

Mr. Speaker: May I request the hon. Members who are in favour of 'No' to kindly stand in their seats?

There are 30 Members who are against it. Now, those who are in favour of it may kindly stand in their seats.

I find a great majority are in favour of it.

So, the motion is adopted.

Shri Kishen Pattnayak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I walk out.

15 hrs.

(Shri Kishen Pattnayak then left the House)

Mr. Speaker: In obedience to the decision taken by the House, राम सेवक यादव, मनी राम बागड़ी और बी० एन० मण्डल। संविधान के आर्टिकल ८७ के अधीन १८ फ़रवरी, १९६३ को एक साथ समवेत संसद् की दोनों सभाओं के सामने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के दौरान आप के आचरण को सभा ने नामुनासिब, गौरवहीन और एक संसद् सदस्य के लिए अशोभनीय तथा प्रचलित परिपाटी के विपरीत और उस महान अवसर के प्रतिकूल ठहराया है। आप के आचरण की जांच करने के लिए नियुक्त की गई समिति को आप ने जिस प्रकार के बयान प्रस्तुत किये हैं, उन से आप के अपराध की गुरुता और बढ़ गई है।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के दौरान आप के इस नामुनासिब, गौरवहीन और अशोभनीय आचरण के लिए और बाद में आप के आचरण की जांच करने की लिए नियुक्त की गई समिति के सामने आप ने जो बयान दिये हैं, जिन से आप के अपराध की गुरुता और बढ़ गई है, उस के लिए मैं सभा की ओर से आपका वाकफ़ाइन करता हूँ।
I might read it in English also.

Ram Sewak Yadav, Mani Ram Bagri and B. N. Mandal. The House

has adjudged your conduct during the President's Address to both Houses of Parliament assembled together under Article 87 of the Constitution on the 18th February, 1963, as undesirable, undignified and unbecoming of a Member of Parliament and contrary to the usage and derogatory to the dignity of the occasion. This offence of yours was further aggravated by the nature of the statements you chose to submit to the Committee appointed to investigate your conduct.

In the name of the House, I reprimand you for this undesirable, undignified and unbecoming conduct during the President's Address and for subsequently aggravating your offence by your evidence before the Committee appointed to investigate your conduct.

15.04 hrs.

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: We now take up the other business: the Budget (General). Dr. Sarojini Mahishi was in possession of the House.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): When will the Prime Minister reply?

Mr. Speaker: At 4 O'clock, the Prime Minister would reply.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Only two hours are left out of 8 hours.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): The time that the Prime Minister will take will be outside the time allotted.

Mr. Speaker: That was only for the Budget allotment: not during this. There is some misunderstanding about it.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta—South-West): Two and a quarter hours are left.

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday, we sat 15 minutes late. Probably he does not know.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi (Dharwar North): Sir, in spite of our policy of non-alignment or rather because of that, we have been able to get the sympathy and help of the countries in the west and also in the east, help in the form of machinery, in the form of raw materials, in the form of technical know-how for the expansion and modernisation of our defence production. Democracy is the way of life that we have accepted and this policy of non-alignment is only a means to an end and not an end in itself. It is only a means that we have chosen. Had we not tried to reach our economic aspirations, had we not tried to see that democracy takes a deep root in this country, could it have been ever possible for us to create such a feeling, such a deep sense of democracy and the sort of democratic institutions that we have in this country? Could we have for defending the security of democracy in our country earned the goodwill and the strength of the other countries? It would never have been possible. Therefore, this policy of non-alignment, even though it meets with certain criticisms from different corners, has been a success, even though it is now passing through the trial period.

The two burning problems that are confronting India today are the Chinese invasion and our border problems with Pakistan. The Chinese invasion and the subsequent unilateral withdrawal and then the impasse created by them on the border—these are quite in conformity with the Chinese tactics and with the pattern that they have been following through the ages. A Member from the opposition remarked that on account of this, India has been isolated. I do not know how he gathered this impression. On the contrary, it is India which has

been able to get sympathy and which has been able to get goodwill of a number of countries in the world whereas China has been isolated. The definition of isolation may be very different according to him. Different countries have expressed their good opinions as regards the attitude taken by India. The *Times* of Ceylon expressed that the stand of China is vague, verbose and that a smoke-screen is being created by the Chinese when the Chinese said that theirs was a positive response to the Colombo proposals. The *Times* of Vietnam criticised, quoting Khrushchev that it is the Hitlerist tendency of the Chinese towards India and not a sign of Marxism.

15.08 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *In the Chair*]

So many other distinguished people have remarked that India has been invaded by the aggressor China in an unprovoked way. The Nobel prize winner Pearl Buck remarked that this war of Chinese invasion and unilateral withdrawal..... (Bell rings) I have spoken only for 5 minutes yesterday.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are four or five more speakers. They have to be given some time.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi:...the war and unilateral withdrawal and the subsequent deadlock created in the border is quite inkeeping with the pattern that the Chinese are following for centuries. Therefore, I wish to know how the hon. Member remarked that India is isolated.

Now, another problem that is confronting us today is the border dispute or negotiations that are going on between India and Pakistan. From the day when India was divided into two nations and we agreed for the creation of a nation within our country, that became a perennial source of trouble for us. In the light of the new agreement that has taken place between Pakistan and China all these

[Dr Sarojini Mahishi]

things are to be studied even though we find that certain by-products are issuing out of the main problem of negotiations between China and Pakistan.

As far as China is concerned, many people say that India was not prepared to meet the aggression and invasion which was there on the Indian border by China. How can any country be prepared for war unless it has got some aggressive intentions? A well known writer, more acquainted with the Chinese people and their manners says:

"There have been wars in China, wars between rebels and imperial forces, between the Chinese and the foreigners, between warlords and warlords, with very little breathing space between them. Those who are old enough to be veteran communists have, therefore, lived their whole lives through the dangers and privations of war and for them the few short intervals of peace could have only small formative influence on their mind."

In fact, war has been woven into the fabric of the mental make up of the Communist leaders.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude now. I am very sorry. Time is very short; I have to distribute whatever time is available between four more Members.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi: Our main attempt should be to strengthen our border areas. Today I read in the paper that the Communists in the district of Darjeeling are intensifying their activities and the Nepalese communists are giving their full support to these activities. (An hon. Member: Which is the paper?) It is in the *Indian Express*. Therefore, Sir, it is but proper now to see that the various developmental activities and also defence activities are strengthened in these areas.

I would like to refer to one more point and then conclude my speech. Mr. Nath Pai yesterday remarked that India possibly depends upon the rifts that might be created between U.S.S.R. and U.S.A: Is it his inference that India gambles with possibilities? Is it ever in the history of India that it has gambled with possibilities? The international developments that are taking place, for example, the spirit of unity created in the distant east on account of the Cuban affair and the solution of the problem of disarmament and nuclear tests etc., are creating a new atmosphere in the country in the international sphere. We have to think of our problems also in the light of the new developments in the country. He referred yesterday, Sir, to a particular verse in the Gita. Bhagavad Gita is the book which is most exhaustive and deals with so many things and may be interpreted in a number of ways and the interpretations of different acharyas, Shankara, Madhya and Ramanuja, speak volumes of that. Therefore an interpretation can be made by any Member to suit his own convenience also.

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

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi: This is what the Gita says:

नष्टो मोहः स्मृतिर्नद्धा न्वन्प्रमादान्मया-
च्युत

I hope that he will interpret this in the light of this particular verse:

अशोच्यान्नवशोचस्त्वं प्रजावादादच भाषसे ।
गतामृतगतामृदच नानुशोचन्ति पण्डिताः ॥

I don't wish to engage myself in the eulogies or in the deification of our Prime Minister, but we cannot at the same time ignore that his magnanimous personality has wielded a great influence in the international sphere. We have got our own his-

tory; we have made history and we do not simply read history. We have got our own culture. We want to stick to democracy and we want to stick to our basic policy of non-alignment. We shall survive with our own history, culture and prestige.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Singhvi. 10 minutes each.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): I would request some time more. I am the only speaker on behalf of my group. Ours is one of the largest groups in the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. I have to accommodate three or four more people.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, a large variety of subjects have been dealt with by the hon. Members who preceded me and I should like to desist from repeating, reiterating or re-emphasising what has been said by them.

The discussions on External Affairs Ministry are necessarily focussed on policies as well as the performance of the Ministry of External Affairs. Sir, our policies are crystallised over a long period of time and it would be quite rash to abandon them lock, stock and barrel in a fit of fright or panic. These policies however, it is true, have not been an unmixed blessing for us, but then, nothing in this complex world is either an unmixed blessing or an unrelieved curse. It should be our consolation also that there are several things to show on the credit side of the ledger in the policy of non-alignment which has paid to this nation considerable dividends. What is necessary at this time is not a partisan condemnation of this policy, but an insistence that this policy should receive a positive reorientation of approach in the light of experience which has necessitated an agonizing reappraisal of a past which unfortunately has been impelled by an unwitting dependence and reliance on people we could not inherently help.

I hope that this agonizing reappraisal has forced upon us a greater sense

of caution and a greater sense of realism in our thinking on international affairs. I had occasion to submit, Sir, that the foreign policy, in order to be effective, and in the long-range as well as the short-range, must be aware of a general consciousness of objectives and directions. It should also be fully mindful of the current and compelling exigencies which confront the nation. For, if it is not conscious of the general conception or direction it would tend to be blind, if it is not quite mindful of what ought to be done in response to current exigencies it would be lame. In ignoring these two criteria a foreign policy would tend to be either blind or lame or both.

I submit, Sir, that there is a shift which is observable in the foreign policy of this country inasmuch as it is in actual fact steadily receiving a reorientation. I think that our foreign policy cannot afford to be either lame or blind because we must continue to have the use of our foreign policy as an adequate instrument of our national aspirations and needs and because we must continue to play a vital role in the councils of the world in building a new order, a new world order, which is struggling to be born.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I feel that ours cannot be a hand-to-mouth policy. Ours cannot be a policy of mere moral shibboleths either. In this perspective of things I should like to express the hope that the distinguished Prime Minister will strive to round up and to strike at the many persisting angularities of approach in our foreign policy, in order to bring it in line with the experience we have had recently.

To particularise what I have said, I would like the hon. Prime Minister to give this House an assurance that the delegation of this country at the United Nations would not canvass and canvass the case of the People's Republic of China for admission to the United Nations. I would like the

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

Prime Minister to reassure this House that none of the pointless inhibitions which have been magnified out of all proportion would deter our seeking aid in a massive measure from friendly foreign countries. I would like, Sir, the Prime Minister to tell us how he proposes to counter and deal with the insidious propaganda by the perfidious Chinese and how he proposes to win the sympathy and the support of the chancelleries of the world, because, many of us have watched with considerable sense of regret that our stock has not always been very high even in some of those countries whose independence we had helped to actualise. There is reason to believe that our case has not been put forward with as much competence and as much efficacy as it should have been put before the Governments of some of the Afro-Asian countries.

Sir, the Chinese have been spreading all sorts of lies and have been misrepresenting our whole position in international affairs. I feel that what has been said about external publicity is quite valid and correct because it has proved to be unequal to the task which it has been called upon to perform. At the same time, I think, there is need, now greater than ever, for our diplomacy to rise equal to the task that is confronting us as an embattled nation.

I would like in this context to press upon the Government the desirability of adopting a more critical and a more cautious attitude towards Chinese front organisations or organisations which sail under different kinds of dubious banners like the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference and to adopt a position which does not spread and disseminate the impression that they have support and patronage of our Government.

Sir, those who swear by the so-called impending chasm or breach between Russia and China are, I think, unwitting victims of their own wishful

thinking. I think it should be quite clear to us, that we cannot build our foreign policy on such slender and vague foundations. It must be quite clear to us that this breach which is much advertised in advance is not around the corner, and I think that those who have been proclaiming this impending breach would now find that their calculations have perhaps been upset by the news that there is an impending summit meeting between the leaders of these two countries.

I think that we must also remember that the very foundation of Chinese industrialisation and economy is Russian assistance, and if that is not enough we must also remember that the Chinese dragon depends on Russian fuel to spit fire. This has been the background of the situation, and any realistic reappraisal of the situation would necessarily lead us to the conclusion that every step we take must be very cautious and we must not be swept merely by wishful thinking. I think that the most dilemmatic problem which confronts us as a nation is the possibility that the Chinese may develop atomic devices in the foreseeable future. I should like the Prime Minister to tell us how he proposes to cope with this problem which may not be too far in the future and how he intends to meet this peril the likelihood of which cannot be ruled out.

I think in this connection that my anxiety is legitimately heightened by the fact that China is today ruled by a military hierarchy which has shown by its conduct that it is trigger-happy, and that it is warlike, and because the ruling political pantheon in that country has time and again proclaimed its adherence to the principle of inevitable total confrontation and war between the two blocs in this world. I hope that the Prime Minister would be able to tell us what action, what measures and what steps Government propose to take to meet

this eventuality of Chinese acquiring atomic weapons.

I should like to welcome the recent declaration by the Dalai Lama of a new constitution giving unto his people the liberties and freedoms which we so much value in our own country. It helps to remind us that the gallant and the long-suffering people of Tibet are held in a cruel bondage. It also serves to remind us that one of the most cruel genocides was practised in Tibet upon the people of Tibet by the Chinese Government. If we have to hold aloft the banner of human rights, we cannot allow, and we cannot afford to let, the cause of the Tibetans to go by default. I should like in this connection to remind the House that the International Commission of Jurists had given an unequivocal finding to the effect that the Chinese have been wantonly guilty of paracitising genocide in Tibet, and that is a finding which deserves our respect and which should persuade us to take something of a positive step in the direction of engaging international attention in the matter.

15.23 hrs

[SHRI KHADILKAR in the Chair]

I am sorry to say that the External Affairs Ministry has not responded to the crying need of economy and austerity. I looked in vain in the Ministry's report to find an indication of what measures the Ministry proposes to take to bring about greater austerity and economy in the working of this Ministry. I have looked in vain in the statement laid before this House by the Finance Minister on the 24th January, 1963, which gives the details of the economy measures proposed or already adopted by different Ministries. The External Affairs Ministry's report says a few things at page 2 regarding rationalisation of the methods of work and connected matters, but says precious little about the observance of economy which is the pressing need of our country.

I should like to comment very briefly on the unprecedented rise in the number of professional diplomats in the Foreign Service of this country. I do not think that the Prime Minister was right when he said that the performance of the non-official diplomats can be quite disappointing. I think I understood him to say that this has been the case. Well, there is a large number of very distinguished non-official diplomats who have acquitted themselves with great credit and with great success for the cause of their respective countries. I should like the Prime Minister to look into the matter and to consider whether he cannot secure a greater association of non-officials in this respect.

In this connection, I should like also to express my regret that the Indian Delegations to the UN have also become close preserves of partisan patronage. I find from statement laid on the Table of the House that invariably the delegates have been from the Congress Party. The Prime Minister has time and again preached to us that there should be a certain unity of approach in matters of foreign policy. But that unity of approach cannot be achieved if patronage is distributed on a partisan basis.

Shri Ranga: Let us make it clear that we do not want any of their patronage.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It is not from that point of view but from the point of view of principle.

I would like to say that our foreign intelligence is in a bad way. It is lackadaisical, it is incompetent, it is ill-fated, and it is ill-organised. I should like to say that it has proved wholly unequal to the task we would have expected of it.

The same can be said of our external publicity which has shown itself to be helter-skelter, and which has suffered from abstemious isolationism and lack of imagination, lack of resilience and lack of life.

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

I would like in the end to make a plea that Goa, Daman and Diu, Pondicherry and the Naga Hills Area should be taken out of the tutelage of the External Affairs Ministry. I do not think that it looks good.

It does not behove us to continue the tutelage of the External Affairs Ministry over subjects and territories which are essentially of intranational character.

In conclusion, I would like to make a plea for greater research and greater awareness and study of international law in our universities. Of this there has been precious little. I made an enquiry from the External Affairs Ministry as to what legal research had been done on outer space, and I was happy to find that some beginning has been made, but the co-operation of the academicians and the co-operation of those who can contribute very fruitfully to interantional law problems has not been fully enlisted. I would like to express the hope that this would be done in a fuller measure in the future.

Mr. Chairman: Shri U. M. Trivedi. May I point out that he will have only ten minutes?

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mansaur): I shall sit down rather than speak in that case. I am entitled to 30 minutes. My party has not spoken at all. I shall rather sit down if I am going to have only ten minutes.

Mr. Chairman: I have to accommodate three or four more speakers.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: My time cannot be curtailed. I would most emphatically submit this that I was not allowed an opportunity to speak so far.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Why only ten minutes in his case?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The Prime Minister may kindly reply after I have

spoken. I cannot be deprived of my opportunity to address the House. I shall curtail myself as much as possible, but I must be given the opportunity to speak.

Shri Ranga: From our group also somebody has to speak, and if you are going to give only ten minutes for the representative from our group also, then I would prefer not to have any speech made at all from our side. This is most unfair, and it is wrong.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me. The Prime Minister has to reply at 4 P.M.

Shri Ranga: The Prime Minister may take his own time. We have got to have our say. Otherwise, what is the use of the Prime Minister's speaking?

Mr. Chairman: I have got to accommodate three more speakers. So, I would request the hon. Members not to take more than ten minutes each.

Shri Ranga: The Prime Minister would certainly have his usual quota of time, but then we must have our time also.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I quite agree that the time may be very short, and I shall try my best to finish as early as possible.

Shri Nath Pal: Nobody has spoken from his party so far, and so he must get his due.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The question before us is how our foreign affairs are being dealt with. Let us take a bird's eye-view of the whole picture before us. In some countries we are vitally interested, inasmuch as our nationals are living there. Let us take for example, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, Nepal, South Africa, Kenya, Uganda, Portuguese East Africa, Zanzibar, Madagascar, Mauritius, and Fiji. Wherever our nationals are there in foreign countries, they have gone there by virtue of passports issued by our Government. Yet we follow a policy of some cowardly father who

cannot protect his children, whose children get beaten, and the father in the bargain, when complained about, beats the children again. We are oppressed in those countries. When we are oppressed and some of our countrymen clamour about it, out goes either our Ambassador or some Minister from here and gives them advice, 'discard Indian nationality; you accept the nationality of the country in which you are living'. I think such advice ill becomes a great nation. It should be enjoined upon our ambassadors that it should be their duty to protect the interests of the Indians as best as they can and not to give them advice to give up their nationality, nationality of a nation which wants to become great. It is most degrading for us to go and say something of that nature.

All over the world, whole movements of citizens take place from one country to another. After all, what are these embassies provided for? Their whole object is to see that the nationals of the particular country whose embassy exists in the other country get protection from it. If any ambassador fails to discharge that duty, I say that he does not deserve to remain in the Indian Mission there. He must be called back.

Then there is the question of the Indian Foreign Service. The Indian Foreign Service should not be a sort of 'steel' service. It is not meant to be like the ICS or IAS. It cannot have a single and singular type of work like that. Recruitment to it must not be on the same basis or method as that to the IAS or other services. I will, therefore, suggest that in recruitment to the foreign service, the age criterion must go. Public-spirited men, men with knowledge of the world must be recruited. I have come across some people working in Consulates. I have seen some of them. Young men without knowledge of geography are sent. Their knowledge of the geography of their own country is limited, and limited to a very great extent about the geography of foreign

lands. Talking with one of them in a train, I once enquired—he was going to America—if he knew what were the conditions nowadays in Gyuaquil. He just blinked. He could not understand where Gyuaquil is. From such people we do not expect proper representation of our country. Those who go as ambassadors of our country in foreign lands must be well-equipped in their knowledge; they must be well-equipped with the culture which they want to represent there. They must not be mere foreigners in foreign dress; they must not be merely servants employed on sinecure jobs.

It is often noticed, and painfully noticed, by most of us that somehow in arranging our foreign affairs those persons are sent out who have got some sympathy with the ideologies obtaining in the country to which they are sent. Why should we not look to that particular type of persons to represent the views which we ourselves endorse and which we ourselves adopt? I cannot see any reason why a particular communist leader is allowed to go to Moscow to represent our view there simply because he happens to meet his own expenses. From where does he get those expenses? Why should people known and classified as fellow-travellers be allowed to go and represent the views of our country and mislead the people there? It is high time that our publicity was geared up in a proper manner. We receive complaints from our own countrymen and from those who come from outside that somehow or other our case goes by default. Our views are not put across there properly. Even as compared to Pakistan, we are a back number. I do not know how it is manipulated. Things which Pakistan says go into the press but what we say, truthful things with facts in support of them, do not get across. Our picture that emerges is a picture of a wrong-doer rather than one of the wronged.

Therefore, I would suggest that in so far as this foreign policy is concerned, the whole country should stand as

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

one man, as it has always stood, as we have depicted in this very House when the question of the emergency arose when we stood up as one man in this House and proclaimed our determination to drive out the aggressor. The same should be the attitude, whether we belong to the Opposition or to the other side, in regard to foreign affairs. Each one of us should endeavour to put the foreign policy of our country on such a footing that it appears as one singular policy of the whole nation as against the foreigners.

Then I come to another question. Some friends here have repeated that non-alignment has been good. I will not offer any criticism whether it is good or bad. I will only say that we must judge every case on merits, without in any manner formulating a policy whether we should remain for all times non-aligned or whether we should be aligned with some.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): That is exactly non-alignment.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Mr. Harvani, keep quit.

Mr. Chairman: He should address the Chair.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am sorry. He was unnecessarily interrupting me.

What strikes me is this, that when we talk of non-alignment, we forget that in some cases we have aligned ourselves unnecessarily with those for whom we have developed some sort of soft corner. I feel surprised even today to note that a growing nation, a nation of the oppressed, a nation which had been oppressed for years together and for centuries, and which is now making headway—I mean Israel—a nation which shows its mettle, though a small nation, still remains diplomatically unrecognised by us. We have not established diplomatic relations with that nation.

Why? I find that we are afraid to offend somebody. If we are afraid to offend some friends in the process, then we admit that we are not those who consider ourselves non-aligned. We are not.

Shri Muthyal Rao (Mahbubnagar): Prof. Ranga is very happy.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: He is always happy. I do not think you are unhappy. The question that comes before us is this. In this world just as there are people who are governed by their own selfish considerations, there are similarly nations also moved by the same considerations and spirit. It is perhaps for self preservation as much as for a desire to be of some human help that some help is coming from a particular nation at a particular juncture. Without attributing motives in any manner, we should not hesitate to co-operate with those who have ungrudgingly offered help. The United States, the United Kingdom and Germany and some other countries have rushed to our rescue; when we wanted help they offered us help. We know that there are others who may like to help but who are afraid that in some manner or the other they may offend the big dragon and if they were to offend it, the net result would be that they themselves would be crushed. We are running after them; we are wanting their friendship. We are not shaking hands with those who have extended us their hands of friendship. Sir, blunders we had committed and blunders have been many. But today it is not the time for us to weep over them. That time has gone. We cannot just now sit and brood over the past. The past is gone. The country has to progress and has to meet the challenge. The challenge is before us; it has not gone away. When we meet the challenge, it must be as a challenge of the brave, it must not be a challenge of the weak. Certainly a weak man will run away when a goonda wants to beat him. But a brave man, weak though he

may be, will stand up with a cudgel and say: all right; come on; either you die, or I. That should be the attitude for us. I do not say this in a mere spirit of bravado. It is not a mere question of bravado. It is a question of one nation standing against another nation. Here China has unilaterally declared its own cease fire and has walked out and says: I have gone away 20 kilometres. What have we done? Nothing. The whole of NEFA has been vacated today by the Chinese aggressive forces and are perhaps waiting for a chance to attack us again in a massive and better manner than what they have done before, having known the topography of the land. They have said: we are here, sitting, watching. We are doing nothing. I should say that the time has now come.

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

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We should be prepared to march our armies and in such a manner that we should be prepared to meet the challenge when it comes and at the border, not within our own lands. Once the Chinese enter our own land, their communist forces will be on a territory where they can attack us. It is better for us that we should meet the menace where we can and drive them out and we should not be afraid of it. Today, there is this emergency. There is no reason why we should not be well-equipped even after this length of time that we have been able to get

15.45 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

In these days when we are all talking of the mounting budget expenditure and of taxes being levied upon the whole nation, unprecedented taxes admitted to be of an unprecedented nature by our Finance Minister, we should not lose sight of the fact that the economy is very essential for us. I see no propriety in having huge expenditure by

our ambassadors. Representatives of a poor country, practically a country which is heavily indebted to one and sundry go on spending as lavishly as any other country such as the United States or the United Kingdom. It ought not to be so. We have as many as 55 ambassadors and many missions, consuls and consul generals. We are spending about Rs. 3.20 crores for embassies only and a total of about Rs. 3.50 crores on the missions abroad. This expenditure was practically negligible before. It is growing every year. The net result that we obtain is nothing. Complaints pour in from various parts of the world and our nationals in those various countries are rendered no help which ought to be normally rendered to them.

Look at the question of our relations with Nepal, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia. How have we suffered? We can call Nepal our own kith and kin. It is not on happy terms with us. Why should it be so? Where is the fault? A huge number of us have been brought up in Burma and lived and enjoyed the hospitality of that country. Today we are a taboo there; we are driven out. All our doctors, engineers and contractors, everybody had been driven out from that country. Nine-tenths of the total assets of Burma were in the hands of Indians in 1939. What has happened? That is why we were made to be hated by the British and they did it in a very proper and methodical manner. We went on saying to these people to become nationals of Burma or get out of Burma. Where are the lands here to come and settle down for over 14 lakhs of people? The same thing happened elsewhere also. The policy of apartheid is being followed. Except a negative approach, we have not been able to do anything. What others are doing, we are not doing. The same story has now come up with a boomerang upon us in Tanganyika, Uganda and very soon coming in Kenya. It is, therefore, time that some measures are taken by us. A

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

new spirit must be inculcated in our ambassadors. Those who go abroad to represent us should not, in the fitness of thing, say to people who approach them: there is no protection to be granted to you by the Indian Nation; you should become the citizens where you live.

Shri Narasimha Reddy (Rajampet):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, on the morning of our Independence our sun rose resplendent on the Indian skies by virtue of our geographical position, by virtue of our huge population and size and by virtue of the fact that we put up a strong fight to end colonialism in our country. We became the inspiring symbol of all the resurgent nations in Asia. How is it that within a short time, within a bare 15 years, we have lost our leading position in the world? How is it that our closest neighbours have been neutralised, if not positively alienated. How is it that the very position and safety of our nation is jeopardised? I am afraid our External Affairs Ministry has to bear the full responsibility on its shoulders.

Sir, the effect of our foreign policy has to be seen from its results. We have been calling ourselves neutral. We have been outwardly following a neutralist policy, whilst we were ideologically and emotionally aligned to the communist nations. We have been issuing declarations and directives for the moral guidance of the world. Uninvited, we aired our views on the Suez question, but in return Nasser had not a word of sympathy and support for our cause in Kashmir. In the same breath, we condemned the Suez affair, we could not condemn the atrocities committed by the Russians in the suppression of the people's revolt in Hungary. But we did condemn the King of Nepal all right for stifling and suffocating democracy in his kingdom. The result was that we rubbed America the wrong way and infuriated it to a very great extent, while we created a feeling of bitterness in the King of Nepal which bitterness

lingers to this day and it is a problem for us in that strategic area.

Again, we have been in season and out of season pressing for the membership of China in the UNO. Our representative has been irritating everybody in the UNO and then heaping up insults, annoyances and giving pinpricks to the western nations. Is it conducive to happy relations between us and other nations? But we must thank God that these western nations have forgotten everything, have forgiven everything, and they have come to our rescue in the time of our greatest need.

We have been making pompous declarations on all matters arising within the canopy of Heaven and constituted ourselves as a world court to give uninvited verdicts on all controversial matters which have antagonised nations and left a feeling of bitterness behind. While we have been rushing like Knights errants in the cause of other people in distant climes and lands, we did practically next to nothing to the more than one crore of our population in South-East Asia, in Africa, Mauritius, Fiji and Ceylon, where our people are denied elementary human rights. At this time, when the whole of India is pulsating with goodwill as never before, in order to make up with Pakistan, it is quite unfortunate that Pakistan should have rushed to enter into a pact with China. Common sense, a sense of common danger, a common defence and past associations should have impelled Pakistan and also should have impelled our country to come together. I hope that Pakistan has not entered into any secret pact with China in order to mount a two-pronged attack simultaneously on us. If that be the case, it will be a bad day for Asia. Let Pakistan thank its stars that there is an India still alive and throbbing. But for our country, Pakistan would have been struck on the head like a gnat and made into another Sinkiang province of China.

In this world, there is an inclination always to side with the stronger against the weaker, and our Prime Minister is no exception to it. When Chiang Kai-shek, with Madam Chiang Kaishek came to our country, he espoused the cause of our country's freedom. We took them round our country with acclamation and enthusiasm; the moment the communists took possession of the land, we rushed forward in an indecent haste to recognise them and disown Chiang Kai Shek.

I would give another instance to show that we have not been acting always on moral considerations. Did we not allow China to gulp down Tibet? Tibet was a religious country, was a peaceful country, associated with us culturally and spiritually for ages. Where was our sense of right and wrong? Where had our adoration of Lord Buddha gone, when we agreed with China to the extinction and extermination of this peaceful people who had connections with us from bygone ages? we, with the very principles, with the very objectives of Lord Buddha, with the principles of Panchsheel, sealed the fate of Tibet and allowed the Chinese armies to come surging onwards to our frontier and into our land. Probably, Providence brings its retribution which is priescapable, both alike for individuals as well as nations; it has sent this Chinese fire across our borders to teach us a stern lesson that we should not give up helping the weaker nations in pursuit of an opportunist diplomacy.

We want the neutral nations to help us at this time, but how can they help us? Apart from helping us, how can they give, even moral consolation to us, when we ourselves showed the lily livered heart before a big nation, when we hugged and embraced China with every gusto of affection and friendliness? We taught them to be ideologically and emotionally aligned with China. We taught them how to be neutral and we want them to help us in the time of our

trouble as they are remaining neutral even towards us. They will remain neutral to one another under similar circumstances. These neutral nations are new-born babes with hardly any teeth developed. Most of these nations, with honourable exceptions, may safely be deemed to be tied to the apron-strings of China. Neutrality has no place in Nature. There are only two genders in Lord's creation: male and the female. The neuter gender is only man-made. If anybody says that there are neutral nations, it is incorrect. If there be still neutral nations left, they are toothless, spineless, rudderless and colourless.

We are absolutely isolated. The Prime Minister seems to have written in a quarterly journal which is reported in today's papers that China is isolated. Think of our position. There is Ceylon. It is tottering and it is not prepared even to send our National Defence Fund collections collected in Ceylon to us. There is Burma, which is almost aligned to China. The whole of South-east Asia is simmering with communism. Nepal is there, having constructed roads and airfields with the help of the Chinese; allowing Pakistan air force and the Chinese air force to stop and go hither and thither. Now Pakistan has concluded a pact with China. In Afghanistan, Russia has connected Kabul and Kandhar by Railway lines. Who is that has been isolated? New fires are raging around our frontiers. The whole of our continent is in danger of being engulfed. Let us look at facts in the face. Let us modulate our behaviour with other nations and reorient our foreign policy.

16 hrs.

Edmund Burke said, "When bad men combine, the good must associate, or else, they will fall one by one, like an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle." We should look at the facts in the face and modulate our foreign policy.

Unfortunately, our foreign policy has

[Shri Narasimha Reddy]

often been running into quick sands, because it has been changing according to the gyrations of a single brain. In any Government with a democratic setup, all the persons forming the Government sit down in sober deliberation and contemplation and decide this. But in our country, the members of our Government are but shadows in the distance. That is why our foreign policy has been vague, vacillating and oscillating and without any sense of precision. Emotion and passion rage where cool reasoning of the intellect should have held sway. Well-intentioned criticism only serves to intensify the existing and old obstinacies. Any sense or consciousness of the danger on our frontiers voiced forth by Members in the Parliament or in the Press knocked out the little courage in the External Affairs Ministry and made them come out with effusions of peaceful methods in fury at us. Where firmness was required, weakness palsied our limbs. Thus has our policy been going on in a meandering, shifting and drifting manner, which took us away from the world of realities into the dreamland of our own creation.

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

Shri Narasimha Reddy: I shall finish. An important development we see nowadays is that the resolution that we passed in Parliament on November 14 is being played down everywhere. Excepting for a passing reference in the President's Address to both Houses, in none of the public utterances of the Prime Minister has there been any mention of that solemn resolution of our Parliament passed on November 14. The prowess of our nation is not such that we need bend our heads in fear nor our hearts falter in cowardice....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should close now.

Shri Narasimha Reddy: Yes, Sir. I am sorry.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the Members that have spoken in this debate, both to those that have commended our policies and to those who have criticised them. We try to profit by all the criticisms that are made here, though sometimes I feel they are not justified or based on a knowledge of the facts.

Now, in a debate of this kind on the Demands for Grants, a great deal might be said. Something has been said about the necessity for economy etc. The general policy is discussed and, more specially two matters have come up: our foreign service and our foreign publicity. In particular, the foreign publicity has been referred to by many hon. Members on both sides of the House.

So far as the question of economy is concerned, it is rather curious that we are asked for economy. I might inform the House that lately economy amounting to Rs. 150 lakhs has been made in the Ministry of External Affairs. But at the same time, our foreign service and foreign publicity is criticised vigorously when, partly at least, this might be dealt with greater expenditure. Some hon. Members have indeed accused us of not having more foreign missions abroad, more foreign posts and, generally not in spending much more money on our publicity. It is a fact that we have been restricted a great deal by our desire to limit expenditure. It is natural that if we could spend much more on publicity and if it is rightly spent it will have greater effect. And, compared to other countries, I believe, we are very much on the side of spending less than what they do. I am not talking about great countries like United States of America or England who have an enormous apparatus of publicity; but even smaller countries,

countries of Asia and some countries even of Africa, spend a great deal on publicity; relatively speaking, much more than we do.

So far as our foreign service is concerned, it has been referred to on many occasions. I do not quite know what I can say about it. But I will endeavour, with all humility, to give my impression of it. The foreign service has been built up in the last 14 or 15 years. It started with a number of people from the government service; some,—not many—I suppose about one-third or less, of the old ICS element, some from other government services in India who were transferred. Some were Political Officers in the old British regime, some were professors, educationists, etc., and others, some of them, were public men. Gradually we tried to build up a foreign service, as every country has to, with adequate training as far as we could. It was built up partly by recruiting people generally from outside and not so much from the services—a few might have gone, not many went later. Mostly they were recruited from outside, including educationists and others. Some professors and others joined our foreign service and also some who have been engaged in public affairs. As we went on building the foreign service, gradually the cadre of foreign servicemen became trained. And when we have to train a service, it cannot be done in a day or two; it is bound to take time. Also, we cannot function without a trained cadre in any particular service, whatever it might be. That training consisted, apart from the original competitive examination, which itself is a difficult one, of two or three years of training, of which the first six months were spent in going to some places in India some districts, to watch the work in the districts and to get some local knowledge, to see some of our development works in India and so on. Then they work as apprentices to learn the languages of the countries where they are going to be posted, one or two languages, sometimes even three. Then they have to serve in a

relatively humble capacity in some of our posts abroad and gradually work themselves up.

16.10 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now, it is obvious that any generalisation about such a service would probably be not justified. If we say that the entire service is a brilliant one and every one is brilliant, of course, that would not be justified. On the other hand, if we condemn the entire service, it would be equally unjustified. The foreign service consists of about 250 to 300 people, all kinds of men; some are remarkably good, many others are good average, some others not good average and so on, as we find in every service.

So far as non-officials are concerned, I should like to remove the impression which the hon. Member had that I had stated that the non-officials were not very successful. Some of the non-officials in our service have been outstanding people and it is not very easy to get such outstanding people, either in service or from outside. They are always relatively few but on the whole, we had quite a number of persons who have been very much above the average, not only our average but the average of foreign services of other countries.

It is a fact, I venture to say, that, generally speaking, our diplomatic service is supposed among the diplomatic circles all over the world to be a high grade one and is supposed to have reached that stage quite rapidly. In fact, reading a book about the foreign services of the various countries, there were two countries mentioned specially, whose foreign service had come up remarkably well, and one of the two was India. Now, that does not mean that all of them are brilliant or good; they are good, as one can normally expect, good average with some really brilliant persons.

Nowadays, in these days of telegrams and telephones, the foreign service constantly refers matters to headquarters. In the old days when it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

took weeks to get directions, they had to rely on their own judgment, whether good or bad. Nowadays, every morning I have to go through a sheaf of telegrams from various embassies and in the course of the day also they go on coming so that, so far as policy is concerned, it is very largely governed by headquarters. Of course, a person may put across a suggestion or a hint, but they are individual cases.

A general remark was made about our services. As I have said, there are all kinds of people, but their average is fairly good. The kind of instances that were given—I think Shri Nath Pai gave one or two instances—were remarkable. One was that after the Sino-Pakistan Treaty was signed, it was not put across properly in Washington and London. I think he mentioned something like that. As it happens, this work was particularly well done in Washington and London.

Shri Hem Barua: It was reported that our Ambassador to USA was not in Washington when the Sino-Pakistan treaty was signed. He was not there to explain our viewpoint.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He was in America.

Shri Hem Barua: He was in America but in San Francisco; not in Washington.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Anyhow, I can assure the House that both Ambassadors in Washington and London have done a remarkable piece of good work from any point of view. And we have a high opinion of them.

Now, take another case mentioned by some other Member about Indonesia and our Ambassador there, because of an unfortunate incident that happened there in regard to Asian Games. Asian Games, of course, had directly nothing to do with our Mission. Of course, some people had gone from here and the question arose that one of the representatives of our

contingent, who was the leader, was of certain views which were disapproved by Indonesians. Our Ambassador in Indonesia, probably, fulfils all the qualification that hon. Members have been laying stress on. He is most popular in Indonesia. He is an able man and a hard-working man devoted to Indonesia, as he is devoted to India, with many approaches to every kind of people there. Yet, how is he to be blamed because of some incident that happened there which is beyond, as a matter of fact . . .

Shri Nath Pal: Everybody has very great regard for the magnificent services of Mr. Pant. The point sought to be made was that you did not draw the necessary inference from the portentous warning you got in the burning of the tricolour in Jakarta. The blame was laid at the Foreign Ministry, not at Mr. Pant. It was a warning which was ignored.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think any warning was ignored. But what, having received the warning, could he have done? As a matter of fact, this particular instance was largely engineered by the Chinese in Jakarta or in Indonesia, probably the Chinese communists. It is unfortunate. But I would say we cannot blame our Ambassadors for all the turns of events that may take place in the world which we do not like. We do not leave out Ambassadors, as a Government, as a country, control the world or countries or the way they act. Many things that happen in the world which we do not approve. We cannot control them. We can sometimes express our opinions about them. Sometimes, we do not even do that because it does no good expressing our opinions strongly when there is no possibility of any action to be followed by that opinion. The world today is a very odd place. I suppose, it has always been odd. But now that we live in it, we have to deal with it some way; we come nearer to curious manifestations. It is at the present

moment—I think, even more than at other times—full of contradictions, full of incipient countries. Some hon. Members find it very easy for them to get over all these conflicts, to get over all the difficulties that arise from them by not thinking or acting oneself but allowing the thinking to be done by somebody else, by some other country for us; whether that some other country is America or Russia depends on the party. But they want to dispose of this burden of thinking and acting by casting it to somebody else and then living in some kind of a mental ease at somebody else's responsibility, whether it is for our defence or whether it is for a solution of any problem. Somebody has warned us: Do not rely too much on the fact that there is a rift between Russia and China; that may not do much good; something else may happen. Well, if I may say so, a country should always be trying to be friendly with other countries and should never rely upon them absolutely. That is common sense. Because, to be friendly does not mean to sell yourself body and soul to any other country. It is not only the right policy always, more particularly because of our background, it is right. It always helps to have a friendly atmosphere even when we disagree with a country. It is easier to impress others. I do not pretend to say that we have been always right. Of course, not. The normal criticism appears to be that we should side with this group or that group. Then the responsibility goes to that group, not to us very much. That is not, I venture to say, the attitude which a mature nation or a self-respecting nation should adopt.

As a matter of fact, take the strongest and the biggest countries, America and Russia or any others. They are constantly faced with developments which they dislike intensely, where their diplomatic service, their policies have failed completely for the time being—the countries have not failed, but a particular action has failed. That is almost a regular recurrence. People who have well established

foreign services, who have definite policies, who have enormous resources and propaganda—yet they fail. In fact, compared to the failures of others, I should think our failures are very small. Of course, our responsibilities are small too, compared to them. I would beg of the House to remember this that there is no country today which you can pick out,—it does not matter whether it is in Europe or Asia or elsewhere—where the country is not continuously coming up against great difficulties, difficulties of a kind which they do not always expect. Of failures of their policy, and trying to find out how to make it good, how to profit by it. That is the nature of the world today.

In spite of two very great powers dominating it, the world is not amenable to domination today. Not even the smallest country likes to be dominated: much less any other and the result is, this continuous conflict. Now we see in Africa the extraordinary kaleidoscopic picture, changing all the time; large number of countries gaining independence and finding the future difficult; wanting help and yet not wanting anybody's domination. They get help where they can. They themselves are split up into various groups. Take the Arab world which is, again, undergoing a great transformation. There is greater prospect of some unity in the Arab world than there has been for many years. All these are changing phenomena. One lives in a period of the current of history running on and on. We have to keep pace with it and understand it.

Shri Nath Pai, I think, talked about ossification of those who control our foreign policy or....

Shri Nath Pai: Ossification of tensions: I said there has been an ossification of tensions which threatened to engulf the world in a conflagration.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry, I misunderstood. What I was going to say was, whether you call it ossification or something else....

Shri Nath Pai: I did criticise your policy. That was not the phrase I used.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: All right.

I find a curious repetition of things dead and gone, which have no relevance today and yet they fill the minds of some of our critics so much that they cannot think of the present day things. The hon. Member speaking last got eloquent about Hungary, Tibet, of course, is often referred to, as if our attitude to Tibet 12 years ago is a natural cause of everything that happened subsequently.

Shri Hem Barua: To some extent it is true.

Shri Ranga: That is indicative of your present attitudes also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I can quite understand hon. Members opposite, especially the learned Acharya not being able to catch up to events. He is living in the past. It is unfortunate.

The whole structure is changing today in the so-called communist and non-communist world, the so-called two major blocs standing opposed to each other. They are still opposed to each other; yet basically that position is being undermined. We see within the two blocs, whether it is the Western bloc full of internal conflicts between nations, or the Eastern bloc very much affected by the conflict between Russia and China, that these solid monolithic structures of West and East are changing. Russia and America are definitely coming somewhat nearer to each other; I do not say that anything wonderful is going to happen soon.

Shri Narasimha Reddy: Is that going to save us?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, but I hope it will enlighten you a little.

So, any policy that we have to follow has essentially to be based—well, every foreign policy has to be based on the interests of that country,

not only the immediate interests, but the longer interests; one has to see ahead, one cannot live from day to day thinking of the interests today which may turn out to be harmful to us tomorrow—on the interests of the country plus, I hope, certain basic policies that we believe in. Foreign policy, as any policy, must be determined by that. A foreign policy, of course, is intimately connected with one's domestic policy; it is a projection of it in a wider field; it is not the same thing, because it deals with other matters, but it is a projection and it must fit in with it. Otherwise, there is a confusion between our domestic policy and our foreign policy. I think that some of the hon. Members who have criticised our foreign policy really dislike much more our domestic policy, and, therefore, they criticise the foreign policy.

Shri Narasimha Reddy: A faulty conclusion.

Shri Nath Pai: That is good rhetoric, but not really very convincing. We criticised your China policy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Shri Nath Pai need not accuse me of rhetoric because he indulged in rhetoric far more than I can ever do.

I am merely pointing out that foreign policy or external policy and domestic policy have to be related. Otherwise, there is a confusion all the time. If one disagrees with the one, it follows that the disagreement goes to the other.

Now, take the question of Tibet to which repeated references were made. I am yet unable to understand—nobody likes what happened in Tibet; I am quite unable to understand—although I have given much thought to it, how much people have thought or what any hon. Member has thought we could do at the time or later.

Shri Ranga: We could have protested at least. We could have raised our voice. In so many other cases, we went abroad all the way like King

Herod to the UN to raise our voice when it was not wanted.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member might have raised his voice, and no doubt, having raised his voice, got into very deep waters where he could not keep his hand up, because one only raises one's voice when one follows it up, or when that voice is meant to be followed by some particular action. We could not take any action in Tibet at that time or later. In fact....

Shri Ranga: We do not agree with you at all. That was a total failure on your part, a moral failure.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: We have done nothing in South Africa; still we have raised our voice against the *apartheid* policy of South Africa and the denial of human rights. We have done precious little and yet we have raised our voice.

Shri Nath Pai: Only once, finally please tell us this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Natb Paj: I have referred to it. Only once and finally let him tell us whether it was a question of 'unwilling' or 'unable'. The ground has been continuously shifting. Sometimes you say that we could not do something; at other times, you say that we ought not to have done something; what is your true position? Let me point to your latest remark. You told the Rajya Sabha that we inherited this situation from the British. That is not true.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I regret to contradict the hon. Member, but it is true, what I said in the Rajya Sabha; in spite of it....

Shri Nath Pai: I read out from Mr. Anthony Eden's letter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It does not matter. Mr. Anthony Eden is no authority for me. I say this is true, and Mr. Anthony Eden, as you have

read him out, too does not contradict me in the slightest.

Shri Ranga: Anyhow, they were only simple failures of ours.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Who is sinful and who is not?

Now, take the case of Tibet. From the very first day when China came into Tibet, I think I have often said in this House that we have had to consider this fact of a great, dynamic and powerful country, aggressive and expansive, coming nearer our borders. We had all the time to consider it and adapt our policy accordingly. That did not mean that I expected them suddenly to attack India immediately. But it was potentially threat to us; the potential threat might materialise in ten years or twenty years—that nobody could say. That was the position and we had adapted our policy to a considerable extent on our borders and elsewhere. It is our adapting our policy to that threat to which the Chinese refer now saying in connection with NEFA that we were not in NEFA, we came into NEFA afterwards. They interpret that way. It is quite different of course; it is absurd because NEFA was theoretically and constitutionally always part of India for a long long time.

Shri Hem Barua: Practically also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But the fact that we were always working in NEFA, developing NEFA, sitting on the borders there makes them say that we entered NEFA then, otherwise it was theirs all the time. But they have a remarkable way of stating their case. That is a different matter. It is a little difficult for some of us trained otherwise to keep pace with the perversities of truth that they utter.

The whole point was that there is this potential threat and danger, which might become a real one, might become a big one. There were

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

only two ways of dealing with it, to be pursued simultaneously. One was to strengthen our position gradually, and secondly, to be friendly to China, not to bring about such a conflict and crisis much sooner than it might otherwise do. That is the normal policy which any nation adopts. We followed both those policies.

Then other things happened. The Tibetan rebellion happened and that encouraged and induced the Chinese to send vast numbers of troops into Tibet in those days; they sent to Tibet only a greater number of troops than the whole Indian Army, and gradually approached our borders, frontiers, and started aggression in the Ladakh area. Then you come to the next stage when actually aggression is taking place quietly, without much fuss. They did not come on the NEFA side, but on the other side. Again, we tried to protect ourselves, to strengthen ourselves in the Ladakh area. It was not an easy matter because of the tremendous difficulty of communications. We had to build roads, air-fields and such like things. We did build them. We sent everything by air to them. Roads became the most important thing in NEFA and in Ladakh. Those roads were built. I think they were built fairly rapidly, such as had been built; they might have been built a little more rapidly or perhaps not. But anyhow, that was the policy, and roads were built because that was essential. It was impossible to do anything without them.

An hon. Member asked: why don't we march across NEFA and put our armies on the border? The simple thing is that one has to feed an army—food, supplies and everything. It is difficult to feed an army where there are no proper communications. Communications are being built, and it is not right for any military commander to take a powerful enemy on disadvantageous ground. He has to choose his own ground. The choos-

ing of the ground is not for me, not for this House, if I may say so. We lay down the principles. It is for our military people to choose how, where and in what manner they have to fight.

Shri Hem Barua: Have you taken into consideration the danger to the security of NEFA because of not sending troops there? The Chinese might walk in at any time. There are also subversive activities.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member will not expect me to discuss these matters with him. It is obvious that these matters have to be considered. But when you have to live under the menace of a powerful country with a powerful army, one has to meet the menace with strength, not with declarations, not with strong resolutions. One has to meet that with strength, with a strength which enables you to think that you will win. You do not do things in an adventurist way which will react against us. All these factors have to be considered.

So far as our general policy is concerned, except perhaps for the hon. Members of the Swatantra Party, almost everyone is broadly in agreement—though not in all the details; it may not be—with the general policy we have pursued. What is the general policy? Of course, any foreign policy must deal with the protection of one's country; that is inevitable. That is foreign policy or domestic policy, call it what you like. The foreign policy has been to further our interests by friendship with other nations, all nations whoever they might be because we were convinced of it. That is why we followed a policy of non-alignment. If we became entangled in military groupings, that would be practically harmful, apart from any moral or ethical view of it. Alignment means limiting your independence to that extent... (*Interruptions*). Some countries may have

to do it; it is a different matter but for a country specially situated as India is, there is no meaning in alignment. It is harmful, harmful psychologically apart from practical considerations. It is harmful in the sense that one begins to think of others doing your own job and defending; thereby you weaken the moral fibre of the nation. It is a very important thing when danger threatens it. It is one thing to get help from others. And I am grateful for the help that comes. But it is quite another thing to do something which makes one think that somebody else will look after us and protect us and we need not do very much. That is a dangerous mentality to develop among the people, especially situated as we are, when we happen to be in friendly relations with countries of the two blocs of nations, apart from China. It would be a folly in the extreme for us to give up this friendship of others in the hope of getting some more help or protection from one party. That would be practically, apart from any theory, a folly. That is why I said that it was recognised by all persons claiming any degree of intelligence or wisdom in most countries, whether it is the countries of the western alliance or the eastern alliance. It is only in India that some people appear to doubt it. I venture to say that the doubt is raised by their timidity, their lack of facing their own country and what the country can do. I think it is a wrong approach for anybody, for any country, especially for our country. Apart from other things—we get arms, aircraft, etc., that is a different matter...

Shri Ranga: How do you put it? That must be coming in anyhow; yet we are free, independent?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member's logic is not apparent to me. However, what I said was that the main thing in this country—I will repeat it—is the spirit of the country, morale of the country and the unity of the country. I throw away all the big arms and big aircraft if I have

the morale, the spirit of unity in the country. I am prepared.

Shri Ranga: That is bravado.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not decry other weapons. They are very important in modern warfare or at any time; therefore we get them. We hope to get them. But I would like to assure this House that the attitude they represent has a greater effect and a greater influence on outsiders than the other attitude.

Take our budget, apart from what you like or dislike in it. The fact that it was a budget with courage—it went all out—has had a tremendous effect in other countries: that we are out to face this and are not waiting for doles on other people. It is the whole difference of mental approach, whether it is to war, or to finances or to development. We want all the help we can. We are trying to get it. But we rely on ourselves ultimately. I have no doubt in my mind that, whatever the near future might show, this is the only policy that will tell in our favour and that will be appreciated the world over, because a country wants to help another country when that other country is doing the job itself.

Take the other countries. It is all very well to think that we can cast ourselves on the protection of others completely, but one might think whether the others like it or not, whether the others are prepared to shoulder the burden. It is no easy burden for anyone to carry. Some newspapermen and others might say so, but responsible people are not prepared to take that burden. So, inevitably you arrive at this conclusion, now of course especially with the Chinese menace there, that our policy of non-alignment and strengthening ourselves and taking help from every country that we can is the right policy, and that we should pursue it. It is right positively; it is right negatively. It is right positively for the reasons that I have

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

stated; it is right negatively because, not doing so would mean the cutting off of all kinds of psychological and other help that comes to us or that may come to us.

One of the biggest questions in the world today which is agitating every chancellery of the powers, great and small, is the future of Russian-Chinese relations. Nobody knows. I am not saying that, or banking on the Soviet Union rushing to our help. I am merely saying that this is the biggest question in the world today. It affects the whole future of the world—as to what and how the Russian-Chinese relation will develop. And it is rather an immature way of thinking that because both are communists they will necessarily support each other, however much they may disagree with each other. The fact of the matter is gradually people are beginning to think that communism and anti-communism, important as they are in some respects, are outworn cries, because policies are determined by countries from the point of view of their national interests. Their interpretation itself of communism or anti-communism is determined by their national interests and nothing else. Opinions may vary about the national interests, but that is a different matter. But broadly-speaking, these are the determining factors. If the Soviet Union and China disagree on ideologies of interpretation of the Marxist doctrine, I think you will find that fundamentally those disagreements are due to their national interests, how they interpret it from the point of view of their own national interests.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): Do you think that they will fight among themselves—China and Russia?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not a Jyotishi. How can I tell him what will happen? I am merely pointing out the trends in the world and the

problems in the world, and they are not quite so simple as some hon. Members opposite seem to imagine. History is being made; this strong current of history is running. You will have to keep pace with it and try to adapt yourselves, remembering always that one can only act vigorously with strength. Many of us still think of an old agitational approach, of taking out processions and shouting a lot and thinking that we have done something. Any procession or any shouting that we do here does not affect China. They might be affected by our strength on the border. That is a different matter. Of course, they will be affected. Therefore, we have to build up that strength and not take any adventurist action. That is the normal thinking, normal caution, that every country displays.

Mr. Nath Pal adjured me to go and repeat to the public that I am the same old Jawaharlal, this and that and show that I am a man of courage.

Shri Nath Pal: Did I make a mistake?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Of course, you did. You made a mistake in thinking that I am somebody different. Naturally, as one grows, one matures. But the unfortunate thing is that some people even after growth do not mature.

Shri Ranga: I am glad you have made that discovery.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I congratulate the Acharya, who does not mature, however old he may be.

Shri Hem Berua: Maturity is a process.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In regard to the general policy, I do submit that apart from the policy of serving one's own interest, serving our narrow interests of today and forgetting our

interests of tomorrow or day after, there is the wider point of view. Apart from the point of view of serving our interests, we have served the cause of peace and I think that is essential that we should continue to do so. That cause of peace in the world is important to us, as to every other country and it has brought a good deal of sympathy for us and even affection for us in other countries.

I do not know where they have got it from—some hon. Members talked about our reading homilies to other countries on ethical and moral grounds. I think they must have read it from some foreign newspaper, because I am not aware of any ethical or moral homilies to any country that we have given from India. If we stand for something in the United Nations, naturally we have to support it. We are not delivering homilies to other countries that we are holier than they are. We are not holy at all. We are pretty bad in many ways, I think. I have never been guilty of that.

Shri Nath Pai: But the tone of all your speeches before the Chinese aggression shows that we took other people's difficulties very lightly and told them how to behave.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Perhaps it depends on the context, when one says it and in what context.

Anyhow, we must stand for peace and every country must stand for peace. Of course, I still stand for peace, but I have to fight a war if China attacks. That is a different matter. That does not mean that I do not stand for peace in the world, because if we do not stand for peace in the world, the world will be shattered to bits. I think that difference has to be kept in mind that we have to defend ourselves and defend ourselves by war-like means. I am sorry I do not know myself how we can defend ourselves by non-violent means against an aggression by China. I do not know it and therefore, if I

do not know it and understand it, I cannot do it. But the mentality of peace must remain the same, not with China, but with the whole world. Even with China, when a peaceful method is found of resolving these disputes with honour, we should accept it. We should not merely for the love of fighting and killing refuse peace.

Shri Nath Pai: We did not kill one Chinese; we did not take one single prisoner.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not quite correct; we killed a number of Chinese. I am not talking of what we did, but of the mentality of some people who rejoice in killing. I do not rejoice in killing even an animal much less a human being.

Then, the third thing in our policy that is generally encouraged is the elimination, the ending of colonial control anywhere. That has made great progress. But some colonial areas still remain, chiefly in Africa and a few elsewhere, and we should like to help them morally, help them otherwise if we can to the best of our ability.

There has been some criticism that we have not been helping the African nations. Well—I do not know—the African nations are, many of them, newly freed. They have fine leaders and they are full of dynamism and vitality. Sometimes, in the United Nations or elsewhere, they have advanced a policy in regard to some matter which we thought would not ultimately benefit them or the world or Africa. We have had to argue with them. May be, because of their youth and dynamism they have still a belief in achieving results by strong resolutions. We passed that stage some years ago, and if we have tried to hold them back or tried to argue with them they have been slightly disappointed in us. That is a minor thing. Fundamentally, I think, we have the goodwill of Africa and they certainly

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

have our goodwill—all the countries of Africa require it.

Some hon. Member—I forget now—here suggested about the Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique, that we should train their people and all that. We are prepared to train them. We have trained hundreds and thousands of foreign scholars in India. My colleague tells me that at the present moment there are 5000 foreign students in India—not all are scholars, many of them are scholars and many are not. We have not got many people from Angola or Mozambique. It is not that we do not like to have them, but normally these arrangements are made with the governments of the other countries and the Portugueses will not allow them to come here. We cannot go and kidnap people and bring them here to be trained. It is difficult. If they can come somehow, certainly we will be happy to train them. In other countries there are large numbers of our teachers—they have gone to Africa—and other experts.

So, that is our broad policy. Now, of course, in a changing world a policy is affected by circumstances, by changes that take place, and we have to be wide awake and adapt it.

I have already said about our foreign service. I am not prepared to defend everything that they have done but, by and large, it is a good service of some very good men, outstanding men and women. We are improving. We hope to improve. There is some advantage sometimes in having non-service people. Non-service people we have a good number. But the non-service people, when they remain for a long time, practically become like servicemen. But it takes time for a person to adapt himself to the routines of the foreign service. We have had both experience in it. Some of our non-service people have been brilliant, extraordinarily good; some of them have been, if I may say so, in all confidence, flops. There it is.

Shri Hem Barua: It is a nice admission.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That applies to service people too, naturally. We cannot generalise about this. But, normally, the work that is done by the head of missions is very much circumscribed, except in America. Normally, the heads of missions are not supposed to go about delivering public speeches. That is not the practice for them. Americans, apparently, have developed that practice both in America and in India. That is a different matter.

Shri Hem Barua: Our people also do that. There is a lot of delivering speeches, television and all that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am saying that in America that is done, but normally that is not done. In Europe or England rarely something like that might happen. They are much more conservative in these matters.

Coming to publicity in these places, it can always be criticised and it can always be improved. I think it has improved considerably lately, specially since this invasion, this aggression, by China. I think we have done pretty well in the last few months specially. Somebody I think Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, said something about Hindi publicity material. It is produced originally in English; immediately it is handed over to the Information and Broadcasting Ministry for translation and Hindi translations are brought out. Therefore, there is a little gap between the two. In fact, it is done not only in English and Hindi only but in a dozen or more foreign languages, French, German, Arabic, Spanish etc.

If hon. Members would make any specific suggestions, we will consider them. It is difficult to consider vague charges of inefficiency. When it's a large organisation, there are bound to be some matters worthy of improvement. I welcome any specific suggestions made to that end.

Shri Nath Pai: We did ask for a parliamentary committee like the Senate Committee of the USA. The House of Commons has now appointed a Committee under Lord Inchera to look into their working and their services. I gave that instance. Why do you not take Parliament into confidence and allow them to have a look at your embassies?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not quite understand what the hon. Member said in the course of his speech when he suggested that we have objected to any inspection by others. I do not know what he means by inspection. Inspection of what? They can inspect the way of working; they can hardly inspect the policies; that will take time; they can only inspect routine matters, much more than anything else. I do not mind Members of Parliament going and seeing the working of embassies, but I do feel that it will be a long tour, a costly tour, without too much of effect, because they can only go and see the normal working of it. Also, obviously many hon. Members cannot go.

One matter of grievance I have heard, sometimes from some Members of Parliament and sometimes even from pressmen, is want of co-operation from embassies. They go to a country and want, well, to see the Prime Minister of that place immediately, or the President of that place, or they want to be feted etc. It is rather difficult especially when a large number of people go to foreign countries. For example, a pressman was annoyed very much because our embassy could not arrange an interview for him with Mr. Churchill when Mr. Churchill was the Prime Minister of England. Mr. Churchill was a very busy man then, as Prime Ministers normally are and, therefore, he could not arrange an interview for the pressman with Mr. Churchill or with the other Ministers there, especially because he wanted it immediately in two or three days, and so he got annoyed and wrote that the

High Commissioner of India did not serve India well, because a party was not given in his honour by the High Commissioner.

Then, on the one hand, we are trying to economise. But, every person who goes from here wants a car to be put at his disposal. Sometimes, in big cities like London, Paris and Washington, plenty of people from India, eminent people, go and it is rather difficult to put a car at the disposal of everyone. These are little things.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): That is one side of the story. Please do not emphasise only the official version. I have many things to tell, but I do not want to.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Many such complaints were made and certain specific instances were quoted.

17 hrs.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know why Mr. Hanumanthaiya or Mr. Mathur should think that complaints were made by them or about them.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I have never made a complaint. But you are degrading the officials all the time. There is another side also to the picture.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no doubt that there is another side.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Shri Sri Prakasa has written an article recently and he has given, what is called, the secret psychology of these ICS Ambassadors.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): The Indian Members of Parliament do not get that much respect that the British Government gives to their MPs.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know:

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I beg you to raise the status of the Members of Parliament.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If a service, of which I am in-charge, is criticised, I have to say something on their behalf. I am responsible for that. I do not pretend to say they are not in error. They are often in error, often being pulled up. I have no doubt that Mr. Hanumanthaiya can tell me many things to their disadvantage. I accept that. But I have to put that side because they are not here to defend themselves. I have to defend them. Take the American Embassy here. It is a big Embassy with a vast staff and every American Senator and every businessman who comes here is treated well by the Embassy. But, secretly they may perhaps tell you that they are embarrassed by the visits of these crowds, senators and others.

Shri Hem Barua: Where is the secrecy?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, there are one or two matters that I should like to mention.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Something about our relations with Nepal and Pakistan.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think, it was Mr. Nath Pai, probably, who drew my attention to Kalimpong appearing here.

Shri Nath Pai: Pardon, Sir? I did not.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Not you. Some other Member drew my attention to Appendix II in this book—Indian Information Units Abroad. In that list, Kalimpong also appears, as was quite rightly pointed out. Obviously it is wrong. It has no business to be there. It is a mistake.

Shri Nath Pai: Do you sometimes read the reports? We have pointed out many things.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I read them about the same times as the hon. Member does.

Shri Nath Pai: They are shown to you before they are prepared.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes; sometimes.

Shri Hem Barua: They are prepared by you. That is how it appears.

Shri Nath Pai: His compositions are bound to be better.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, may I tell you about Kalimpong? It has a special information centre which was opened when the Tibetans started coming in large numbers. It was for that. It should not have been put here. But we had to open it because many problems arose because of those Tibetan refugees coming there and many living there.

Then, there is another matter. I think, this was by Mr. Nath Pai. He was quite worked up about the fact that our *charge d'affaires* went to a dinner party or something in Peking which Mr. Bhutto was given. Well, I did not know much about it. I enquired and I found that he had referred the matter to our Ministry.

Shri Hem Barua: That is true. We know that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: And our Ministry had told him that this was a normal function and that he should go.

Shri Nath Pai: Was it a normal function? It was an occasion when Mr. Bhutto was there to sign a pact against India. And it makes it all the worse that the Ministry had given a consent. What you tell makes the affair worse.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know. I am not inclined to agree with the hon. Member. But, normally, in these matters, these normal formalities are observed unless you want....

Shri Nath Pai: Signing a pact against India is a normal protocol function?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not want to argue this matter. There was a Foreign Minister there and a party was given in his honour by his opposite number in the other Government.

Shri Hem Barua: To celebrate India's disgrace.

Shri Nath Pai: That is not the truth of the matter. He knows it. He himself is uncomfortable about it.

Shri Hem Barua: He was disturbed mentally. That is why he consulted you. We know the details of that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are no other details except that he referred the matter to the Ministry and our Ministry told him that he had better go.

Shri Ranga: Your Ministry has committed a blunder and you are not prepared to agree.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Shri Ranga: Were there not many occasions when the Russian Ambassador had walked out just because a few observations were made against Russia in many countries where dinners were being held. And we seem to draw a lot of lessons from Russia.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Everybody has occasionally walked out. People even walk out of this sovereign Parliament. What to do? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Ranga: We certainly wish to censure your Ministry as well as your *Charge d'affaires* for having insulted this country in that ignominious manner.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not prepared to accept that. You may say that. There may be two opinions: it is better not to have gone or gone. In fact...

Shri Hem Barua: If it had been a normal function, the *Charge d'affaires* could have consulted you. It shows that he was mentally disturbed. He is an honest man, I should say.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would like to put the other side of the case. Because our relations both with Pakistan and China are very bad, therefore it was desirable for him to go.

Shri Hem Barua: We completely disagree with you. Not on this occasion. (*Interruption*). . .

Mr. Speaker: He has said that there can be two opinions. Why should there be.... (*Interruption*).

Shri Ranga: There is difference of opinion over this. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: What is to be done? (*Interruption*).

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: In one breath he is inclined to agree with what the hon. Member says. In another breath, he tries to justify a thing which is indefensible.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not arguing about this. Hon. Members are certainly entitled to their opinions.

Shri Hem Barua: If you admit your mistake, that would be more graceful.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I agree to my mistake?

Shri Nath Pai: It is your Ministry's serious mistake. The whole of India thinks so. If you admit that would be more graceful.

Shri Hem Barua: That would be more graceful.

Shri Ranga: My friend, you are a die-hard.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Some hon. Member asked me about Marshal Chen Yi's statement that Mrs. Bandaranaike had interpreted the Colombo proposals to them in one way and to us in another way. Obviously, I am not the person to answer that. It is for Mrs. Bandaranaike or some of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

her colleagues. Mr. Ali Sabry, Chairman of the Executive Council of Egypt, has replied to it, denying this fact. He has said that they interpreted it in the same way to the Chinese authorities, as they had done to us.

Some hon. Member objected to our inviting foreign dignitaries to India on grounds of economy. I do not know if it would be very good economy not to invite people, especially when we have previously invited them before the emergency. We could not tell them not to come. It is very bad. I think that from many points of view, it is desirable for us to invite people and sometimes for our people to go there. Our President is going abroad fairly soon first to some West Asian countries and later further west.

About Nepal there is nothing very much to say, and I do not know why people should imagine or why some hon. Members should have imagined that we have been at any time even in the last two years and more, opposed in any way to Nepal. All that I said here in Parliament when for the first time the *coup* took place in Nepal was that I regretted the setback to democracy. At no time have we changed our attitude to Nepal. We have been carrying on our works, constructive works, which we are making in Nepal. But, somehow or other, these ideas arose in people's minds, but we are trying to put them aside, and I think that they do not exist now.

I entirely agree with some hon. Member who said about our Home Minister's visit there. His visit did a great deal of good. Unfortunately, we cannot send him all over the place.

Shri Hem Barua: He is wanted here.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Quite so.

Then, there was another matter about Goa or Pondicherry, NEFA, Nagaland etc. being removed from the purview of the External Affairs Ministry to the Home Ministry. I would be glad if that was done, but I do not think at the present moment that is desirable. My chief reason is not that the External Affairs Ministry is in any sense looking after them better than the Home Ministry would, but their own wishes in the matter. The people there are anxious to remain for the moment connected with the External Affairs Ministry because of past contacts.

Shri Hem Barua: They are interested in your leadership, not so much in the External Affairs Ministry as such; but they are interested in it because you are there.

Shri Nath Pai: That is a very important point, namely that the Prime Minister handles it. It looks *prima facie* that they want to be under the External Affairs Ministry, but really they want to be under the Prime Minister. And that is understandable enough.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That may be so. Anyhow, at the present moment, they would not like to go over. Take NEFA, for instance. Whatever may be done to it in the future, at present, in the present emergency, it will be undesirable to make any change.

About this Treaty to which reference has been made, namely the Pakistan-China Treaty, I do not know if hon. Members have seen a new pamphlet that we have issued which deals with that, and we have, probably yesterday or the day before, presented a note to the Security Council on that subject. Some reference to it has appeared in the press today.

Some hon. Members took exception to our continuing our talks with Pakistan. I can quite understand their slight irritation at this, but there are many things that irritate us, which we in the balance still consider worthwhile doing, and which to put it in the other way, we think it would be wrong not to do. We considered this fully and we came to the conclusion that we should not break these talks or refuse to go to them even though the outlook was pretty dark. And at the last series of talks in Calcutta, Shri Swaran Singh agreed to another series. I may say that Shri Swaran Singh has done this work in these talks in an extraordinarily fine manner, with great patience and yet clarity and firmness. For, it is right, fundamentally right, especially in cases of two countries, never—I repeat 'never'—to refuse to talk.

If one is clear of one's position, one can stick to it. But in national matters, national passions are roused and they come in the way of the consideration of any matter soberly and impartially. We feel strongly about these matters; I think we are right in that. But rightly or wrongly, others feel strongly the other way, and if one takes up an attitude of no-talks, it adds to these national passions which makes it still more difficult. Therefore, we should be prepared to talk and to try to reach some kind of a settlement provided it is in keeping with our notions of what is right.

One thing more and I shall finish. Some Members referred to Shri B. Patnaik, Chief Minister of Assam—I am sorry, Orissa.

Shri Hem Barua: We do not want him as our Chief Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no need for him to go there. You have got a good Chief Minister.

In the early days of this emergency we had occasion to discuss with him

many factors concerning our defence. He is a man with considerable ideas, considerable experience, actual experience, which hardly anyone of us here has, certainly not I.

Shri Hem Barua: Ideas about what?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: About defence.

Shri Hem Barua: Defence?

Shri Narasimha Reddy: Was he in war service in the first or second world war?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: War service as an aviator, specially about aircraft etc. So I asked him to come here occasionally from Orissa to confer with me. He knows many of our people, Generals and Air Marshals. He has worked with them in his younger days. In the last war he was a pilot. We found his advice helpful. So he used to come here from time to time. Later, we thought it would be a good thing if he went to America and discussed some of these matters he had discussed with us there. As a matter of fact, he was thinking of going to America for another reason, concerning his own State.

Shri Ranga: He has businesses also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We asked him to add this to his work and from such accounts as we have had—he will be coming back in four or five days—he has done good work there.

Shri Ranga: Since when have Chief Ministers been allowed to go to other countries in regard to their own State affairs? Earlier a similar question arose and they said it was an exceptional case, but generally it ought not to be done.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am pointing out to the hon. Member another reason why he was sent. He was already going on his State affairs. I do not think any other Chief Minister would have gone for that reason.

Shri Ranga: I know he has a number of businesses.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are a number of cut motions. I am sorry I am not dealing with each one of them. But I hope Members will appreciate that we have to find a balance between two things: one is our desire for economy and the other to improve our service, publicity and the rest. They are very expensive. That is very unfortunate. Even if you want to open a small office somewhere, it involves a large expenditure—staff. So also publicity. But I do believe that our publicity has improved lately considerably. We have had the help of a very experienced man, whom we sent for, who was in London, acting as a correspondent of one of our Indian newspapers, and his help has been very good.

Anyhow, I welcome this discussion which has brought out many of the ideas that hon. Members have and many of the criticisms, and I hope we shall profit by them.

Shri Nath Pal: One question, Sir, I had raised the question of Indian prisoners of war. I think the whole House is anxious about the fate of our prisoners of war in Chinese hands. May we know what is being done about them? We should try to do something to remove the impression that they are forgotten. Can we have an assurance from the Prime Minister that even if the Chinese accept the Colombo proposals in toto, one pre-condition on our behalf will be the release of our men before the talks are started?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Naturally, it does not need my saying that we are much-interested in our prisoners of war in Chinese hands, and we would like them back. But I hope the Members will appreciate that it is not a very desirable thing to go about begging the Chinese with favours, whatever they may be.

Shri Nath Pal: Refusing to talk about. That is what I said.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Refusing to talk; yes. We are not talking. In fact, that may very well be the first thing that one talks about. One cannot take up these attitudes. One can only take up attitudes from certain strength which you apply. It is not merely refusing to do this or not do this. You must also have the strength to enforce your demand. If you have not got that, it is futile talking about that in that way.

Shri Hem Barua: It is reported of late that hostile activities in Nagaland are intensive due to the successful entry into Nagaland of hundred hostiles under Mr. Kaito, and it is reported that they are armed with the latest weapons also from Pakistan, and they are showing definitely pro-Chinese tendencies. In that context, is it a fact that Mr. Phizo has written to the Prime Minister that he is ready to give a respite to these hostile activities for another five years provided that the Prime Minister gives him an assurance that they will have a plebiscite to determine the Nagaland's future political destiny?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: About the hostile activities in Nagaland, they revived somewhat about two or three months ago, partly because of the removal of some troops from there, although right at the beginning of this emergency, there was definitely a feeling among large number of Nagas to help us. Apparently they did not like this Chinese aggression and they wanted to help us. But then, when certain pressures were removed, all the hostile Nagas did take to that. Recently, a group of Nagas, about 200 strong,—I do not know if Mr. Kaito is there or not; he might be there or might not be there.

Shri Hem Barua: He is.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Might be. He split this into two groups. They came on the Manipur frontier. They were met by our border guards—whatever they are there—and one of

them was pushed back completely. They went back into Burmese territory—they came via Burma. Of the others, some broke up and some small groups probably entered—it is a very jungly place, forest-clad hills—and they probably entered parts of Manipur territory in bits, and they are being pursued—whatever you call it—by our forces there.

About the other part of the hon. Member's question, I received a letter from Mr. Phizo about a month ago or thereabouts—may be more.

Shri Hem Barua: From Mr. Michael Scott.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes. Mr. Michael Scott brought a letter for me from Mr. Phizo; in which Mr. Phizo said that he was—I do not remember his words—distressed at this continuing trouble in Nagaland between the Government and his people there. And, he would like to find a way out, etc. I think he suggested, in that letter or otherwise, I do not quite remember, that if we gave him facilities to come to India, he would like to come and meet me to discuss this matter. I first of all told Rev. Michael Scott that I am always prepared to meet anybody, but in this matter, I can only proceed on the advice of the present Government of Nagaland.

Shri Hem Barua: They are opposed to it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, I referred the matter to the Governor of Nagaland, who consulted the Executive Council of Nagaland. They are not opposed to it exactly, but they said that at the present moment, it would not be desirable.

Then I sent a message to Mr. Phizo through our High Commission there that I would be prepared to meet him and to give him facilities for his coming here, but these hostile activities in Nagaland must be curbed and must stop. Otherwise, there will be no point in his coming here.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Would the Prime Minister tell us whether the Government propose to persist in advocating and in sponsoring the cause of the People's Republic of China for admission to the United Nations?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That question will come up about six or seven months later, and I do not know what the situation will be then. But I would like the House to appreciate that our advocating the cause of the People's Republic of China entering the UN has nothing to do with our liking or disliking the Chinese. (*Interruptions*). I do not know what we will decide then, but I wish to point out that it is an odd thing that the Chinese Government itself has no particular desire to go there.

Shri Nath Pai: That is a pretension; they know they are being rejected. They are making the best of the job.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is very difficult for any major question like disarmament to be settled there without the agreement of a great country like China.

Mr. Speaker: Am I required to put any of the cut motions separately?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The I shall put all the cut motions to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 17 to 23 and 118 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

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

DEMAND No. 17—TRIBAL AREAS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,55,04,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND No. 18—NAGA HILLS-TUENSANG AREA

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,54,89,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Naga Hills-Tuensang Area'."

DEMAND No. 19—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,47,15,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 20—STATE OF PONDICHERY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,45,28,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'."

DEMAND No. 21—DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI AREA

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,90,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending

the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Dadra and Nagar Haveli Area'."

DEMAND No. 22—GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,48,46,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Goa, Daman and Diu'."

DEMAND No. 23—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,42,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

DEMAND No. 118—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,12,75,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 41 to 46 and 127 to 129 relating to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture for which 8 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating which of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND No. 41—MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 75,50,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

DEMAND No. 42—AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,93,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

DEMAND No. 43—AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,74,10,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Agricultural Research'."

DEMAND No. 44—ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 88,71,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Animal Husbandry'."

DEMAND No. 45—FOREST

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 97,64,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Forest'."

DEMAND No. 46—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 29,14,62,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

DEMAND No. 127—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON FORESTS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,10,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Forests'."

DEMAND No. 128—PURCHASE OF FOODGRAINS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,27,57,36,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Purchase of Foodgrains'."

DEMAND NO. 129—OTHER CAPITAL OUT-LAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 60,27,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture'."

There is one other thing that I have to say which concerns particularly the smaller groups. I shall not be able to accommodate every group, however small it may be, in every demand. Therefore, they should send me the preferences that they have, so that I might accommodate them as far as possible.

Is no hon. Member getting up to speak?

Some Hon. Members: The House is tired.

Mr. Speaker: Somebody might begin and then I will adjourn the House.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका मशकूर हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : खेती के बारे में आपसे प्रच्छा बोलने वाला और कौन हो सकता है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : हमको खेती के लिए अपनी नदियों के पानी का बांध बनाकर पूरा उपयोग करना चाहिए। हम गंगा के पानी का पूरा उपयोग नहीं कर रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आगे माननीय सदस्य बोल जारी रखेंगे।

17.31 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, March 20, 1963/Phalgun 29, 1884 (Saka).