

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने अग्रर गलत भी बात कही है तो वह ठीक मानी जाएगी।

श्री मधु लिमये : हम आपकी मदद करना चाहते हैं...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपकी बड़ी मेहरबानी। जरूरत होगी तो आपकी मदद ले ली जाएगी।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप अपने ऊपर ऐसी चीजों को न ले लिया करे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अरुं किया है न कि आप बैठ जाये। अब हो गया।

12:21 hrs.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

FORTY-FIRST REPORT

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): I beg to present the Forty-first Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Appropriation Accounts (Civil), 1963-64, Audit Report (Civil), 1965 and Audit Report (Commercial), 1965 relating to the Ministries of Civil Aviation, Commerce, Community Development and Cooperation, Education and Food and Agriculture (Departments of Agriculture and Food).

12:21½ hrs.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
BANGALORE

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of clause 14(v) of the Scheme for the Administration and Management of the properties and funds of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, read with regulation 2.1 of the Regulations of the Institute, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two members from among themselves to serve as members of the Council of the Institute for the next term."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of clause 14(v) of the Scheme for the Administration and Management of the properties and funds of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, read with regulation 2.1 of the Regulations of the Institute, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two members from among themselves to serve as members of the Council of the Institute for the next term."

The motion was adopted.

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Aney had given me notice that he wanted to raise a point of order at this hour. I wanted to call the Minister but he wanted to raise a point of order because he had not got the turn to speak though he had moved a substitute motion.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Sir, those who have given their substitute motions have a right to be heard if they want to speak on the substitute motions which they have tabled to the main Motion before the House. What happened was that as the time allotted to the Motion...

Mr. Speaker: I would like the Member to quote only the rule under which a Member who gives notice of an amendment gets a right to speak on that. All along the Speakers have ruled that there is no inherent right.

An hon. Member: It is a normal justice.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): You may kindly give him a chance.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Banerjee, my difficulty is that if I give him a chance, I have to accommodate half a dozen more Members. If he had been

the only Member, I would have given him a chance.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Heavens are not going to fall if he is given 15 minutes. He is the seniormost member here.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हाउस प्रगर चाहता है कि इनके केस में एक्सपेशन कर दी जाए तो मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है ।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barackpore): You may kindly give him a chance.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: An exception can be made in his case.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : लेकिन इसको प्रेसीडेंट न माना जाए ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It will not be taken as a precedent.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Dr. Aney, instead of making out his point of order, may speak in support of his substitute motion.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I think the House for having made an exception in my case.

I will not take the time of the House by reading out the substitute motion that stands in my name on the order paper of the day.

At the outset I congratulate the Government generally on the statement of the present international situation and their policy in relation thereto. My congratulations are mainly due to the opportunity afforded to the Members of this House at an early date in this winter session by tabling a motion for its consideration.

In the substitute motion standing in my name which is fairly long, I have noted certain points with a view to inviting the attention of the Government to consider them in order to make their own policy more elastic and less rigid and easy for adaption to

circumstances and conditions which are not stationary but changing in incredibly short time.

I am conscious of the fact that the Indian nation is at war forced on it by neighbours like Pakistan and China which have no respect for truth and no regard for equity and fairness. Our territories are invaded and occupied by them with military force in utter defiance of all conventions of civilised warfare and recognised by International Law. The Government of India has to take up the challenge sheerly in self-defence and protection of its territorial integrity as an independent nation. The unity which was seen in the country has to be maintained and I shall say nothing and nobody should say anything to damage that.

It is a matter of great pride that in the war against Pakistan to repel its invasion in the last few months, our jawans and the military officers as well as the Air Force have given such a thundering blow to the much-talked-of armoured cars and highly trained fighting forces of Pakistan that they were completely shattered and routed. Within a few weeks the Indian Army regained its prestige and demonstrated to the whole world that Pakistan, in spite of all the assistance it has received from U.K. and U.S.A. for several years, was no match in its military strength with India. The success of our brave jawans is in itself a factor that has set in motion a new wave requiring even the so-called friends of Pakistan in Asia, Europe, Africa and America to revise their estimate of India and I am sure that the bold stand taken by India's representatives at the U.N. Security Council meetings as well as at the Algiers Conference left an impression on the civilised world which will slowly, but surely, work to create a better and more reasonable understanding about the stand of the Indian Government on some of the burning questions like the demand of Pakistan for self-determination to Kashmir.

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

I am confident that the world will understand the broad humanitarian principles underlying the international policy of India more quickly and clearly if it sees, as it has done this time, that India not only talks and preaches high principles and lofty ideals, but it has its millions to stand by them and shed their blood in defence of them.

I looked upon the Pakistani invasion of India by its armies and infiltrators as a golden opportunity for the Indian Defence Forces to regain for the Motherland the prestige and high position which it had to lose three years ago when China treacherously betrayed India by invading Indian territories, putting forth fictitious claims to them. And be it said to the eternal glory and credit of the Indian Defence Forces that they have done their job splendidly and India no longer feels crest-fallen. It is Pakistan and all its trained men and wire-pullers behind the curtain who have to tax their brains to find excuses for this phenomenal debacle of their fighting forces on the battle-field.

I maintain that the war that ended in the present stalemate known as the cease-fire has helped to create a better atmosphere for the reconsideration or re-shaping, if necessary, of the international policy of the Central Government.

Another desirable result of the present war with Pakistan is that it has virtually demonstrated to the Indian Government whom they can rely upon for active help in times of war with Pakistan and even with China.

The reluctance on the part of most of the big nations in the UN Security Council to name Pakistan as an aggressor in spite of the indisputable evidence before them in the reports of the observers and the statement of the Secretary-General was due not to any want of knowledge of facts by them but to the guilty conscience . . .

Mr. Speaker: Can the hon. Member not give us only a gist of it now? All those Members who had pressed for him saying that he should be allowed to speak have now gone away; probably they do not want to listen to him. I find that all those Members who had pleaded for him are not here.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not all, but some.

Dr. M. S. Aney: The part that they had played in arming Pakistan up to teeth for several years was to a great extent responsible for the audacious adventure of Pakistan in invading India. 'Delhi is only a march for a few hours for the Pakistan Army' was the slogan of Ayub Khan on the strength of the armoured cars and most powerful and up-to-date weapons of human destruction supplied to it by them for a number of years.

It was a disgraceful thing for America when India's representatives openly charged America with breach of faith on the ground that Pakistan had broken the very conditions on which the arms were supplied when they used them not against China but against India, and that further America instead of stopping the supply of such arms to them further and coming over to the help of India thought of putting an embargo on the imports of certain goods to India . . .

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Member's speech nearing completion?

Dr. M. S. Aney: It is just two more minutes' reading.

Shri Daljit Singh (Una): It may be laid on the Table.

Some hon. Members: No; let him speak.

Dr. M. S. Aney: This nation of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, the founders pioneers and protagonists of the Ameri-

can Constitution had not the courage of its conviction to reprimand Pakistan but on the other hand has helped it still further in pursuing its evil designs against India. It is generally surmised that Bhutto's success in getting a second meeting of the Security Council was possible only because he had friends in these big nations to oblige Pakistan in New York.

I have dwelt on this point so much because the fundamental duty of the Foreign Minister is to ascertain which of the nations are friendly, which are hostile and which are neutral or indifferent. The ancient writers of India on politics like Kautilya have a very salutary rule for the guidance of the Foreign Minister. Kautilya says: 'Udaaseenah arivat varjyah', i.e. those who pose as neutral should be eschewed like enemies. This should be borne in mind while asking them to do anything for us.

We all like disarmament and talk of the days of eternal peace. I feel that this is Utopia. As you cannot have a sea without its waves perpetually going up and down and at times throwing them into storms, so, humanity also in its progress has perpetual ups and downs. In the march of progress the principle of rivalry is bound to play its role at times and disturb the smooth surface. Through mistake of an individual or big groups of individuals the equilibrium or apparent harmony is bound to be disturbed now and then. Then the restoration of the disturbed conditions to order and normalcy is possible only through big clashes of rival groups. This has been the law of progress from time immemorial. Hence the necessity of diplomacy and defence is a perennial necessity. You can attempt to regulate them if possible, to make them less inhuman. But its abolition is only a mirage to pursue, a biological impossibility. Shri Krishna says in the Geeta:

“कालोऽस्मि लोकशयङ्करप्रवृद्धो
शोकान्तमाहर्तमिह प्रवृत्तः ।”

“I am Kāl, the Destroyer of Lokas; I have arrived here to destroy them.” War is in a way a divine surgical operation on the collective body of humanity to cure the whole humanity or its part from some malady causing excruciating pain and which is otherwise found incurable.

With this understanding of realities, we must be prepared to do our best, to do justice to ourselves and not falter.

I thank you for giving me time to make these few observations.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Daljit Singh raised an objection. We must show every respect to our octogenarian Member. He is a privileged person.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुगेर) : क्या सदन में प्रधान मन्त्री जी धार्येंगे ताकि मैं उनसे एक श्राघ्र प्रश्न पूछ सकूँ। मैं कल पूछना चाहता था लेकिन सदन उठ गया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: यह मैं क्या बतला सकता हूँ।

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate has lasted two days and distinguished Members belonging to different Groups have participated in the debate and have given their views on some urgent problems that face our country; they have also reviewed the broader perspective and made several suggestions that should be adopted.

Yesterday, we had the privilege and benefit of hearing the Prime Minister who intervened in the debate. In a major policy statement, he has enunciated the Government's position with regard to some matters which are naturally engaging the attention of the

[Shri Swaran Singh]

House and are the concern of the country. My task now has been very greatly lightened; I will confine myself only to other aspects, and won't take much time of the House either.

The Prime Minister yesterday made a reference to our relations with our neighbouring countries. In that connection, he referred to the friendly relations that exist between us and our neighbours, Ceylon, Burma and Nepal, and the steps that have been taken, and are continuously being taken, to strengthen those relations.

In this connection, I would also like to refer to a few other countries. Our relations with Afghanistan have always been friendly and close. There has been a great deal of understanding of our position, not only with regard to our conflict with Pakistan, but also with respect to several other issues of international importance.

The Prime Minister of Afghanistan, along with his colleagues, visited our country, and he not only had very useful talks with Government leaders here in Delhi, but also visited several other parts of our country, and that visit strengthened our relations with Afghanistan still further.

Mention has been made of the presence of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan in Afghanistan. We have the highest respect, the greatest regard and affection for Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. He was the most outstanding amongst the leaders who won freedom for us and freed this subcontinent from colonial rule, and therefore our regard for that great leader and valiant fighter continues unabated.

श्री मधु लिमये : उन्हेंने बटवारे के बारे में जो कहा उस को भी मान लीजिये प्राय ।

Shri Swaran Singh: We have suggested to Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan that he would be a most welcome visitor to India, and we will, when he is

here, afford him all opportunities to carry on whatever work he wants to carry on.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When did you write to him?

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा (कोट) : प्रापने बुला मा है क्या ?

Shri Swaran Singh: With regard to the Pakhtoonistan issue, we are fully aware that the fundamental freedoms and the natural aspirations of the brave Pakhtoons have been consistently denied to them, and their struggle has got our greatest sympathy, and we will certainly support the efforts that Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan might undertake in that direction. When we look at other countries in South-east Asia, our thoughts go to a very friendly country, Malaysia. Reference had been made to Malaysia by several hon. Members from all parts of the House. As you know, Sir, Malaysia has shown a great deal of understanding for our position and objectively has come to understand the correct situation of our conflict with Pakistan and of our conflict with China. They have put across their viewpoint without fear, but it is sad, and I would say highly regrettable, that even when Malaysia adopted this objective attitude and understanding of the real facts of the situation, Pakistan thought it fit to sever diplomatic relations with Malaysia, simply because their representative in the Security Council presented what appeared to be the correct situation. We should view it in that light, and that shows to what extent Pakistan can go in her international behaviour, and how she cannot tolerate the opinion of those countries who, after understanding the facts correctly, give their opinion. They have not got even this much of international conduct and behaviour, which is the minimum that is expected from any member of the United Nations. That, on merely coming to the conclusion that another country does not agree with them, they should resort to

this rather unusual step of severing diplomatic relations is something which cannot be too strongly condemned.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is Pakistan's loss, we need not be sorry.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is Pakistan's loss, and no one is sorry for Pakistan's loss, but at the same time, all countries, including Pakistan, should from time to time be reminded that all of us have got certain obligations to the international community. Any slipping away from that is a matter which should be noticed and condemned, should be taken note of. We should not gloss over these things. Malaysia is unfortunately facing confrontation with Indonesia and that confrontation still continues. We have always extended our full sympathy and support in this confrontation and it is our earnest hope that the normal adherence to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs of other countries which is expected from all countries would be respected by Indonesia. Indonesia itself is going through a turmoil and I will not say much about it. It is earnestly hoped that in this confrontation Malaysia whose cause is just and right will come out of these difficulties and play its rightful role in Southeast Asia and in the comity of nations. Singapore has emerged as a free country and we had the privilege of welcoming the Deputy Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and the Minister of Education of that government. We have from the very beginning taken a very friendly interest in the welfare and strengthening of these new States. We sponsored their admission into the Afro-Asian conference and we will continue to take interest in a friendly manner in strengthening the new State of Singapore. Both these countries have special significance from our point of view and both of them are following democratic methods; besides they are also both multi-racial and multi-religious societies . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Multi-lingual also.

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . Yes, multi-lingual also as my hon. friend opposite points out. This experience of working a democracy successfully and of a society which is multi-racial, multi-lingual and multi-religious is a great experience and a great objective that we have set before us in our own country. This identity of views, apart from our close relationship and understanding are other factors that bind us and we wish them all well.

Mention had been made by some hon. Members that we should develop closer relations with other countries of Asia and in this region. That has always been our endeavour. Two countries were specifically mentioned in this connection besides others, namely, Japan and Australia.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Israel also.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am talking of Southeast Asia. Let us have some level of importance while bracketing these countries. Japan and Australia are important countries of this region and we have very friendly relations with both these countries. We have strong economic ties and we are trying to develop even more strongly our relations with these two countries. There are other countries also in the region, countries in the former Indo-China region. We are functioning there as the Chairman of the International Control Commission and the Laotian representatives in all the international gatherings including the United Nations have always been showing a great deal of understanding about our conflict with both China and Pakistan.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Malaysia too.

Shri Swaran Singh: I have said a great deal about Malaysia and Prof. Ranga probably came late. He is generally late when important things are being discussed.

Sir, it is one thing to develop friendly relations, close relations, relations of understanding, in the economic field and the rest. But a suggestion had also been made, perhaps indirectly, that

[Shri Swaran Singh]

some sort of security arrangements might also be worked out. In that connection, let us not forget that the pattern of military pacts which was very much in vogue about 10 or 11 years ago itself has miserably failed at the present moment, and there are distinct signs of the pacts crumbling not only in Southeast Asia but also the European pacts known as the NATO pact and even the Warsaw pact. I do not want to go into the details; these pacts had already been mentioned on earlier occasions, but in the present situation, both amongst the NATO countries, the latest attitude of the various NATO countries in several respects, the attitude of France in several respects, the relationship between Turkey and Greece over Cyprus—both of them being NATO countries—all these are factors which point the direction in which the world is moving in respect of these pacts. Members of the pact countries themselves are trying to find some way of either formally getting out of those pacts or taking attitudes which are obviously inconsistent with those pacts. Take the case of Turkey, Iran or even Pakistan. They have of late been taking such attitudes, trying at any rate to publicly take postures although we know as to what value should be attached to those postures. We know that most of these postures by Pakistan are meant to delude and deceive others at present, just as in retrospect, when they entered into those pacts, they were trying to deceive those others with whom they had entered into the pacts; now, when they are thinking of leaving those pacts and are wooing others, they are trying to deceive another group of people. We know it because we know Pakistan a little more than many other countries. But at this stage, what I am referring to is that even those countries who started these pacts, who remained actually the signatories to those pacts, themselves are having second thoughts both about the effectiveness of the pacts and also about the responsibility in relation to those pacts.

In Southeast Asia or NATO itself,

Pakistan is a member of both these pacts, and in this conflict, bilaterally Pakistan may have got some help from some countries on a bilateral basis, but in Pakistan's conflict, Pakistan could not take any advantage of any pact. So, we have to view the whole situation in this context. We have always taken the view that any formal entry into any military pact of this nature creates a situation which detracts from the freedom of action in the developing situation which might be available to a country. India, on account of her importance, her historical role, her urge for freedom and the great desire to keep a consensus even in our own country—because there should be some national purpose when we pursue these policies—we had taken a decision that we should not enter into any pact but should retain our freedom of action by remaining non-aligned. And in retrospect, whether in peace or even in time of conflict, our adherence to this policy of non-alignment has not only enabled us to keep our head high and enabled us to demonstrate to the world that we can stand on our own legs

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . but even for an enlightened self-interest, there could not be any other arrangement which would have yielded results that had actually been achieved even at the time of this conflict. I would like to remind the House that when we were engaged in this conflict with Pakistan, resulting from Pakistan's aggression on our territory, and China threatened us by issuing highly provocative notes, both the United States of America and the Soviet Union gave a clear warning to China that any country intervening in this conflict between Pakistan and India would be adding fuel to the fire and, that warning, to a large extent, must have acted as a deterrent besides the unity and the determination that our country showed at that time. We could not expect this type of action, this type of very clear attitude by the two main super-powers—the United States of America and the Soviet Union

—if we were members of any military pact or this bloc or that bloc.

Then again, even in the matter of increasing our defence potential, in the matter of our going ahead with our manufacturing programme of various materials that are required to strengthen our defence and also in the acquisition of the armaments or military hardware, the fact that we were not aligned really helped us a great deal, and we were therefore not placed in any position in which our sources of supply were linked only to one country or to one source. I would only request the hon. Members—I am not quoting that as something which should be accepted but something which should indicate—to glance through certain parts of the speech of President Ayub which he delivered in this connection, where he himself has said that even for Pakistan, according to him, it was a mistake to depend on only one source for the supply of his military hardware. Whatever may be the correctness or incorrectness of that, this is the whole situation that we should view and not jump to hasty conclusions. While we find ourselves in a difficult position, sometimes easy solutions occur, bright ideas occur, but we should resist the temptation of accepting those ideas or these new things just at their face value, but should try to scrutinise and go to the basic situation that we will face, if we were to align ourselves with one or the other group. We have to take all possible steps to strengthen ourselves, and in this, there is the unanimous opinion of all sections of the House. That is the one burning thing which is uppermost in the minds of all our countrymen today. And in pursuit of that policy, we should take the maximum advantage from all possible sources to strengthen our economy, to strengthen our defence potential and internally also to become strong and united. Those are the real things that are of the highest importance and howsoever we might feel that others might save us—marginally they

might—let us not forget that essentially this is a burden that we will have to bear and we will have to defend our freedom ourselves. For that we should be prepared to undergo both difficulties and sacrifices.

It is in that context that we have to view whatever attitude we take and it will not be wise, if I may say so without entering into any controversy on this issue, to tie ourselves down, at this present stage of our situation in this very complicated world, to any security arrangements of the type which had been suggested by some hon. Members.

12.59 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

While referring to the countries which have shown a great deal of understanding about our viewpoint, I would like to make mention of the recent tour of our President when he visited some friendly countries. He was good enough to visit certain countries after our conflict with Pakistan. He visited Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Ethiopia. I am sure I am voicing the feelings of our countrymen and of all sections of the House in extending our thanks and appreciation to the people of those countries who extended a very warm welcome to our President. The visits were very useful and the talks he had with the leaders showed that there was a great deal of understanding of our problems, specifically about our attitude on Kashmir. The joint communiques that had been issued at the ends of the visits, particularly after the visits to Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia clearly show that those countries understood our position on Kashmir and extended all sympathy and support to India.

13 hrs.

I would also like to mention in this connection the support that we have been receiving from Cyprus on our

[Shri Swaran Singh]

attitude. I am mentioning this because sometimes when we find ourselves in a difficult position, we fall into a rather unfortunate mood of saying that the whole world is opposed to us and we have no friends. That is not correct and we should not view our position in that perspective at all.

A large number of hon. members made mention about the Arab world. I have no intention to say much on that, because the Prime Minister did make a reference to this very briefly in his speech yesterday. But as hon. members are again reminding me of that, I would like to take this opportunity of clarifying the factual position and give my appreciation of the situation. It will not be correct to say that the Arab countries have not understood our position correctly or to say that in our attitude to Arab countries, we have depended on any one country. We have got diplomatic relations with all Arab countries. I am sorry one of the hon. members said—I do not know wherefrom he got this information—that all the ambassadors we send to Arab countries are Muslims. That is not correct. We have got more than 11 or 12 ambassadors in Arab countries and only four are Muslims, although we have never considered it from that point of view at all. It is the suitability of the ambassador for any particular country that has been the guiding factor. It is unfortunate that any such suggestions should have been made on the floor of the House.

There are certain Arab countries which have not shown an understanding of our case. I myself when I spoke at the commencement of this debate made a reference to Jordan and their attitude in the Security Council. We have some information that another Arab country has either extended or is likely to extend sizeable foreign exchange credit to Pakistan to enable them to purchase certain armaments.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Saudi Arabia?

Shri Swaran Singh: That cannot be regarded as a friendly act. But to say that Arab countries as such do not understand our position is not correct. I would appeal to the hon. members that while we are discussing the attitudes taken by sovereign countries, even though we may not be quite happy about their attitudes, we should resist the temptation of clubbing all of them together, unless, of course, there is some definite evidence to that effect. Some hon. members have replied to that criticism, but I would like to supplement it. There are several Arab countries which understand our position. For one thing, they know fully well—although appeals have been made to certain Arab countries in the name of religion—that Kashmir question is not a religious question from that point of view. They are fully aware that there are only 2½ million Muslims in Kashmir out of a total population of over 50 million Muslims in the country, i.e., only 5 per cent of the total Muslim population in India. Therefore, to take an attitude on Kashmir on the basis of religion is not factually correct nor is it in their (Muslims) interest even if it is looked at from a religious angle. This is known to the Arab countries and I myself had an opportunity of discussing this with several foreign ministers from Arab countries who happened to be in the U.N. They understood our position quite correctly.

On earlier occasions, whether it is the question of Palestine refugees or the question of equitable division of Jordanian river waters or the Suez crisis, India took a line which was the correct line to take. It will not be correct to say that in our relationship with Arab countries, we have depended upon one country or we have adopted an attitude which is not appreciated and understood by the Arab countries. I am sorry some hon. members made special mention

about President Nasser. It is no secret that in Casablanca, it was mainly his efforts that resulted in the Arab Conference taking an impartial attitude on this question. Even in the Security Council, UAR's position has always been that this is a matter essentially between Pakistan and India—the question of Kashmir—and anything that is not mutually acceptable to the two countries is not acceptable to UAR and any interference from outside will not lead to any settlement. So, let us not try to misrepresent the situation. Our efforts for the freedom of certain Arab countries from colonialism and all those things are not forgotten. We should continue to pursue our policy of friendship with the Arab countries.

In certain Arab countries themselves, there are some extreme reactionary movements, based purely on religion, who think that the governments there are not, according to the criteria of those extremist parties. Those countries are facing the same type of problems which we in a secular democracy face from certain extreme sections of opinion in our country. We should appreciate this position and try to encourage liberal forces rather than be swept away into taking attitudes on extreme positions.

Amongst the Afro-Asian countries, it is no doubt correct that in certain African countries, Pakistan has been able to create confusion on the basis of the principle of self-determination and certain countries have easily, without close scrutiny of the facts of the situation, feel attracted to this principle of self-determination, which is essentially a principle for liberation from colonial rule. But the extension of this principle to parts of a country is something which is not accepted by anybody. Otherwise, there would be chaos in many countries. When this position is explained to them, it is bound to change their attitude. It has already changed and it is likely to change the attitude of several

other countries. We have to continue our efforts in this respect. We have to take persistent and patient steps. . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What have our Missions in those countries been doing all these years?

Shri Swaran Singh: Our Missions are doing a good work and it will now be supplemented by the visit of special envoys and Members of Parliament from all sections of the House.

Sir, a mention has been made, in this connection, that our publicity arrangements are not adequate. Now, it is true that publicity arrangements do require strengthening both here as well as abroad, and I would like to assure the House that we ourselves are very conscious of this. There is the complaint of certain foreign correspondents also, which was mentioned sometime back here in the House, that adequate facilities are not given. I hope that we will be able to make proper arrangements to straighten this all out. We have already taken some steps. We have increased and improved our communication with several of our missions. We have installed teleprinters so that important news and publicity material are sent to them immediately. Then, the material is produced in the languages of those countries. Now we are producing material in more than a dozen languages; more could be done and should be done.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Did they have no teleprinters so far?

Shri Swaran Singh: There are teleprinters in several of them, in a very large number of countries. We are now extending this to several other countries. Therefore, we ourselves are conscious of making better arrangements for publicity, but I would like to support some of the observations that were made by some hon. Members.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: From the Opposition?

Shri Swaran Singh: Both the Opposition as well as from this side, because this is not a controversial subject, I hope. It is no doubt correct that we have to intensify our efforts to improve our publicity and do everything possible, but let us not forget that publicity will play a marginal role and the attitude of the countries will not be capable of alteration just by producing good publicity material. Certain wrong ideas or wrong information they may have can be corrected, but it has been our unfortunate experience that certain countries who cannot say that they are not well informed about the conditions in our country, or that they are not aware of what is happening in the country, or, what are the broad facts of the situation, they have taken an attitude which they thought they wanted to take. Any amount of publicity in those countries, probably, will not alter the facts of the situation. That we have to deal with in some other way, publicity alone perhaps will not do, and with all the publicity there will be certain spheres where simply by reading a fine presentation of any case we will not convince the people just as we do not always react very favourably if we have got a particular attitude on a particular subject, merely because we find something which is presented to us in any fine form or good form. Publicity is important but publicity is not the full answer, and it will be wrong, therefore, to argue in reverse that those countries whose attitude is not favourable to us show a lack of understanding—on account of lack of publicity. There may be other reasons. We have to go into those other reasons, which is also our duty and responsibility, and do our best to clarify our position and make those countries see our viewpoint. If in spite of that they do not agree, we should get reconciled to it and try to take other steps.

Something has been said about our representation at the diplomatic level and the functioning of the Ministry. I would like to say that, by and large,

we have diplomatic representatives who have done their jobs reasonably well. But what should be the best way of strengthening this either at the headquarters or in the missions is a matter which receives constant attention. We have appointed, as the House is aware, a committee which is going into all this organisational aspect. What should be the best way of strengthening the foreign service, their training programmes, their sources of recruitment and all that is being gone into by that committee.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How long will the committee take?

Shri Swaran Singh: The committee is not likely to take very long, and I would like to say that the committee is not one which would like to unnecessarily prolong it because the members are not getting any allowance. We are not spending any money on that. That is a general temptation which, probably, some members have, that when the work is not finished they generally say that the members want to prolong the work because they are getting allowances and salaries.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is rather unfair.

Shri Swaran Singh: That is not an inhibiting factor, fortunately, in this case, and perhaps the hon. Member is deprived of one argument which he generally puts forward in such cases. We are hoping that the committee, which is very earnestly devoting its attention to this problem, will make a worthwhile report, and we intend to derive benefit from this. In the meantime, I would earnestly appeal that the work that is being undertaken by our diplomatic missions in countries abroad and also at the headquarters is not an easy work, particularly in view of the very complicated situation that faces our country, and while we are perfectly justified in pointing out the shortcomings and in suggesting improvements let us be careful in making our observa-

tions lest we shake the morale of the services and try to create a situation in which they may have a certain hesitation or certain reluctance to take decisions and to go ahead with their programme and line of action.

I would now refer to one or two specific points which have been urged in the course of the debate. Some hon. Members have suggested about the position of the Commonwealth and our membership of the Commonwealth. Sir, Shri Frank Anthony, in a very remarkable speech, yesterday, gave the Indian public reaction to what has been appearing in the newspapers in U.K. and the general attitude that has been adopted there. Several other hon. Members also have spoken in the same strain. But we should always keep in mind that the Commonwealth is not essentially or principally a British concept. If we look at the composition of the Commonwealth today, there are a large number of African countries and there are Asian countries. Even our friendly countries like Malaysia and Singapore are members of this. We have got several African countries who are members of this. We had very useful discussions at the time of the last Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference about the Rhodesian issue and about several other issues. So, whatever final decision or attitude we take, whereas we should continue to express concern at the lack of understanding—to express it very mildly—shown by the U.K. Government on this occasion of conflict between India and Pakistan, on this issue of continuance in Commonwealth it is a matter which is not bilateral between us and U.K., there are several other friendly member countries from Africa and Asia and any attitude that we take on this should be based on those wider considerations rather than that we should take a decision in a huff on account of these bilateral relations that, unfortunately, are not too good at the present moment. It is also hoped that this strong feeling voiced in the Parliament and voiced in the

country, will induce the right-thinking people even in U.K. to correctly appraise and appreciate the situation. Already there are some signs that there is some change in their attitude (Interruption).

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Nobody expects this Government to leave the Commonwealth.

Shri Swaran Singh: Therefore, we should look at the commonwealth from that point of view rather than on this bilateral basis. Regarding our neighbours Pakistan and China, the Prime Minister has covered the entire ground. So, it is not my intention to say anything more about them.

I would like to finish by referring only to one other matter. The question of suppression of freedom and fundamental rights of Tibetans is a matter in which we are extending full support in the United Nations when this subject is likely to come up there. We had expressed great concern at the situation that prevails there.

I think I have tried to cover the salient points in the debate and I have attempted to give Government's reaction on issues which are of greater importance. I know that if I had more time I could have referred to more matters. I would finish by saying that among the several substitute motions that have been moved I accept substitute motion No. 1 and I oppose all others.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, on a point of clarification. The Minister made a lucid speech but, has practically shied away—I do not know why—from the very mention of Israel. I had mentioned it. Is the Government still holding rigidly to its antediluvian view that it is impossible to have friendly relations with both Arab States and Israel, as many European and Asian countries are having?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no antediluvian view. We have followed a certain policy and it is our intention to continue to follow that policy.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The point is different. Perhaps, he has not understood my point, I am sorry to say. Is it impossible to have friendly relations with both Arab States and Israel?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद)
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक प्रश्न पूछने कीजिये हमेशा की यह परम्परा रही है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका भाषण बहुत लम्बा हुआ चुका है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : लम्बा होते हुए भी वैदेशिक कार्य मन्त्रों कोई धरसर नहीं पड़ा है । इसलिये एक सवाल पूछने कीजिये, जैसे धारों का पूछने बत है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does any hon. Member want his substitute motion to be put to the vote separately?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We want our substitute motions to be voted first.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister is accepting substitute motion No. 1. There are other disapproval and suggestion motions. I want to know whether any of them want their motions to be put to the vote separately.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): I think the correct procedure is to put the first amendment first and then the rest.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to put the suggestion motions first, then disapproval motions and then the substitute motions. Now I am putting suggestion motions Nos. 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18, 20 and 21 to the vote of the House.

The substitute motions Nos. 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18, 20 and 21 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I will take up disapproval motions. I will first take disapproval motion No. 2 of Shri Madhu Limaye and put it to the vote of the House.

The substitute motion No. 2 was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I will put to the vote the other disapproval motions, namely, Nos. 4, 6 and 9.

The substitute motions Nos. 4, 6 and 9 were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I will put to the vote substitute motion No. 1, accepted by the Government. The question is:

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

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

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 5]

[13:28 hrs.

AYES

Ahul Rashid, Bakhshi
Alta, Shri A. S.
Aney, Dr. M. S.
Arunachalam, Shri

Bakhtwal, Shri
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Barman Shri P. C.
Basumatari, Shri

Baswant, Shri
Batra, Shri
Bhagwati, Shri

Bhanja Deo, Shri L. N.	Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini	Ray, Shrimati Renuka
Bisr, Shri J. B. S.	Manasa, Shri	Reddar, Shri
Braichwar Prasad, Shri	Mamtri, Shri D. D.	Reddy, Shri Lings
Chandrabhan Singh, Shri	Masuriya Din, Shri	Reddy, Shri R. Surender
Chaturvedi, Shri S. N.	Matcharaju, Shri	Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Chaudhry, Shri Chandremani Lal	Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra	Sadhu Ram, Shri
Chaudhuri, Shri Sachindra	Mehdi, Shri S. A.	Saha, Dr. S. K.
Chavan, Shri D. R.	Mehta, Shri J. R.	Saha, Shri Rameshwar
Chavda, Shrimati Joraben]	Mehta, Shri Jashvant	Saigal, Shri A. S.
Dafle, Shri	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Samanta, Shri S. C.
Das, Shri B. K.	Mohammad Yusuf, Shri	Sanata, Shri Nardoo
Das, Shri Sudhansu	Morarka, Shri	Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.	More, Shri K. L.	Shakuntala Devi, Shrimati
Dighe, Shri	Muhammad Ismail, Shri	Shan Nath, Shri
Geekwad, Shri Patehsinhrao	Mukane, Shri	Shankaraiya, Shri
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri	Murthy, Shri B. S.	Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Ganapati Ram, Shri	Muthiah, Shri	Sheo Narain, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V. B.	Naik, Shri Maheshwar	Shinde, Shri
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan	Naskar, Shri P. S.	Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Hem Rai, Shri	Nigam, Shrimati Savitri	Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati
Himatsingka, Shri	Oza, Shri	Singh, Shri D. N.
Iqbal Singh, Shri	Pande, Shri K. N.	Singh, Shri K. K.
Jadhav, Shri M. L.	Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath	Singh, Shri S. T.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati	Parashar, Shri	Singha, Shri G. K.
Jedhe, Shri	Patel, Shri Man Singh P.	Subharaman, Shri
Jena, Shri	Patil, Shri T. A.	Subramanyam, Shri T.
Jha, Shri Yogendra	Prabhakar, Shri Naval	Sumat Prasad, Shri
Jyotishi, Shri J. P.	Pratap Singh, Shri	Surya Prasad, Shri
Karuthiruman, Shri	Raghunath Singh, Shri	Swaran Singh, Shri
Keishing, Shri Rishang	Rai, Shrimati Suhodra Bai	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Khanna, Shri P. K.	Rajdeo Singh, Shri	Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Kinder Lal, Shri	Raju, Shri D. B.	Tula Ram, Shri
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar	Rane, Shri	Uikey, Shri
Kureel, Shri B. N.	Rao, Shri Muthyal	Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
Lahtan Chaudhry, Shri	Rao, Shri Ramteharwar	Valvi, Shri
Lalit Sen, Shri		Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Laskar, Shri N. R.		Verma, Shri Balgovind
Lonikar, Shri		Virbhadra Singh, Shri
		Yadav, Shri N. P.

NOES

Bade, Shri	Kachhavaia, Shri Hukam Chand	Mahanan-la, Shri
Banerjee, Shri S. M.	Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu	Masani, Shri M. R.
Barua, Shri Hem	Kanjappa, Shri S.	Seshiyao, Shri
Basant Kunwari, Shrimati	Kanur Singh, Shri	Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal	Kripalani, Shri J. B.	Singh, Shri Y. D.
Bheel, Shri P. H.	Krishnapal Singh, Shri	Singha, Shri Y. N.
Chaudhuri, Shri Trilob Kumar	Lahri Singh, Shri	Singhvi, Dr. L. M.
Danicker, Shri N.	Lakshmi Bhawani, Shri	Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Deo, Shri P. K.	Limaye, Shri Madhu	Utiya, Shri
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati	Lohia, Dr. Ram Manohar	Yajnik, Shri
		Yashpal Singh, Shri

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee: Sir, my The result, as recorded by the machine, is : Ayes 123; Noes 31.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is noted.

The motion was adopted.