradesh	11296
1098	A.I.R. Jaipur	11296
1099	Indian Foreign Service	11296-97
1100	Payment of Compensation to Displaced Persons	11297-98
1101	Ambar Charkha Programme	11298
1102	Dandakaranya	1129-99
1103	Indian Chillies	11299
1104	Atomic Radiation	11299-11300
1105	Indians in Burma	11300
1106	Employment Exchanges	11300-02
1107	Mandi Rock Salt Mines	11301-02
1108	Central Schemes in Mysore	11302-03
1109	Government of India Press, Simla	11303-04
1110	Design Centres for Small Industries	11304
1111	P.M.'s Visit to Japan	11304
1112	Cotter Mills in Madhya Pradesh	11304-05
1113	Cloth and Yarn Production	11305
1114	Sales Emporia	11305-06
1115	Labour and Employment Schemes	11306-09
1116	Slum Clearance in Andhra	11309
1117	Mica Mine Workers' Union, Andhra Pradesh	11309-10
1118	Export of Tea	11310
1119	Labour Co-operatives	11310
1120	Hides and Skins Industry	11310-11
1121	Fourth All India Handloom Week	11311
1122	Documentary Film	11311
1123	Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity	11312
1124	Displaced Persons' Colonies in Delhi	11312-13
PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE		11313-14
The following papers were laid on the Table :		
(i) A copy of each of the following papers, under		

PAPERS LAID ON THE
TABLE

The following papers were laid on the Table :

(i) A copy of each of the following papers, under

COLUMNS

COLUMNS

Article 151(1) of the Constitution :

(i) Appropriation Accounts of the Government of Delhi, 1954-55 and Audit Report, 1956.

(ii) Appropriation Accounts of the Government of Mysore Pradesh, 1955-56 and Audit Report, 1957.

(2) A copy of the Report of the Court of Enquiry into the accident which occurred on the 26th September, 1956 at the Burro Dhemo Colliery in the district of Burdwan, published in the Notification No. S.R.O. 925, dated the 23rd August, 1957.

(3) A copy of the statement correcting the reply given on the 31st July, 1957, to Unstarred Question No. 408, regarding Migration Certificates.

REPORT OF RULES COMMITTEE LAID ON THE TABLE—

First Report was laid on the Table

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILLS

Secretary reported that the following Bills, which were passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current Session, had been assented to by the President :

(1) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1957.

(2) The Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1957.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

11315—16

Sardar A.S. Saigal called the attention of the Minister of Defence to the resignation of five elected members of the Jabalpur Cantonment Board and the situation arising there from.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon) made a statement in regard thereto.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

11316—17

Twelve members were granted leave of absence from the sittings of Lok Sabha.

MOTION ADOPTED

11318—11450

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru) moved the motion *re International Situation*. The discussion on the motion concluded and the substitute motion was adopted.

AGENDA FOR TUESDAY 3RD SEPTEMBER, 1957—

Further discussion on the motion to consider the Expenditure-Tax Bill, as reported by the Select Committee and also passing of the Bill.