[Shri Kanungo]

(ii) The Woollen Textiles (Production and Distribution Control) (Amendment) Order, 1964 published in Notification No. S.O. 811 dated the 7th March, 1964. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-2678/64].

(2) a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) Annual Report of the Nahan Foundry Limited, Nahan, for the year 1962-63 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.

(ii) Review by the Government on the working of the above Company. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-2679/64].

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

FIFTY-THIRD REPORT

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): I beg to present the Fifty-third Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Finance—Department of Revenue and Company Law (Company Law Division).

12.17 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—*contd.*

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs. Shri D. C. Sharma may continue his speech.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I was submitting respectfully yesterday that the proposal which is before the Disarmament Conference at Geneva has two aspects. The first is concerned with nuclear delivery vehicles and missiles. It also has something to do with a cut in the conventional arms. I do not care for the percentages—the percentages are to be very high—nor do I want that this question should be stalled on the rock of physical verification. But these questions should be negotiated properly so that the Partial Test Ban Treaty which was arranged between the late President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev does not become an end in itself, but leads to further attempts at progressive realisation of the goal of general disarmament. If nothing else, I support the proposal for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which received very favourable reaction in the talks there and it should be given a very good climate to work.

Now I come to the Security Council debate on Kashmir. I do not want to go into what happened at the last meeting,, but I do want that when the debate is resumed in the Security Council, our country should stick to the stand already taken without any fear or favour, without whittling down a jot or tittle of this demand. I feel it was very unfriendly on the part of the British delegate, Sir Patric Dean, to suggest that the legality or the constitutionality of accession was not sufficient. If the legal and constitutional aspects are going to be questioned, I feel democracy will be a mockery. If it comes from the delegate who represents a country which is known as the mother of democracies, I do not know what conception of democracy that delegate or that Government is pursuing.

The USA delegate advocated mediation, but are they having recourse to plebiscite in all those countries in the world where the British people have trouble with others? Is the USA resorting to mediation in countries in the world where it is having some kind of trouble? No. I think it is good to

preach to others what you cannot practise yourself. I feel that these things should not be taken very seriously nor do I think that statements made by Sheikh Abdulla after his release should deter us from pursuing our course of action. It is a pity that he should have referred so slightingly to the Constituent Assembly; it is also a pity that he should have thought that the general elections which have been held in Kashmir on three successive occasions were not fair and impartial. I feel that the people of Kashmir have given their verdict already in the Constituent Assembly in three general elections and that there should be no reversal of what has been done already. We must not be led by considerations which pertain to constitutionality or legality or demogagy. We must try to be above them. At the same time I suggest that we should not try to determine the people's views again. The people of Kashmir should not be put on trial again and again over a thing which they have decided once for all already nor should I say that the process of integration should come to a halt. It should go on taking its normal course and we should not try to be deterred by what is being said.

I was speaking about the stand of U.K. I know that the Governments of Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden have offered military units to UN. Our country was of the opinion that this question should be mixed up with the question of general disarmament. A time has come when the U.N. should augment its international police force or peace keeping forces. There are border troubles between one country and another. There are troubles in so many parts of the world. I feel that this is a necessity which is demanded by the disturbed situation in the world at this time and the U. N. should go ahead with this.

I want to say a few words about the Indians or people of Indian origin resident in some of the countries of Africa. I refer to Mozambique, Kenya, Tanganiyka, Zanzibar. It is a fictitious distinction to say that some persons are Indian nationals and other persons are persons of Indian origin. There may be that legal distinction but I feel that my country must have the overall responsibility for the safety and dignity of those persons who may be Indian nationals or persons of Indian origin, who are living in other countries. It may be Burma, Ceylon or any other country but our country must pursue a very dynamic policy so far as the lives of these persons are concerned.

One point more and I have done, Sir. We should try to strengthen our diplomatic missions in Africa. We do not have any missions in some of the newly emerging countries of Africa, such as the Central African Republic, the Congo, Gabon, Nigen. Mauritania, etc. African countries received impetus for their liberation movement from our country, especially from Mahatma Gandhi and our Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru they are grateful to them both. I feel that our resources should be augmented so that we can establish missions in every independent country of Africa.

Lastly, I want to say something about India and Pakistan. It is essential that the Nehru-Liaquat Ali pact must be given a new lease of life; it must be made operative: it should not remain a dead-letter. It should be given a semblance, not semblance but real life. I know attempts are being made to abrogate this pact, but I feel that this gave some sense of security of life to the minorities and also some psychological impact. Therefore, I think everything should be done to keep this pact going and make it workable and operative. At the same time, I submit that India's stand on the subject of the infiltrators into Assam and Manipur should not be given up in the light of what is happening in other parts of India and in the world. I would say that India should try to inform the world about the minorities that are here.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

One last word and I shall finish. While we are discussing India and Pakistan here at the level of the Home Ministers, I read in the papers today that Mr. Ao has said that hostile Nagas are being armed in Pakistan and they are infiltrating into our country. I also read an item of news which has been contradicted by our Government that a wedding party of 36 had been killed in a village in Jammu and Kashmir and that village does not exist anywhere. What I say is, Pakistan is creating trouble for us all along the line. Pakistan press is not only giving distorted news about India but it is manufacturing news about India also. But in spite of that, India should not give up its stand so far as the infiltrators are concerned. So far as the minorities are concerned, it should not try to abrogate the Nehru-Liaquat Pact even though there may be very strong reasons given by them. I hope that our case about the minorities should be made known to the world as early as possible.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as we debate here in this House, the Home Ministers of India and Pakistan continue their deliberations. It would be perverse and churlish not to wish them well, but Pakistan's repeated record being what it is, optimism is indeed a feeling very difficult to muster. Pakistan's delegation is welcome to Delhi, but there can be no forgetting that nearly 200,000 people—Hindus, Christians and Buddhists—have come from East Bengal for shelter in India, that an unending procession of unfortunates still seems to be in prospect, and the cry of anguish continues to be heard from across the borders.

In their present mood and with their western patrons backing their intransigence, Pakistan may not listen either to the voice of reason or of neighbourliness, but let us hope, even against hope, that the conference will at least ensure Pakistan's compliance with the main provisions of the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact to which reference was made by my hon. friend Shri Sharma just now.

In West Bengal, I understand the Minorities Commissions has already been restored and it is time that Pakistan at least begins to do its duty by the minorities who have suffered so very grievously. If Pakistan cannot stop the exodus, it would be a very difficult prospect indeed. The papers report, in spite of what Shri Shastri said a little while ago, that in West Bengal official sources have intimated to the press that the East Pakistan Government has sealed the border. Without being able to stop the exodus, just to seal the border is no good at all. But they seem to have done it, and if the exodus continues, sealing of the border or no sealing of the border, the argument that there should be an exchange of population which we have heard sometimes from certain quarters, would become powerful and insistent. Such a thing is horrible to contemplate. The entire basis of our life would be subverted; insensible and unlimited hatred would make a permanent settlement on our minds and hearts and degrade both our countries. India, I am sure, is determined that whatever the provocation from our neighbour and whatever the price we many have to pay, we should prevent communal conflicts completely in this country and we look after the refugees as well as we can.

But we cannot have Pakistan glibly and crudely mount this hate compaign against India by imposing the refugee problem and creating an economic and emotional strain for this country which is truly terrific. A genuine effort towards understanding is the only remedy and meanwhile the pedestrian course of something like the revival of the Nehru-Liaquat Ali pact would be helpful.

Pakistan poses sanctimoniously that India is guilty and her patrons like

the UK and USA persistently encourage that lie. Yet, Sir, while we have sometimes failed—we have admitted every time we have failed—I have not hesitated in this House to attack our Government for what I consider to be its failure in regard to the protection of the minorities in this country. We have failed from time to time, but we have consistently sought to behave fairly. Let us not have always and everywhere a "Holier Than Thou" attitude; but let us not also pocket malicious slanders. Conceived in guile and executed in filth. Partition has brought shame and sorrow enough. When shall we have an end to this chapter? From the time when on the eve of his martyrdom Gandhiji made India pay Rs. 50 crores to Pakistan which might have been withheld, to our assumption of obligations under the Indus Water Treaty and during the long course of India's forbearance over the issue of Kashmir and the borders and the treatment of minorities in Pakistan, this country has been subjected to continuous provocation and to pin-pricks mounting to insufferable dimensions. I say again that India has sometimes failed, but for Pakistan and her patrons to throw stones at us is the utterest infamy.

Sir, I do not wish to believe that the rulers of Pakistan want the present madness to go on, but good sense must dawn, and in the movement of the Pakistani people themselves especially in East Bengal against the negation of democracy which is Ayubshahi, one should see the writing on the wall. We in this country—and I wish this House to remind itself—have the world's third largest population of Muslims. We cherish our secular democratic ideal. We are proud of our total Indian heritage, our composite culture with Hindu, Muslim and other strands commingling, a phenomenon which certain obscurantists wish wrongly and mischievously to deny.

We are faced with this gigantic exodus problem created by our neighbour's perversity, and yet, ironically, we are sought to be put in the dock all the time. Perhaps, in pursuit of a civilised policy in Kashmir and elsewhere, we have turned the other cheek a little too often to our neighbours bullying. Let us show up Pakistani wrong-doing for what it is; and I add, show up the patrons of Pakistan so that at least countries better fitted to understand in Africa and Asia can know the truth.

Sir, the other day I read an article written untruthfully, and he knows it, by President Ayub in *Foreign Affairs*, where he says that India has ambitions of hegemony from the Hindukush to the Mekong river. Why he stops at Mekong, I do not know. His Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto says in London that U.K. and France are in his pocket and over Kashmir India is "on the run." Perhaps the Christian persecution in Pakistan has slightly touched the Christian hearts of the West. But their motives are plain. The *London Times* which had the affrontery to refuse to publish a letter sent on the question of immigration by our High Commissioner in London, this paper which parades its piety before all the world, wrote recently an insolent article where it suggested—in spite of what Mr. Chagla had said in New York and our Government has repeated—that there should be Commonwealth mediation over Kashmir and the other questions, and that the United States should give us a reprimand because the Plan projects have been disturbed by certain communal happenings in this country. This paper has the gumption to write this kind of thing and talk about America giving us "a sharp warning." Of course our foreign publicity, in answer to this kind of thing whatever the Prime Minister, standing by his minions might say in its favour—fails as usual.

In a Calcutta daily which Mrs. Lakshmi Menon might pooh-pooh as a vernacular paper—I was amazed to see how she could use that expression in the presence of the Prime Minister who had objected to the word in relation to our Indian language papers....

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): The Member who asked the question used the same word. I was repeating what the Member had said.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Minister of State had said in answer to a supplementary that Government is not going to take notice about vernacular papers or something like that.

Mr. Speaker: She says that she only repeated the words that had been used by the Member who put this supplementary.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Do I take it that if I use an unparliamentary word the Minister would fling it back at me? Do I take it that the Minister uses language which is coloured by whatever is said by other Members? Do I take it that the Minister can use words which were considered to be objectionable by the Prime Minister himself years ago? I am not going to waste by time over these footling little things. But here, in the *Jugantar*, in their editorial on 7th April they write that one of their Chief Editors went to Washington and met the editorial staff of the *Washington Post* and the *Washington Post* told them that there was not one hand-out from our Indian embassy in Washington about the happenings in the last three months between India and Pakistan.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know the Security Council is meeting in two weeks' time. Some of our chaps might go abroad in the middle of May after the whole thing is over. Meanwhile, the Secretary-General, Mr. Desai or somebody else is making a jaunt over thirteen countries. God bless them for the tours abroad which they are having in the summer of India which is a little too tiring. But this is not anything like enough. This is the kind of thing which we are doing. Meanwhile, the United Kingdom hugs Pakistan over Kashmir. Mr. Nixon calls Pakistan the United States' "staunch ally." Mr. Adlai Stevenson, aching, to hit India below the belt, bellows before a university audience that India did "an outright invasion" when Goa was liberated. Our university studdents have to read a book—I will give one example—a book entitled *The Relations of Nations* by one Mr. Frederick Hartman of the Florida University, U.S.A., where India is called a Hindu State, where the redemption of Goa is condemned and Pakistan is supported over Kashmir.

It is time for the world to take note of what is at stake in our sub-continent. Sometimes we fail, but India tries to prove that various religious groups can co-exist in the same State on equal terms of citizenship; but Pakistan wants to prove that it is impossible. Communal killings come to India as a terrible embarrassment and we seek to prevent it, while they are to Pakistan as instrument of policy, a hopeful way of feathering its own nest in the international sphere. We are a secular democracy, keen on progress and bent on solving our social and economic problems. Pakistan is anti-democratic and anti-secular, unduly interested in maintaining a repressive and nearmediaeval structure of life and society. These are matters which the world must know. It is no good merely talking in terms of the handouts which the High Commissions produce from time to time. These are things which the world must know, especially the Afro-Asian countries must understand and they should know how Pakistan, born as something like a potential British base of operations against India, has played a necessarily reactionary role for the last sixteen years or so, crushing its own people in East Bengal, particularly. And as the only Asian member both of CEATO and CENTO, it does the dirty work of its western patrons. These are the things which should be made known to other countries.

Regarding Kashmir, Government's attitudes and actions are often a little unclear, and even though we wish godspeed to what Government is trying to

do' things appear in a very peculiar light. But the recent formation of the Sadiq Government has been a very welcome event. It has cleared the air to a large extent, and restored decency and the possibility of democratic life to the clouded politics of Jammu and Kashmir.

The release of Sheikh Abdullah also is welcome in so far as he has been very long in detention, and astronomically enormous amounts have been spent in prosecuting a case against him; and so it is a good thing that that blot on India's escutcheon is removed, that he is now free. He has given some statements which I hope would be studied with more care and we should not also hustle him and expect him to make statements which can be criticised one way or the other just at the present moment. He is perhaps a little equivocal when he referes to certain matters in his statement. That is, may be, because he has just been out after eleven years of jail life. But I should think that there is no reason for panic. I should think that both India and the democratic forces, the progressive forces in Jammu and Kashmir, would come together. I should think that we are not going to bedevil the future by building up a new quarrel between the past and the present in Kashmir.

Sheikh Abdullah has made a very welcome reference to his relationship with the Prime Minister. I am very glad because of this reference, because it reminds us of something of a treasure which we possess. No one we know or shall ever know has the Prime Minister's power of evoking affection from very disparate sorts of people. This great human quality which is natural in a country which has known the compassion of Buddha or the gentle spark of Gandhiji's personality should be brought to bear on the happy solution of the Kashmir tangle. I cannot say more than that; perhaps to say more than that might unnecessarily jeopardise the position which, we all wish, is being smoothly tackled and successfully conluded.

This reminds me how our stand over Kashmir before the United Nations requires to be modified. Why do we keep this miserable case dangling before the United Nations? Why has our Minister of Education to run again in mid summer to New York in order to present our case, to answer objections which are going to be made against our conduct? And, have we not discovered, particularly in regard to the United Kingdom with which we have a certain kind of relationship, that, perhaps, that relationship has to be re-examined? May be, something has got to be done about the commenwealth link.

What exactly is the charm in the Commonwealth? At one time we anathematised it. At Lahore, when we took the independence pledge, we said that being part of his empire is not only politically and economically but also spiritually degrading. We said it. Then we thought, after we were free, that it was not perhaps too bad to be in a very big conglomeration if that did not hurt. But this thing does hurt. This Commonwealth today is hurting our people. I would like this House to remember—I will give a few instances—the pinpricks which amount to something worse. Late last year, in November 1963, the British Parliament passed and quitely renewed the Commonwealth Immigration Act, and the British Labour Party this time protested in a very much milder tone than last time, something which bedevils the racial atmosphere of Britain which goes against Asia and the West Indians, and that is put again on the British statute-book. The other day, on 6th April, in answer to Starred Question No. 908, we were told by the Minister that Indians holding British passports in Zanzibar were refused help otherwise extended to other non-British Europeans by the United Kingdom High Commission and, of course, we could do nothing about it. We are still "natives," we are still "the lesser breed without the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

law;" that is how they look upon us even now. That is why I say, why not examine the question of our remaining in the Commonwealth.

I remember, this question came up earlier in this session. Shri Chagla was asked about it and he said, we behave in a civilised fasion, we do not act in a huff, we do not act because of our anger. But the anger is there, he admitted. He admitted anger having been produced in our mind. I am not asking the Prime Minister to act in a huff, but I am asking him to examine the position again and to bring it before the Commonwealth authorities and their leaders in the United Kingdom and elsewhere that this kind of thing is not going to be stomached by India which has known how to fight for freedom and how to try to consolidate that freedom.

I turn now to what is called the China question, this trouble which has gone on for so long, this jolt to our soul, our body, our self-respect and all that which was implied by the aggression from our neighbour. Do we have to live with the Chinese aggression on our borders as we have been living with the Pakistan aggression over half of Kashmir? Has our policy become just pertified into a pathetic waiting on events elsewhere? I wish the Prime Minister and his advisers please take a new look at non-alignment and make it a more vibrant thing, the kind of vibrant thing which it was at one time and which it ought to be again.

Over Kashmir and over this China question, unequivocal support has come to us from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The House will remember how in his New Year Message the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union asked the heads of States to agree to an understanding in regard to the settlement of all boundary questions of whatever sort by negotiation, and I am glad to notice that our Prime Minister welcomed it very heartily. Recently there has been a report presented by Mr. Suslov at the Soviet Communist Party where he has said over and over again how the Soviet Union condemns the Chinese invasion of India and refers to the blind arrogance with which China has behaved towards us. I may quote a few words from this report, because I consider it to be extremely significant. He said:

> "The Soviet Government has repeatedly advocated a settlement by negotiation of this frontier dispute."

He added:

> "The pernicious consequences of this conflict have now manifested themselves fully. It has rendered a great service to imperialism and inflicted grave harm to the national liberation movement, the progressive forces of India and the entire front of anti-imperialist struggle. Utilising the Sino-India conflict for their own purposes, the imperalists and their supporters are seeking to undermine the trust of the people, of young national States in socialist countries, draw India into military blocs and strengthen the positions of extreme reaction in the country."

Then he adds sarcastically about China's alliance with Pakistan and says:

> "Can anyone believe that a rapprochement with Pakistan has been dictated by interests of development of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Asia against imperialism that the Chinese leaders talk so much about?".

These are things which are heartening to hear. But I hope that the "rethinking" to which Shri Shastri made

some esoteric reference the other day is really sought to be conducted.

I say this because of certain things which I wish to submit to this House in all humility. India has said "no" to the Ceylon Prime Minister's query if India would agree to negotiations if China were to vacate the seven posts in Ladakh. This is a departure from the Chinese previous stand and to that extent somewhat significant. I agree that India may have very good reasons for the refusal. But what I wish to say is, let us not just stick in the mud of an *impasse* which we cannot solve on our own. Let us not merely wait upon events. Let us not merely wait for whatever friends might turn up from wherever it might be to help us out. Let us try to think a little more constructively. Can't we take some initiative with the Colombo powers and our other friends? At present we wait for them to make a move. Certain things have happened which we cannot expect our friends will not misunderstand.

I am trying to remind this House of those things which have happened. We had joint Indo-US air exercises. They might have been unavoidable, but they enabled the US air force to familiarise itself with operational conditions on the India-China border. Many countries in Africa and Asia just did not like it. We have had the Voice of America agreement signed by the Government of India without batting an eyelid. Then the Government repudiated it under public pressure. It leaves a very bad taste in the mouth. The US Seventh Fleet extends its operations in the Indian Ocean. They operate and there is no rebuff. The Prime Minister said it was not to our detriment. He said also that a few ships might be going here and there and so they are not important. But the few ships of the Prime Minister's reckoning are a task force with modern aircraft carrier carrying nuclear arsenal sufficient to blow up and wipe out this part of the globe many times over. Was it the expectation that the presence of the Seventh Fleet would somehow persuade China to settle the border question to our satisfaction? It is too native, I believe, to be taken seriously and should now at last be discarded after the U.S. pronouncements on Kashmir and on Goa.

Re-thinking therefore should be done. Make a re-thinking, make a re-assessment rationally of Chinese objectives in the present setup. China is getting rebuffs in so many places. China has done her worst. That is why Pakistan is being sent out to pester us. It is not just an accident, it is a part of the game, a part of the conspiracy against India. Certain powers can never stomach the idea of India being really free. If India is really free, there will be a change in the climate of the world in favour of the kind of ideal which India has got in the South-east Asian region. Some people do not like India to be free. But China is getting rebuffs. Here is a report by Mr. Suslov and we have seen reports of what happened at the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Budapest or some other place. On this basis, we can define our attitudes and policies regarding this problem. Otherwise, willynilly we shall be drawn into the vortex of United States policies and purposes that may suit some people—I need not specify who they are; they might also be in this House—but not this country. This is a matter to which I hope the Government gives all its attention.

I turn now to the question of Nagaland, where peace efforts are continuing and we wish them well. Always we support peace efforts. It is in the right direction. We have full trust in Mr. Ao, who is running the administration there, but I would only sound a note of warning—beware of certain folk. The friend and protector of Mr. Phizo, the Reverend Michael Scott, who descends on the Indian scene from time to time—this time I do not know why he bypassed Delhi; possibly he thought that after his last year's performance he would not

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

get the hospitality of the Prime Minister, otherwise Delhi is not worth a visit—has gone to that part of the world. This sort of a do-gooder, maybe whatever he is, is no friend of India. They might be wolves in sheep's clothing. In the clothing of a reverend gentleman, they might be perpetrating, God knows, what kind of conspiracy against us in that part of the world. The slanders on the Government of India which last year were concocted in the ugliest terms, we cannot forget. Anyway, beware of certain folks which Government seem to be hobnobbing with from time to time. Go ahead with trust in your people on the spot, men like Mr. Ao and carry on peace negotiations wherever that is possible.

I turn now to the question of our High Commission in London, which I find has been referred to by the latest Public Accounts Committee's report at page 4 being still comparatively overstaffed. This PAC Report also refers to financial irregularities committed even by some Ambassadors. But it is not for that that I refer to the Indian High Commission in London. I had tried to draw the attention of this House to the shabby treatment which has been meted out by the Indian High Commission to our eminent Indian artistes who went the Edinburgh festival, Artistes like Balasaraswathi, Subbulakshmi, Ali Akbar Khan and Ravi Shankar went there and Ali Akbar Khan gave a Press Conference in Calcutta where he said—it was supported by other reports in the Press—that this Delegation which created a most magnificent impression in the Edinburgh Festival with their performances, music and dancing, was ignored by the High Commission. It was only after the Press in London and elsewhere wrote wonderful appreciations about them that they tried to take some notice and on that occasion with the high and mighty manner of the englicised Indians they asked Ali Akbar Khan, for instance. "Oh you know you can come along to the High Commission; there will be a sort of a party, you will perform, you will be expected, you know, to perform, but don't take more than 10 to 15 minutes" This is the kind of high-falutin nonsense which is said to our artistes by people who when a Minister of sorts emerges on the scene grovel like anything. If Mr. Subramaniam goes to London, possibly they would be saluting him in a way which would embarass Mr. Subramaniam. But when Ali Akbar Khan, Balasaraswathi or Subbulakshmi goes there, then they say, "You fend for yourself". They had to put up in digs in Edinburgh where the Press people could not even manage to go and they could not even call the Press people to come and see them. This is the sort of thing which happens. I know I asked a question and it was answered in some way. The Prime Minister possibly got a report that everything that was necessary was done for the sake of these people. But Ali Akbar Khan held a Press Conference in Calcutta which was reported in the Calcutta papers where he made these allegations. But, any day, I will believe an artiste like Ali Akbar Khan than the minions which the High Commissioner's office has got in London. This is the sort of thing which goes on and it must stop.

We find reports also—the *Statesman* wrote the other day, on the 3rd April—that the External Affairs Ministry was unable to find an Ambassdor to Burma, a post turned down by a senior career diplomat whose appointment to the Rangoon Embassy was announced several months ago; but for many months nobody was there. I have just heard from a friend of mine who has returned from Europe that for many months there was nobody in Vienna—no Ambassador, no *charge d'affaires*, no First Secretary, no Second Secretary—and the Austrian Government did not know what to do about it. Ultimately, someone was sent there from somewhere in Africa to go and take up the job in Vienna.

Then, the *Statesman* wrote in a special article on 3rd April, 1964—I am quoting:

> "Many of those present at Palam to welcome President Aref had to hang their heads in shame because, thanks to the negligence of the high functionaries of the Foreign Office, the Iraqi President had to travel to India in President Ayub Khan's plane!"

President Aref has given with the Prime Minister a wounderful statement. President Aref has also seen a thing or two. When President Aref is brought here not in an Indian plane but in President Ayub Khan's plane and when President Aref is received in Pakistan by thousands of people milliong together to give him at least outwordly a tumultuous welcome, in Palam he arrives to see only a few people scattered here and there. Why is it, if this report is true, that our Foreign Office failed to arrange some kind of a transport for President Aref to come to this country and to arrange at Palam and elsewhere such welcome as would compete with Pakistan's? I say these little things may not matter, but even so they do matter to a certain extent, when we do wish to win the friendship of the world, when these are the countries whose good opinion we value. We treat them in the manner which some of the high-ups in the External Affairs Ministry might think to be the right kind of conduct. Their training in the British school is something which goes against the grain if Indian decency and Indian hospitality and the Ministry has got to do something about it.

Now, I turn hurriedly to the question of Pondicherry. I am sorry if I am treading on Mrs Menon's toes. I am very sorry to have to do it, but I have to refer to Pondicherry. It seems the Chief Minister there who is a Congress man, Monsieur Goubert, is also the Mayor of Pandichery. There was a Municipal auction irregularly conducted which was cancelled by the order of the Madras High Court. After that, as a sort of a reprisal, in the Pondicherry Assembly the ruling party is trying to bring up legislation in order to remove the jurisdiction of the Madras High Court from Pondicherry and to have a sort of a Commission on the old quasi-French lines which would be always amenable to influence by the executive there. In Pondicherry also I find reports which would be perhaps amplified by other people regarding political hooliganism being practised against political opponents. This is the sort of things to which I wish to draw Mrs Menon's particular attention. I am sure if she knows the facts, she would do something about it. But this kind of an attempt at removing the rights of the High Court of Madras, this sort of an attempt should neveh possibly be countenanced.

There is a new conference going to take place of the non-aligned nations. Many more have joined this camp of non-aligned nations. I am sure it is going to do some good work. In any case, apart from whatever power it can exercise politically and economically, as a moral force, if properly directed, it has a tremendous force for good and I do hope that our participation in the second non-aligned conference would be very effective and all Government preparations for that would be successful.

The question of a second Bandung is there and I wish well to Shri Swaran Singh who has already gone for preparatory work in connection with it. I would like to say that in this House and elsewhere there should be no irrelevant talk about refusing to sit alongside China. We are having Conferences galore with Pakistan. With China we have not broken diplomatic relations. We are hoping for some kind of a settlement at some time or other, the sooner the better. So there is no kind of a sense of contamination if we sit on the same table

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

with China. If it is a conference of Afro-Asian nations, of course, China is there and we are there; both are there because of our own right to be there. There is no question therefore of refusing to sit alongside China all that should not come into the picture. Therefore, I want to say that before the Afro-Asian Group we can, and we have got to put our cast iron case in regard to China and in regard to Pakistan. This is exactly what we have got to do. We have to utilise every possible opportunity, specially the opportunity of meeting our likely friends and telling them about the real position. That is the only way in which we can rehabilitate the image of India which has unfortunately, whether we like to deny it or not, been tarnished in the eyes of many other people.

That is why I say it is necessary for the Prime Minister and his advisers to think not only of some of these little items but also of the economic implications of international relationship and he should turn his mind from time to time to the presently held Conference, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in Geneva. There we are finding out who is our friend and who is not. Mr. George Ball, speaking on behalf of the United States has warned other countries like us that development may be retarded by anti-private sector and anti-foreign investment policies. He said it very openly. Mr. Edward Heath from England has tried to mollify the situation somewhat but it is becoming very clear and India represented by Mr. Manubhai Shah has said it that we want GATT, General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, to be amplified so that socialist countries of Eastern Europe may be Members of GATT and we have supported the idea of a new international alignment so that trade can really be conducted not only on lines of national equality but also on such lines that the developing nations can catch up with the developed nations in the minimum possible time.

13.00 hrs.

These are matters which have got to be given thought to not only by the economic experts who sometimes do not have the foggiest notions about international repercussions of their work and who sit and do all kinds of things in their miserable little offices, it is necessary to have a kind of orientation which the Prime Minister can bring into the scence and I do hope that he tries to do so and he gets his friends, those of his friends, whose job it is to help him properly at this particular juncture to understand the situation.

I conclude by saying that we have friends in the world if we know where to look for them, and if our stand is according to our best judgement, always just, there is no reason for the pathetic inanition into which our foreign policy seems, at the present moment, to have subsided. Let us make our non-alignment more vibrant, more dynamic, more understanding of the present-day realities and then surely we shall be able to make of it that gem which it is and which has been right from its first formulation.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member who has spoken before me has looked at certain problems without putting our international relations in a proper setting. Our relations need to be viewed in the background of the process of change, perhaps more profound and sweeping that is taking place all over the world. As we know, a new turn in the world events, world relations, has taken place since the Cuban crisis. World was brought to a brink of war. But in the final analysis, the outcome was good for the mankind

because it was brought back to sanity and a certain understanding was reached between Soviet Union and America. And a test ban treaty which is going to affect further our relations, world relations, has come into being. At the same time, the two super powers, America and the Soviet Union, who were supreme in their own spheres of influence since the last World War, have been challenged by two powers, one in the West and the other in the East. France has challenged the test-ban treaty and would like to assert her independence in international relations. In the East, China has challenged this atomic monopoly perhaps suspecting a certain capitulation on the part of Soviet Union to imperialism. This challenge of China has come out now openly. It has not remained simply just an ideological conflict but it is perhaps the impending political conflict that we will see very soon.

13.03 hrs.

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

But at the same time when the international relations are transforming, undergoing a rapid change because neither the two super powers nor the subordinate system of powers who came up after the last World War and achieved new freedom are now in an assertive position, France and China coming closer, Chinese diplomatic isolation coming to an end, the Western countries, like Britain, France and West Germany advancing credit at the most favourable rate to China to keep the gap widest enough, if possible, between Soviet Union and China, in this whole context we have got to view our relations with China, our relations with Pakistan and our other problems connected with international relations as a whole. What is the position now? In this changing context, where are we? Unfortunately, since 1962, since the Chinese military adventure on our border where we suffered a little sort of an initial reverse, our border problem has become frozen and we, as if nothing we could do, are sitting tight looking to Colombo powers to take some initiative or China taking a step or two back. I would like to plead before this House: Has not the time come that this House should take some initiative in the sense that the Government must make some rethinking and have a new look at the China policy? Why I say this? This is more important. What is this problem? I would like to say it in a few words as to how this contest has been described by one of our eminent diplomats Shri K. P. S. Menon who was holding the charge of external affairs most competently for a long time. He has put the situation in a nutshell, in his political diary known as "The Flying Troika". This is what he has said. I will omit what he has said about Khrushchev and Chou-En-lai coming over here. But I will read one sentence about that. It is:

> "Khruschev did not admit it, but realist that he is he must have approved of the proposal Chou-En-lai hinted at when he came to India, under which in exchange for the eastern portion of Ladakh, China would recognise the Mc-Mahon line, which no previous Chinese Government has ever recognised."

That is what he says. What is further said is more important bearing on the present situation. He says:

> "The north-eastern frontier is of vital importance to us, whereas the Aksai Chin area is of little use, being hardly defensibles but Aksai China is of vital importance to China because it connects the two outlaying and historically troublesome regions Tibet and Sinkiang. Unfortunately, public opinion in India was so excited over the prestige value of this area that the Government was left with no room for manoeuvre. Moreover, the bureaucratic fervour of both Foreign offices and their passion

[Shri Khadilkar]

for exchanging notes embittered the relations between the two countries. The incident demonstrated how, in the East as well as in the West, men and nations can be propelled towards an abyss which all are anxious to avoid."

This is an assessment of the position given by our ex-Secretary General, an eminent diplomat, in his recent book. I am referring to this problem from this angle. Now, nearly two years have passed, or a year and more have passed, and our border is frozen. Perhaps, China has consolidated her position. Is this continued deadlock on the Indo-China border going to benefit India? There are many lawyers here and they know what happens when they haggle about procedure. Those who happen to practise realise that if parties go on haggling about on procedural matters, perhaps in the end they will lose the case. That is the experience of all practising lawyers. In this case I would like to ask the Government a very straight question as to whether prestige has stood in the way of the self-interest of this country. This is my contention.

When Pakistan had committed aggression in Kashmir we were ready to have talks; we had a series of talks by-passing the natural leadership of Kashmir. We had talks about Kashmir with Pakistan and with several other gentlemen. The talks failed.

What stands in the way when we come to China? What is the present position? We are talking about the Colombo proposals. Let us assess the present position. When Colombo proposals were before us, we accepted them unreservedly. China had two reservations; one was in the western sector. There China said: "Nothing doing, no parity regarding civilian posts." In the eastern sector China insisted that we should not go and occupy that territory. But let us remember that the Prime Minister had said that in some places China had even withdrawn beyond the 8th September line. In the western sector China is not advocating equal number of posts, but parity of zero, that is, no posts, that is, all the area should be demilitarised. In the eastern sector, if I understand correctly, China is prepared to allow us to go there with our troops, excluding Longju and Thag La. This is the present position. What is the difference? Now, when the reservations have progressively been withdrawn, no contact is established at diplomatic level.

There are people sitting in the Opposition and they shout. I am really surprised that a few members in the Opposition shout without looking at the reality of the problem. They shout. 'Oh we have given you the mandate. You must recover every inch of the territory". But do they realise that when we accepted the Colombo proposals, we did accept in effect that there was a certain portion of the boundary which was in dispute? There are lawyers like Shri Nath Pai and others sitting on the other side, They know it. So, the dispute has been admitted. The question is how to solve it. Once we admit a dispute and the procedural matters are more or less straightened and all the reservations in effect have been withdrawn, should we keep the present posture and continue the deadlock? There is every danger that the *de facto* position might become *de jure* tomorrow. That danger cannot be by-passed. There is also a greater danger.

What are the alternatives before us? Let us analyse them. We do not believe in what Kautilya said more than two thousand years ago. While defining the enemy he said: "A State on your border is your first enemy". In the modern world, India of all the nations, does not subscribe to this doctrine. We believe that in the modern civilised community, every nation will have to co-exist with

other nations as good neighbours. That is our aim, that is the objective of our policy. Therefore, with this objective in view, we have to judge whether this policy regarding China has paid dividends. Have we increased our prestige in the Afro-Asian world? People will say: "What of that? If we have got a little more soft corner in America, our problems are solved". Some hon'ble Members opposite said: "Oh, you are following non-alignment. It is a vacuum. And what is your protection? Your protection is the tattered and torn umbrella of Panchsheel.".

Do they understand the implication of non-alignment in the case of these newly free countries? We must remember that their nationalism, their non-alignment, their secularism, their socialism and their democracy have all emerged from the past struggle which they had waged with the foreigners. Their struggles may be different in their character because every colonial country did not rule the country under its control in a similar fashion. Therefore, the character of the struggle was different. But the general approach is the same. We should realise this general approach of anti-colonial past and anti-imperialist past from which all these policies emanated. If we do anything which is contradictory and which creates wrong impressions in the minds of people of Africa, people of Asia, the new emerging Asia, or the Arab world, I think we will get isolated and this isolation is of our own creation.

I am not worried about what the West says because in this wide world, the western world today, according to me, is on the defensive. People may not admit it. Some people might feel that way. When western statesmen like Mr. McNamara or Mr. Rusk say that India is one of the front-liners fighting to check or turn the tide of communism, I am surprised they do not feel that our dignity is hurt. Are we to be lumped together among the front-liners like South Vietnam, the Philippines and Formosa? Is it in any way an honour to us? Have we come closer because American statesmen declared all these things, with whatever motive, perhaps with the best of motives? They have given us help in the emergency. I recognise that. It is good and we are grateful to them for that. But with all this, are we, as one of the biggest countries in the East aspiring to be a big nation and recognised by all these new countries at one time as their leader or spokesman in the international community, going to succumb to this pressure? This is the problem. And for what should we succumb? Therefore, the prestige will cost us so dearly.

We talk of propaganda. What is propaganda? Propaganda means selling. Have you got any policy to sell to the African world, to the Arab world and the Asian world? You have become anaemic, inactive; you do not have any dynamism left in you. You cannot guide them or show them the way, just to sit and manoeuvre, so that out of the world manoeuvres that you depend upon something will ultimately emerge.

Therefore, I would humbly plead one thing with the Prime Minister. During this period, we were perhaps militarily weak. Certainly we are building our defence. We must have defence-preparedness. We must keep our powder dry. But, is there a question of war with China or surrender? To pose that question is wrong and illogical. If we do not act, perhaps events are likely to overtake us. Therefore, I would like to caution the Government that now is the time to take initiative so far as the India-China border issue is concerned. I know that you are taking initiative, but not openly. The other day the Minister without Portfolio said something in the Rajya Sabha that we were not going to be rigid immediately a howl was raised by the Opposition and the next day some

[Shri Khadilkar]

sort of shilly-shally statement was made which was contradictory of what Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had said. I do not admit this position. Government will have to be firm and firm now. I am not a man who has been fond of personality cult. But let me admit, and every thinking person in this country will admit, that our defence was more safe and secure because of the conduct of international relations and the moral authority of the Prime Minister came to our help, sustained democracy, sustained leadership in the international field and we were looked upon as leaders in our own right so far as the guiding force in these new emerging nations was concerned. Today fortunately he is still with us. He can take courage without loss of prestige and he can negotiate and take any diplomatic action in such manner as he thinks fit.

I have my own experience and many Members of Parliament have also got similar experience, as Shri K. P. S. Menon pointed out that because of the bureaucratic handling our international relations occasionally have become bedevilled. For instance, take the case of our nearest neighbour Ceylon. The other day a representative came here and I had a long talk with him. He said: "Our trade relations were good and most favourable. But today, because of the bad handling, there is no non-official contact, no give-and-take of any type on a popular level." The result is that Ceylon is drifting to China and so also the Philippines and the Middle East for their daily necessities at a higher cost. Is it our policy to antagonise our neighbours? Some people shout at certain things happening in Burma. The Burmese case is different. Why should we be hostile to Burma when the Burmese Government are taking certain action, according to their understanding, to implement socialism? We should not get enraged about it. If there is injustice we can represent. These things are very important and we should bear them in mind.

One question remains: are we thinking in terms of negotiations from a position of strength? But there is another aspect. I would humbly like to refer at this point to American experience. American history is most tragic regarding this matter. One Australian professor has reviewed the course of the American policy of negotiation from a position of strength. I will just read one sentence only as my time is up. This is what Prof. Coral Bell has said:

> "There are two possible reasons for not negotiating: because one is weak and cannot afford to, or because one is strong and does not need to. Unfortunately, the psychological balance of policy makers appears to be so delicate"—

this must be underlined—

> "that it swings between these two extremes without ever resting at the point between them. This is perhaps inevitable so long as the attention of each is concentrated on strength *vis-a-vis* the other".

I hope the Prime Minister, so long as he is directing external relations is not making prestige or a position of strength come in the way. I hope all these things will be taken into consideration. Our representative who has gone to the Solidarity Conference will build up contacts. In the comity of Asian and African nations, whatever we had, we have lost. Our image has been tarnished. The personality of Nehru counted outside this country to such an extent that it was a prestige symbol for India. But China has succeeded in doing some damage to that. We can restore it within no time provided we take

bold steps on this issue without standing on prestige.

Reference has been made to Kashmir. I welcome the release of Sheikh Abdullah. In 1958, when he was rearrested, I had tabled an adjournment motion here. Then I had said that no problems were solved by putting leaders in jail. What is the situation today? The Government has acted very wisely taking even some risk, if there is that risk, with boldness. That is commendable. What is happening and what is going to happen? Let us understand it. After the Hazratbal incident, a new sanction came forward and the Minister without Portfolio, recognising this new sanction, has come up and with the goodwill of Sheikh Abdullah brought a new Government in Kashmir. A new process has been set in motion where due recognition has been given to the wishes of the people. People say that Sheikh Abdullah is contemplating to build a Sheikhdom in Kashmir Valley. I know the Sheikh from a distance, not very closely. But to accuse him of thinking in terms of building up a small principality is doing him injustice. He can play a big role in Kashmir. Kashmir is a symbol of secularism in this country. If he wants some freedom within the broad framework of our Constitution, we can carve out whatever he wants. But at this juncture I would make this appeal: let nobody show any distrust. He has said one thing which is very important. He is prepared to take counsel with Panditji. He has said that during Panditji's lifetime all these problems, Kashmir, Pakistan and other problems, must be solved. Because of his moral authority, he alone can put his weight and solve those problems.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, there also the question is how we look at the problem. Are we going to look at the problem because of this exodus, only in a communal way? Excuse me for saying this. Though we are pledged to secularism, unfortunately, if we scratch our skin, there is a certain religious fanaticism somewhere hidden behind revealed. Of course, on that side there are many fanatics.

Shri Bade (Khargone): That is wrong.

Shri Khadilkar: With our secularism, should we succumb to Pakistan's manoeuvre? What is that manoeuvre? Why this exodus? Pakistan is more interested, so far as East Pakistan is concerned, to drive out the minorities because the minorities there provide a leaven of a fermenting force for the democratic forces coming up there. Once the Christian and Hindu minorities are driven out of East Pakistan, there is no opposition left and they can have a military, monolithic dictatorship there as well. I look with hope to East Pakistan. I do not think that all East Pakistan Muslims are motivated with the spirit of revenge and repression and all sorts of violence on the minorities. That will be tarnishing their name.

Regarding Pakistan, I would like to say one more word. Last year, the late Prof. Strachey had visited Pakistan. After returning, he said:

> "Even if you come to some settlement which is acceptable to Pakistan regarding Kashmir, Pakistan will never change its attitude towards India".

A visiting professor in Dacca University repeated the same thing after four years of study and close contact with them. But he has also certain other things to say, which would be of benefit in order to make a fresh approach to Pakistan at this juncture. He has said that psychologically, Pakistan is a problem—it has become a problem to Pakistan, a problem to India and a problem to the western world as a whole. He has put it correctly.

[Shri Khadilkar]

Then there is the question of propaganda abroad. I have referred to it. But I would say one thing more at the end. I have said that non-official contacts should be built up. We must have a dynamic policy in this matter.

So far as the approach to China is concerned, I want to say this. In the context of their conflict with the Soviet Union, China is likely to be in a more reasonable frame of mind at this juncture. I want to say very plainly that our relations with the Soviet Union are most friendly. They will be more friendly. In the ideological conflict, our sympathy will be with them. But if at this juncture, we seize this opportunity, there is a possibility of bringing about a settlement and putting an end to this deadlock, a deadlock which has cost us economically. We are building up a defence shield. Our defences are not built up in a day. Without a proper economic base, a solid base, we cannot build up our own independent defence in this country.

Last but not least, lately there have been many voices raised in this country. Since Panditji's ill-health, all sorts of petty political talks are going on. I would like to tell this House without fear of contradiction that many of us who may be anywhere, here or there, will be thrown into the dustbin of history as rubbish, but the Prime Minister's 15 years' service would remain as a guide even to future generations.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, just now Shri H. N. Mukerjee and Shri Khadilkar put forward their viewpoints. They want some basic change in our foreign policy. This should not go unchallenged.

What is our foreign policy? Let us look at the world picture. After the last war, America tried to contain Russian and Chinese communism. She tried to build a *cordon sanitaire*, a sort of iron ring, consisting of alliances and bases. Similarly, Russia has another protective ring. This Maginot Line approach was bound to fail because it does not provide for the changes taking place in the allies themselves and also in armaments. This rigid alignment was cracking, and is cracking today.

Side by side, how is it that the non-aligned nations are more stable, their policies more dependable? What is the reason for this? The non-aligned nations are weak, the non-aligned nations have no strength of arms, and yet Yugoslavia was able to defy Russia and other non-aligned nations like Egypt were able to defy the big powers like England and France. I ask you where they get the strength, if they are weak both economically and militarily? The only strength they had and they still have is the moral strength. Otherwise it is very difficult to explain these facts. In this world when we are so much awed by the hydrogen bombs, supersonics and intercontinental ballistic missiles, we are apt to forget that the irresistible tidal forces of history are moral forces. This fact we have to recognise and we have to make a choice whether we would like to have the physical strength of Hercules or the spiritual strength of a Gandhi. The aligned nations chose the former. The non-aligned nations are trying to seek faith in the latter. Therefore, if we make a change in our basic foreign policy, we have to recognise what that foreign policy is; what the basis of its strength is. If, in the physical world, a mistake is made, it can be rectified, but in the moral world, one small tiny wrong turning might change the whole life. So, for the undeveloped nations of the world, this is the sheet-anchor. Once

you lose the grip on this, you will be neither physically strong like the developed nations nor morally strong as the non-aligned nations. Therefore, anybody who suggests a basic change is not doing service to the country.

There is talk about China. They say: What harm, you take a round pattern, they have agreed to most of the things, it is just a little matter, why should you stress upon the Colombo proposals, go and negotiate, settle the things and then we will deal with Pakistan. If that is the case, they forget past history. When we had reverses in NEFA, we did not take it as an ordinary military defeat as every nation does every battle, but the wisest and the biggest in the nations have said it was a humiliation. That has often been repeated in this House and that has gone into our bloodstream and no policy can succeed if it ignores that fact of life. Further, everywhere in the world, China has been coming forward and saying that she is invincible and that it is irresistible, that India was at her feet, that she could walk in and walk out, that if she gets any proposals, it is for her to accept or not and if she has to talk, she will talk on her own terms.

After all what are the Colombo Proposals? Quite a large portion of our land still remains outside our jurisdiction. It was an article of faith with us to make China and the world accept that there was some basis, some moral basis, for those terms. If you take that away, if you think that that moral basis is wrong, China wins at the very first round. The moment you go to negotiate on those terms, China wins.

Then, I ask my hon. friends: if you negotiate with China, what are you going to gain?—a few square miles. It is far better to ignore it and carry on. The Swatantra Party people say that non-alignment has failed because we have not got an army, we do not take help which can be provided. These people say: let us change and talk. What are we going to gain? Non-alignment has not failed but non-alignment has not been tried enough. We had air exercises with Great Britain and America, let us have a change and have joint air exercises with the Soviet Union if we want to try the effectiveness of non-alignment and see the forces that it generates. Why do you feel shy of it? Our stand is a moral stand and we are non-aligned the moment you change that, you are really harming the country. So, I am entirely against the approach of Shri Khadilkar and of Shri Hiren Mukerjee.

We do not want war, I know that we should not buy arms, but buy peace, buy time. That is the need of the hour, the need of the whole of Asia and Africa. But, still, in this particular hour when our basic stand is touched, I think it will be a fundamental mistake to go out of the way to try to negotiate with China.

Then I will say something about Kashmir. The stand Shri Chagla and before that Shri Krishna Menon so ably took in the Security Council has made our position quite clear to the whole world. I wish to say here that this House should confirm that they stand by that policy enunciated by these two great statesmen. The Soviet Union has been unambiguously and quite clearly supporting us and we appreciate very greatly the stand that the Soviet Union has taken. But the stand taken by America and Great Britain is open to question. Let us see what America herself did in a similar situation.

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

Hundred years ago, the non-free or slave-owning States of the United States of America wanted to secede. Then, the Missouri Compromise was agreed to by which all those States above 30° 36' latitude were to remain free and all those below that were to be slave-owning States. But, America was expanding, new States were coming in. So this could not fit in. This Compromise was dropped and Mr. Douglas enunciated the Theory of Popular Democracy that every State should decide for itself, that means by a popular vote, that means by plebiscite. What happened? In the State of Kansas, both the free States and the slave-owning states started sending their men so as to influence the Electoral Colleges in their favour. Anger and passions were aroused, riots took place, men were killed and houses were burnt. This is known in history as "Bleeding Kansas." By the time Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated as President, a number of States had seceded and a Confederacy was formed and they claimed that they had the constitutional right to do so and no court had questioned that. Apart from that, the Supreme Court had decreed in the Dred Scott case that the function of the State was to protect property and the property was Mr. Dred Scott, the negro. It was further decreed that he had no right to sue in the Federal Court for liberty. There was also a movement to ban the Republican Party because it was against the Constitution, against the judgment of the Supreme Court.

In such a situation, what did that great man Abraham Lincoln, whose words have got the ring of the words of Bible, do? What did he do? He went to war so as to protect the Union, to stop the expansion of slavery. I ask this House: could we in a similar situation do anything less? That is the question before the House. As for the British stand, the British had been experts in dividing people. Now, take the case of Cyprus, that unfortunate country, which, due to British diplomacy, will soon be partitioned like India. Of course the British are against it but they always take a stand that they are against a thing when they really want it. British had all the time been guiding Pakistan from the date on which Muslim League came into being. Even today I believe that this negotiation and this flirtation with China in spite of the understanding between Pakistan and the United States, are all motivated and directed by Great Britain. She said to Pakistan: you go on; try to bring pressure on India. To United States, they said: do not take it seriously: it is only a pressure move. This is the position of Great Britain. I agree with Mr. Hiren Mukerjee that there is reason to re-examine our relationship with Great Britain. What advantage are we getting? The new Western Europe that is coming up is going to be bigger force, both economically and politically and we should examine our dealings with greater care. Why should we always hang on to Great Britain as if it is the source of all energy, all intellect and the source of science. I personally think that this thing should be re-examined.

I would like to add that Pakistan has got vested interest in creating communal riots. Because, if there are communal riots, they can go to the Security Council and they can say that there is danger of peace breaking down; let us reopen the Kashmir question. If the verdict goes in her favour it requires still more riots to continue so as to influence the plebiscite in Kashmir. I say here and now that it is impossible to have a fair plebiscite, even if it is granted in Kashmir unless there is communal peace and harmony both in India and Pakistan for at least ten years. You create riots and people begin to feel insecure; rightly or wrongly rumours

begin to circulate, stories of atrocities flow in. In such a condition do you mean to say that any plebiscite or any voting will be anything but communal voting? If so, why not take census records and settle the matter? If you want to have really plebiscite or any kind of getting the views of the people, there must be communal peace and harmony both in India and Pakistan for at least ten years.

The future of Kashmir is linked with the future of India. There is suspicion in some people's minds at least that Muslims cannot be relied upon; that is only in some minds. If for any reason it happens that Kashmir is given to Pakistan, that suspicion which is now only in some minds will grow to be a conviction in many minds. And when such a situation happens no nation in the world can live with peace. If such an impression or conviction was to prevail that 50 million of a country's citizens are of doubtful political integrity, what will be the result? The results will be riots, killings and fifty million people moving this way and that way—the very weight of numbers will crush both India and Pakistan; because India will not have the capacity to hold them back and Pakistan has not the capacity to receive them. So, Sir, if you want real peace in the sub-continent, if you want peace in Kashmir, we should not change our policy by an iota. We should insist that Kashmir is ours and will continue to be ours and there will be no plebiscite. We should also insist that we will have no dealing or negotiations with China unless the Colombo proposals are accepted by them. Let them take 20 years or 50 years for that. The moral personality of this country and the moral stand that this country has taken is really the big picture and it is the picture of India. You talk of publicity. The moment you take a stand that tarnishes the face here, no amount of publicity, no amount of money that you spend will have any effect. I am one of those who believe in the moral government of the world; I believe in the strength of the moral force. Therefore, if you have a split mind, you will begin to have split souls and if you have got split souls, there is no salvation. So, I assert again that there should be no change in our foreign policy.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Sir, I beg to speak on my cut motion No. 77 which reads that the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1—failure of foreign policy. It is for the first time that we are moving a motion like this and it was after sufficient thought that we reached this conclusion that we must make amply clear our total disapproval of the foreign policy of the Government.

Before I come to an analysis of that policy or what remains of it, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the report which that Ministry has produced. Last year I had some comments to offer on this report and I must say that there has been some slight improvement. But their tenacity in producing inanities is so great that one sometimes wonders how had they had that same tenacity in pursuing India's legitimate interests how great this country would be.

I will be showing some specimen of the kind of report which the External Affairs Ministry which is supposed to be recruiting the cream of the Indian Civil Service, produces for the sovereign body of this country, the Parliament of India. Here is a specimen on page 10 :

> "....two new petrol pumps were started (in NEFA)"

We are concerned about what happens there and how the problems there are to be solved. What they have to tell us is that two petrol pumps were opened in NEFA!

Next to NEFA is Nepal, our great neighbour. What have they go to say:

> "Dr. Pushkar Nath, Director Central Potato Research Institute, visited Nepal to help Nepal in for-

[Shri Nath Pai]

mulating plans for the development of potato industry."

What delicate secrets the House is taken into confidence! But that is not all. Chapter after chapter, page after page, you are told such profoundly important things for your perusal and for your reflection! To see whether they specialise in indulging in inanities, let us turn to page 19. They say:

"As a gesture of goodwill, the Government of India sent in July 1963, a gift worth Rs. 10,000....."

Is it really necessary to talk of gesture of goodwill? Does any country send these things as a gesture of ill-will? But they will never miss an opportunity of using platitudes, if they could. But there are some far more interesting things than this. 10,000 DM were given by the German President. Good enough. Normally, what should be the reaction? The Government of India accept it thankfully. But the wise men, the brilliant smart Aleks of the External Affairs Ministry must tell this to Parliament: "this sympathetic gesture was suitably acknowledged by the President of India". See the pomposity, the verbosity. Not a single opportunity is missed when they can use something pompous and bombastic!

Here is another example of this kind of indulgence and play with words. We are told how we were faring in Kabul. We sent a team headed by whom? By the Minister of Education, Bihar, and who went with him? "The Indian contingent to Kabul which was headed by Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, Education Minister of Bihar, included musicians, artistes and a hockey team." All lumped together! (*Laughter*). This is not only something to be laughed at. How far they can go! Must this House be told such profound things?

Then "the Government of Mysore accompanied by his staff, visited Brazil for five days". By whom are you accompanied if not by your staff? If the Maharaja of Mysore was accompanied by somebody else, this House is not interested in knowing those secrets. But they will use again such an opportunity to tell us of such inanities. But something serious can happen with regard to our relations with other countries. This flippancy can go too far. Here is an example of it. "Permission has been granted to the Republic of Ireland during the period under review for the opening of an Irish Embassy in New Delhi." Permission has been granted! Mr. De Valera will be really shocked to read that permission has been granted to the Republic of Ireland to open an embassy in this country. No wonder that Government which thinks always in terms of permits and licences gives permission (*Interruption*) and when a country, which for generations inspired Indian freedom fighters, sends here for the first time her truly accredited envoy, we condescend to tell Mr. De Valera that "permission has" been granted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like to know what exactly is meant by this. I do not want to waste my time and the House's time on this precious document. "Some delegations" from India also attended the Fourth Congress "for cultivating human spirit". What exactly is this country doing and where is it going? I never understand this kind of thing. This is the report of the Ministry of External Affairs to Parliament.

Then there is a special love for this hockey team. There are seven mentions of this hockey team and its prowess. "The visit of the Indian hockey team to Belgium received a good deal of publicity." Is this the report of the Ministry of External Affairs or of the National Sports Council of India? How many times must we be told about these superficialities? I shall leave this report at

this stage by telling hon. Members of this House that if you are going on a long journey and if you do not want to spend money on Perry Mason's novels, carry a copy of the report produced by the Ministry of External Affairs and you will have a delightful time.

As I said, there is something pompous about this Ministry, but there is also something about the greed of this Ministry, to which I would like the attention of this House to be drawn. 55 per cent. of the budget of this Ministry is taken up by activities with which foreign affairs has nothing whatever to do. What are these affairs with which this Ministry is concerned? NEFA, Nagaland, Goa, Pondicherry, and then, as if this empire is not enough, they have the army of their own. Few Members of this House realise that the Assam Rifles do not form part of the Indian defence forces. They are directly controlled by the Ministry of External Affairs. They want to have their writ run in every part of the country and they want to maintain an army of their own. The Prime Minister is burdened, and we are not going to do any service to the Prime Minister or to this country by sycophantic homages. But we are going to do our duty unto him and to this country by having the courage to speak the truth even if it may hurt. At a time when he is burdened must his activities be extended in this way?

Is it fair to this country that three years after the liberation of Goa, Goa continues to be the concern of the Ministry of External Affairs? First, they delayed and then bungled on the liberation of Goa, and now, they are playing mischief with the final integration of that territory.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): Hear, hear.

Shri Nath Pai: Here is the authentic voice of the chosen representative of Goa. It may be a lonely voice in this House, but he represents the 600,000 people of Goa. And how are we behaving regarding Goa? Shri H. N. Mukerjee pointed out the background of the Judicial Commissioner in Pondicherry. Precisely the same mischief is done by the External Affairs Ministry with regard to Goa. A Bill was introduced in this House for Goa after liberation of Goa. It provided for the High Court of Bombay as the High Court of Goa. Now, suddenly, first, a Bill is introduced and then hastily, an ordinance is promulgated by the President, in spite of the provision in the Act which has been passed by Parliament, making the High Court of Bombay the High Court for Goa, creating the office of the Judicial Commissioner. Long-term politics is involved in this. I want to warn the Government that this is a very dangerous game the wise men in the Ministry of External Affairs are engaged in, creating an artificial dichotomy in the people of Goa; under the pretext of attending, caring for, taking into consideration, the wishes of the minorities, they are likely to commit the folly of perpetuating differences which do not exist and which they are themselves artificially fostering. I hope soon the authentic voice of Goa, of Shri Alvares and Shri Shinkre, wil be heard in this House.

I will tell you to what extent this goes. Legitimately, the function of publicity, of liaison, is that of the Ministry of Information. But what happens in practice? There is a film produced about Goa. I will tell you to what extent these matters can go. Most of the Members of this House have seen this film, and I think all of them realise what has been happening. From what I heard from Shri Mukerjee and all others, the producer has been told by the wise men of the Ministry of External Affairs. "why do you have this reference to the Ranas of Goa?" That brings the cat out of the bag. The reference is there simply because the Ranas have fought. and not these gentlemen who do not like the name 'Ranas'. One's blood begins to boil when this kind of petty prejudices are

[Shri Nath Pai]

incorporated within the polity. The Ranas fought not once but three times for the liberation of Goa. When the historian tries to picture it, they are shocked at this and their sensitivity is hurt, because there is a reference to Alphonso Albuquerque and Vasco da Gama as pirates. Is it wrong? Were they not pirates when the ship was casting anchor at Calicut? Was he not looking through the porthole of the ship. He had ordered the ship of Muslims to be sunk and was enjoying the sadistic delight of seeing 400 Indian Muslims, men, women and children, drowing in the sea of Kerala. That is Vasco da Gama's and Albuquerque's career, but because he is referred to as pirate, the Ministry of External Affairs, which is presiding pontifically and gives pontifical judgments on everything, wants the film to be scrapped. They are supposed to be highly educated men, but I would ask them to read the book entitled *The Intellectual Tradition of the West* by Brownski, in which there is a chapter on Walter Raleigh, and that beautiful chapter ends like this: "This noble statesman, fighter, writer, gallant man, and pirate, died in the year" etc. Because that was the conception of the age, the age of greatness and gallantry. The word pirate is used in that context, but they will penalise the poor producer of the film because he has not produced a film according to their conception.

I shall now proceed to the next point, leaving the Goa affair here. I hope Shri Shastri will apply all his sagacity and wider considerations in tackling this delicate question of Goa. We do not want to see Goa, we do not want to see parts of India being ruled by the Ministry of External Affairs. It offends our patriotism. It must come within the purview of the Ministry of Home Affairs. We could understand that for some reasons they wanted it to be under the Prime Minister. But that is a different thing, they are not under the Prime Minister; they are under the Ministry of External Affairs. That gives a feeling to many people that these people's assimilation with India is not final, and that creates a doubt whether these territories are finally integrated or not. We must remove this mischief, this impression, by seeing that these territories are not kept under the whiphand of the Ministry of External Affairs. We have had enough of this.

I have said that there is some degree of pomposity, about this Ministry which is a little unpleasant and unpalatable to good taste. Every Ministry in this country is very important and we refer to the highest executive officer of every Ministry as Secretary. But this is the only Ministry where he is not called Secretary. He must be referred to as Secretary General. This must be looked into.

14.00 hrs.

Having said this, let me point out some of the bunglings committed by this Ministry in spite of its vast powers and resources. We remember the feelings of profound shock and sadness with which this country and the whole world heard the news of President Kennedy's death who was an ardent champion of peace, a valiant fighter for peace and a dependable friend of India, as the Prime Minister himself described him. He died in the most tragic circumstances and with him passed something that was very rare in the political life of any country, something which the Prime Minister of India once symbolised when he was a young fighter for the freedom of the country. Such was the poignant tragedy felt by the whole world; a shudder of horror passed through the world. But how did we react? The sworn enemies of Washington, the

rulers of Russia, realised what had happened, forgot their enmity and sent their second greatest man to attend the funeral. Here we were pettyfogging with the excuse that no plane was available. It reflects a certain mental attitude.

I refrained from raising this subject but I told the Speaker that at a suitable time I want to raise it. Then I did not want to raise it, because it would have appeared vulgar to try to chastise this Government, since the tragedy was so poignant. But it remained rankling in every Indian heart, the way we had acted. A fear had crept into the mind of the Government—what would the world think if we send somebody to go to the funeral of President Kennedy? What will they think? But the Russians did not bother about it. They knew their path of duty and they sent their second greatest man. But here the palpably unconvincing excuse that no suitable transport was available was trotted out before Parliament and before the country. Sir, we have innumerable planes. We have Meghdoots and Pushkars. What is this kind of excuse? I am not saying that the Prime Minister or the President should have gone. I do not say this man or that man should have gone, but somebody representing this country ought to have gone. It is not this failure by itself but what it reflects that makes one anxious about the future. That was one aspect of the bungling.

I will give another example. Prof. Mukerjee referred to the way we received a friend coming to our country. President Aref's reception was extraordinary. He comes in the plane of President Ayub Khan to this country. He is to be the State Guest of this country. But something unparallelled, something unique, something which only the brilliant men of the External Affairs Ministry of India are capable of performing, happened. Nowhere else you will find a parallel for this kind of gross ineptitude. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I do not want to labour this point, as it has been referred to. But there are some other alarming failures and examples of bungling on the part of this Ministry.

There is this question of our ambassador attending this dinner. Now people think, why do we mention such small things? But there is a bigger story about this. The Prime Minister told the House, when the matter was mentioned on the floor of the House, that the ambassador misunderstood the instructions, and therefore, he attended it. I want to know from the Minister or whosoever is going to reply whether it is not a fact that to this embassy, like to all the embassies in Western Asia and Africa, instructions were issued four times beginning in December, 1962, laying down what they should do whenever the Chinese will invite Indian ambassadors and Indian diplomatic personnel. It was clearly, amply, repeatedly stated that they must not attend or give hospitality to the Chinese diplomatic personnel. Of course, I know Shri Khadilkar will disagree with this, but since as yet he does not preside over the Ministry of External Affairs, the mandate of the Ministry of External Affairs has got to be carried out; the mandate was very clear and that was that the Ambassador will not attend. (*Interruptions*).

There were three times very clear instructions. Then we are told—I may be wrong and I am open to correction —that the ambassador, in spite of the third clear instruction that any hispitality given by the Chinese shall not be accepted, but we may attend hospitality given to the Chinese by the host countries, asked the Ministry of External Affairs whether he could not attend the return banquet given by the Chinese Prime Minister. Instructions are sent that "you must not" and still he atends. Then we are told that he misunderstood the instructions. If he misunderstands this kind of clear instruction, can we trust these men to interpret the policies of India? Can these men be depended upon, re-

[Shri Nath Pai]

lied upon, trusted upon, to interpret far more subtler things like the projection of the policies of this country? The tragedy of this country is that our diplomacy never properly projected our policies and our policies never properly reflected the true interests of this country. I want to know from the Prime Minister whether he has succeeded in instilling something nobler, something higher and a better ambition in the hearts of these numerous legions of our envoys in the capitals of the world than the ambition to return home with a Mercedes-Benz car, General Electric refrigerator and a Grunding tape-recorder? We need to put in their hearts something nobler and better than this. If the ambassador had misunderstood, I do not know what steps had been taken and what guarantee is there for the future? How could he have misunderstood it?

The same kind of thing, the same kind of misunderstanding, happened when the question of Chinese suzerainty and sovereignty over Tibet came up. Then also we were told that we signed away free Tibet's independence and sovereignty because the ambassador misunderstood the instruction. At a very critical juncture, these brilliant men have developed the genius of misunderstanding the instructions. That is a very rare performance.

There is another example of bungling. How do we behave with people who are friendly to us? Of the many people who were trying to show sympathy with India consistently, there was the UAR. Very stoutly and steadily they had supported the cause of this country. They had wanted to condemn China. Truly, non-aligned Egypt wanted to condemn China after the invasion of India. If they refrained, it was on the advice of the Government of India. Here is our valiant friend Egypt and her gallant ambassador. After a very distinguished service in this country, he bids adieu, but what is the spectacle at the airport? The only Indian to see him off was the Chief of Protocol. No other man thought it worthwhile to go and see him off. They are too busy, too tall, too occupied with other big things. They will never bother to go out of their way. Then we will be told that we are doing this and that and we want Arab friendship.

I can give another example of a shocking, incredible type of bungling. There was the free Government of Algeria. The Government was recognised by as many as 34 free countries in the world. We know what it is to be recognised. An Indian had set up a free Government abroad and 9 Asian Governments had recognised it, and the Government of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose had become a source of inspiration to all India. We realise the agony of the Algerians. 34 countries in the world recognised their Government. They look to us for recognition. But we do not have the courage to do that, because we are afraid of offending France, offending the all-mighty Sphinx-like De Gaulle. Therefore, we did not do it. And what happened? Something worse is still happening. There comes the ambassador of Algeria to this country. The first ambassador of the Provisional Government of free Algeria was forced by the Foreign Ministry of India to our shame to come in not on the passport which his free country had given him, but on the passport of Morocco. Can there be anything more humiliating for any country? Still, we want to go on assuming that the Arabs are going to stand by us.

We will not recognise Israel for fear of offending the Arabs. We will not do justice by the Arabs for fear of offending the French. What is the reward we get? It is not at all surprising that everywhere Mr. Chou En-lai went he got a red carpet. I know there is Professor D. C. Sharma, Seth Govind Das and others who tell us that China has been isolated. "China

has been mauled" he said, "as a result of her invasion of India". And, of course, there is Shri Khadilkar who was accusing all of us of shouting. I must very humbly submit to him that shouting is an activity so far as this humble House is concerned in which Shri Khadilkar remains absolutely unbeatable. Having worked himself into a frenzy he was flying at tangents. In one breath—I quote him—he said: "We must firmly uphold the policy of non-alignment" and looked sarcastically and contemptuously at us. Two minutes later he said: "Is there a policy which we can support and ask the world to support?" I do not understand it.... (*Interruption*). The proceedings will show, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that this is what he said. Then, of course, he gives this great advice: "Remain firm." The real meaning of it is this. Remain firm to do what? To surrender to China, to firmly surrender to China (*Interruption*).

Shri Khadilkar: This is absolutely perverse.

Shri Nath Pai: "Go" he says; "meet and talk, what is wrong about it?' In his eagerness and desire to please and to flatter, he stooped too low—I do not know what he was trying to win and conquer, because stooping to conquer is an excusable activity on the part of a politihe has consigned all of us to the dustbin of history. Once only he suffered from the pangs of modesty, and in this onslaught of modesty he wanted the whole House and himself to be consigned to the dustbin of history.

Shri Khadilkar: I said, many of us, not all.

Shri Nath Pai: He paid a tribute to the Prime Minister. Sir, tributes should be subtle, they should not embarrass the receipients or the giver. Here is what the Prime Minister says on this issue (*Interruption*). You are laughing at me, will you laugh at your hero? Here is what the Prime Minister is saying about it. He says:

> "On this question there is no question of negotiating, of talk. When it comes to the question of maintaining the honour and sovereignty of this country, come what may, we may have to go alone, but we shall not be coerced by fear or by the threat of isolation."

This is what the Prime Minister of India said speaking in Lok Sabha. I think Shri Khadilkar should try to read the Prime Minister's speeches well and more seriously and then only try to come and poke fun at us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, where are we today standing? We are standing in a very strange world which is changing, and our position in that world has changed. But the Government of India and its misguided apologists and supporters continue to hug to their bosom illusions and postures which have become mythical in the face of new realities of today. Even President Lyndon Johnson had to say that from the posture of instantaneous retaliation and contention we have to come to reason, agreement and preserving honour without a world in ruins.

This is what is happening. There is a thaw in the world. The world is no longer divided into two monolithic blocs. No longer do large parts of the world suffer from the pangs and shackles of colonialism. During the past 15 years 50 new nations have become free. There are new fissures in the monolithic blocs. Only two things have not changed: the Chinese bellicosity, the Chinese hostility and the perennial drift of the Government of India. These two things are the the only reliable factors in a changing world.

This is our position today in the world. We stand—and I say it in all sadness but in all seriousness—without a trustworthy friend, without a single reliable ally. I know we are

[Shri Nath Pai]

told that China is isolated and we are surrounded by friendship and alliances. May Shri Khadilkar ponder to think over it. From the pinacle of our prestige in 1947, from the summit of the esteem of our friends and the envy of our enemies, today we have sunk into the abyss of the pity of the world and the contempt of our foes. All the goodwill we enjoyed in the world, all the prestige which we held, all the influence which we exercised have been frittered away There is a book called *How to win friends and influence people*—Dale Carnegie's book. I think somebody in the External Affairs Ministry should write a companion volume to this books "How to lose friends and make enemies"

How did we come to this kind of a sad plight in the world of today? I will give, briefly, some basic reasons for our present sad plight. Why did we come to this sad plight? It is because we suffer from the twin malady of self-imposed hypnosis of righteousness and the neurosis induced by fear. We are chronic patients from this fear neurosis. We are helpless prisoners of the self-imposed hypnosis of righteousness. The second reason why we came to this sad plight is that we tried and we sought to meet every crisis that developed by a barrage of platitudinous verbiage the example of which Shri Khadilkar gave us today. But the even more serious reason was that we adopted an attitude of cringing sycophancy towards the mighty nations of the world whom we regard, who we persuade ourselves, are our friends. We adopted an attitude of incredible pusillanimity towards the mighty nations of the world who were unfriendly towards us, who were our enemies and with the rest of the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we adopted a posture of unctious superiority.

There is another thing in the world and every one knows it, called the "ugly Americani". The Americans realised that there was such a thing like "ugly American". But they realised it and tried to correct it. There is such a thing like "ugly Indian". Who is he He is the typical Indian diplomat. What is his description? He is petulant, perniciuous, presumptuous, pompous, perennially performing on the rope of non-alignment and perpetually preaching peace and patience to the whole world on the slightest pretext or provocation. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, like the albatross sticking round the neck of the Ancient Mariner the shadow of this ugly Indian haunts and pursues us wherever we go in the world.

We need to rectify that image. How are we going to do it? Do we have the realisation of where we stand? Do we have the courage to face the reality and try to adopt the necessary corrective measures or shall we go on indulging in the illusions which we have created and pretending that we have friends, we have allies and we stand to gain everything by pursuing the innate policies which we have been pursuing and shall we go on creating a misunderstanding by deliberately accusing those who will come here and say that something is wrong with the foreign policy, that they want to support this interest and that interest? It is not going, any longer to cut ice in this country. You are not going to deceive this country we have changed, the times have changed and we must adapt ourselves to the changing times.

How are we going to do it? May I ask the Government one thing? Do we have even today an integrated long-term policy towards China and towards Pakistan? What is the China policy of this Government? Is it to go on, parrot-like, repeating or chanting Colombo proposals? And, what is the policy towards Pakistan? Is it to go on threatening the United Kingdom and the United States of America that we shall leave the Commonwealth? Is the world going to take us seriously? If we want the world to take us seriously, we must see that we are taking ourselves seriously. We are not

making any move to show to the world that we are taking ourselves seriously.

What exactly can we do with regard to China? China knows what world politics is. She is not going to be deterred or to be brought to the path of reason and negotiation. She is not going to treat India as an equal ally, friend and neighbour by the kind of jokeying we do of which we saw some dangerous symptoms in the letter written by the Prime Minister, in the assurance given by the Prime Minister to Madam Bhandaranaike. I am afraid, in the kind of first ever speech made by the Minister without Portfolio in this House, the meaning of it was extremely difficult to find. Let us not strike Don Quixote-like posture of Heroes. I fully agree.

But when it comes to our basic rights, we must have the courage, if necessary, to tell the whole world, "We will suffer isolation, we shall go alone, we will suffer privation but we shall never compromise, we shall never temporize when it comes to the dignity and honour of this country."

Look at how a man like De Gaulle is treating us. De Gaulle has been invited by this country. He has already accepted the invitation of Pakistan. The invitation of India, I think, remains in the pigeonholes of the *Champs de L'Elysee* in Paris.

What is the policy towards China and Pakistan that we are going to evolve? Do not go on using this outdated threat that you will leave the Commonwealth. It is meaningless because there are enough tories now who say that the Commonwealth is a gigantic farce. We cannot go on trying to shoot with a pistol with an empty shell and the whole world knows it. Are we serious in making a gesture towards Britain which will impress upon them that we are deeply hurt by Britain's and the United States' policy towards us *vis-a-vis* Kashmir or any other problem? Then, you do not have to go on indulging in this expression of this impotent anger. Something much more solid could have been done to tell Britain that we feel deeply perturbed. You could have indicated to them that you were not going to attend this year's Commonwealth Naval Exercise. You are negotiating for the purchase of three frigates costing Rs. 32 crores from Britain; you could have indicated to them that for the time being we shall have to postpone these negotiations. You could have indicated to the Chinese also likewise.

But what is the response to the Chinese? Under the pretext of being reasonable and realistic, we are being asked to go down the slippery path of surrender. But this House is going to resist it and this country is going to resist it. What an extra-ordinary thing! We are going to attend the non-aligned nations' conference, we must go on cultivating our friends, few as they are. But that we are not doing. There we are failing miserably.

But what is this Bandung? The Ministry of External Affairs says in its Report that China has set up 26 new posts, six of them on the territory of India. Is she going to be deterred from this by your going to Bandung? Was it not your posture that so long as China—the note of 8th August 1962 says that there is no dispute so far as India's territorial integrity is concerned....

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

Shri Nath Pai: I do not want to imitate Shri Khadilkar in defying your bell five times.

Shri Khadilkar: You have defied him six times.

Shri Nath Pai: Only two minutes more..... (*Interruptions*).

But we must go and cultivate. The first thing is, break the chain of isolation, the ring of isolation that China has built around us. Burma, Nepal, Afghanistan, Ceylon—all traditional friends of India by nature, by history, by geography destined to be our friends and allies—in all of them we

[Shri Nath Pai]

have created suspicion and disrespect for us. Nobody trusts us; nobody believes us; nobody accepts us as allies. Can we not break this? Does it require foreign exchange? But who will respect us and who will give us trust? See the vacillation and fear, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, before I sit down. In nothing which it thinks right will this Government make a gesture of courage and conviction. If you wanted the American transmitter, having gone into the deal, why did you not have the guts to say, "India needs it; we will have it"? But if you thought it wrong , why did you go into it? They were looking all the while one way with one eye towards Moscow, another towards Peking and hardly an eye towards Delhi. Therefore we come down tumbling. Once looking there; once looking here—this is not the way. Steadfastly we must fix our gaze on the ultimate interest of this country.

There was the question of the joint air exercises. Did you want them willingly or did you not? If you wanted them, why were you apologetic? If you did not want them, you should have firmly told them that we can look after our defences. But there was hesitation About the Seventh Fleet the same thing. One day, apology; another day, condemnation. What is this kind of policy? Our friends will not respect us and this kind of a policy will not deter any enemies.

We are engaged in three confrontations with China and Pakistan. There was the quick military confrontation, first with Pakistan in 1947. We lost it. Then, there was the quick military confrontation with China in NEFA and Ladakh. In one part we miserably and sadly lost. But there is the other confrontation at the diplomatic level, the cold war. Here again, we are losing to both of our main adversaries, Pakistan and China. Wherever Mr. Chou En-lai went the red carpet was opened to him. He was received warmly and enthusiastically throughout Asia and Africa.

The same thing in regard to Pakistan. The world is thinking that Pakistan is right even on the issue of treating the minorities. On the diplomatic front the initative is with them. But there is a third confrontation of which the Government does not show any sign that it is aware or it is alive to it. There is the invisible confrontation between the men who rule in Peking and the men who rule in New Delhi. This is a confrontation which basically calls for character, integrity, dedication, determination and, finally, faith. The ultimate battle between Peking and New Delhi is invisible; but our first defeats follow from our unawareness of this invisible battle in which we are engaged and to the extent we can bring ourselves to fight and face this invisible battle shall we be able to maintain this nation.

Let us remember, we have to face the world with faith in ourselves and in our future. We shall not flinch or falter and it will not do either to flinch or to falter. If we show such faith in ourselves and in our destiny, today we may be isolated but the world will learn to respect us and if we want this respect by showing that we have sufficient self-respect, tomorrow our frontiers and borders will automatically come to be respected by the whole world.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Devastating; most devastating.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Nominated —Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, practically all the speakers who have participated in this debate up till now have made a reference to the Kashmir question. Regarding our policy about Kashmir, I would like to say that right from the beginning the policy has been interpreted by different schools of thought according to their own convenience. I would make a reference to the position taken by the Swatantra Party regarding Kashmir. Shri Masani even today pleads that there should be fresh elections in Kashmir, while Shri P. K. Deo yesterday, while participat-

ing in this debate, demanded that there should be complete integration of the Jammu and Kashmir State with India, a national government should be formed in Kashmir and the Jana Sangh should also join in the Cabinet.

Since I come from that part of the country I would submit that the most unfortunate thing is that no sincere and serious efforts have ever been made to make a thorough study of the whole question. When Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India there was a raid by Pakistan. We went before the United Nations and complained about the raid by Pakistan. What happened after that? During the last 13 or 14 years a number of times we have gone before the United Nations and we have come down to the position of explaining every time at the call of Pakistan whenever Pakistan goes before the Security Council.

Recently in the last debate in the Security Council Shri Chagla took a very wise and clear stand and he made a statement in this House. I would like to quote a passage from what he said:—

> "And may I say one word about integration? I made it clear that whatever steps we had taken were in the interest of the people of Kashmir or for the welfare of the people of Kashmir. I said we will go on with that integration. I hope—the Prime Minister is here; he used the expression 'gradual erosion of article 370'—I hope that erosion will be accelerated."

Then, continuing he said:—

> "Let us not forget that article 370 is in a part which talks of transitional and temporary provisions. I think the transitional period has been too long."

I quoted this passage only with one thought before me, namely, that Shri Chagla is again going to the Security Council. I only wanted to remind Mr. Chagla and the Government of India, let us not forget the assurance given by the Government of India to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, let us not forget the stands which we took during the last fifteen years before the world regarding Kashmir being an integral part of India.

Another word I want to say about our policy regarding Kashmir. It has been a sincere and clear policy. But I must say, it has not been a firm policy. I do not understand the reason why time and again, when we go before the Security Council and we make everything clear, after another three months, on the initiative of Pakistan we are called by the Security Council to explain things again. Why can we not once for all say "This time India's participation in the Security Council regarding Kashmir will be the last time"? We should tell the Security Council "After this, on the initiative of Pakistan regarding the Kashmir question, India will not be prepared to come and participate in the debate before the Security Council". I sincerely feel that unless and until that kind of firm attitude is taken regarding the Kashmir policy the people of Jammu and Kashmir will always feel uncertain, and by and large the people of India would have certain doubts in their minds that since the Government has not taken such a firm decision regarding the Kashmir policy there may be certain other considerations or certain other lines on which the Government is thinking. I want to be absolutely frank and honest, Mr. Deputy-Speaker.

With the release of Sheikh Abdullah and his colleagues from jail a new element has been introduced in the body politic of Jammu and Kashmir, not only there, I would say in the whole of India. I welcome his release. He was a great leader who led the national movement in Jammu and Kashmir State, and also he led the national movement in Jammu and India. In 1947 he was the man responsible to see that Jammu and Kashmir State acceded to India. In 1953 he developed certain other ideas and after that certain things took place—I do not want to go into that long story. But I want to say this, that his release is welcomed everywhere, in all

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

parts of this country, with the hope that things would normalise. I sincerely hope that with his release new problems would not be created but the problems which already exist would be solved. Now there are apprehensions. Not only that; a whispering campaign has been started in the country. Some people say that the release of Sheikh Abdullah is the first step to give away Kashmir. Sir, this trend in the thinking, this trend in the minds of the people, is a very dangerous trend.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): It is a very realistic trend.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Well, time will prove. Shri Kapur Singh says that it is a realistic trend. He has got every right to disagree with me....

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Being a Member of the Opposition.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra:....on any path or any trend.....

Shri Raghunath Singh: On any label also.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Regarding this matter also. At this juncture I would not like the Prime Minister, if he does not like, to comment on these things, he may not; because, very shortly he will be meeting Sheikh Abdullah. But I must bring forward one thing, that if we ourselves start thinking that Kashmir is going away, then which is the power on this earth which can keep Kashmir with India? I only ask this question.

Shri Raghunath Singh: The will of the people.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Let us not live in panic, and let us not be so panicky that if Sheikh Saheb has said something the status of Kashmir is going to be changed.

During the last debate on the President's Address, Mr. Krishna Menon—I must say, and I must pay a tribute to him, that he is another gentleman in this country who has done a great service to this country by putting forward our case in the United Nations regarding Kashmir—said about accession:

> "Anyway, Accession proceeds from a tripartite agreement at the time of the transfer of power. There was an agreement between the British Government, on the one hand, and what is now the Government of India and those who became leaders of Pakistan, on the other. Therefore, all three are parties to it."

And continuing his remarks regarding accession he brought forward a very significant and basic point. He said:

> "Once accession is made—this is not just legal quibbling—there is no machinery in our Constitution for deaccession."

Sir, I am no student of law, I have no legal background . . .

Shri Raghunath Singh: That is the law.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: But this is the constitutional position of Kashmir being part of India. Then, with certain political changes in Jammu and Kashmir State we should not become so panicky and start thinking that Kashmir is going away from us.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Who has started being panicky?

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: I only want to caution you about it.

Shri Ragunath Singh: This side is very panicky. They wanted him to be released and now they are panicky . .

Shri Nath Pai: Who?

Shri Raghunath Singh: Fifty persons have signed.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra: Now I want to say one thing more regarding the

political situation in Jammu and Kashmir State. After long discussions, a new Ministry which belongs to the National Conference party has taken charge of the affairs in Jammu and Kashmir State, and at the initiative of that Ministry the release of Sheikh Abdullah came into being. The present Ministry in Jammu and Kashmir State is trying to lessen the political tensions which somehow existed during the last certain years. I would plead that the Government of India, the Central Government, should give all support to see that this Ministry could justify its being at the helm of affairs. I would not like to say more.

In the end I would only like to say this and plead before the Prime Minister that the people of Jammu and Kashmir always had full confidence in him and in the policy which he pursued regarding the Kashmir State. Today also we have the same kind of confidence in him; and I only plead one thing before him, that in future no shift would come in the policy so that our confidence is not lessened or it does not amount to a betrayal.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, after some feats of brilliant oratory I would ask the House to come to *terra-firma*. Sir, I was one of those who was associated with one of the greatest sons of India and one of the greatest parliamentarians India has ever produced, who took some part in the struggle for closer integration of Kashmir with India. Sir, there is no question of panic. But let us be frank and let us indulge in plain speaking. After all the recent events which have happened in Kashmir there is a good deal of misgiving in this country: not thousands, but millions of people are deeply perturbed. What is the policy of our Governmnt? Some statements have been made. I am not attacking or condemning the release of Sheikh Abdullah, although standing on the floor of this House I had to make a strong speech when I sponsored the motion for a commission of inquiry into the regrettable death of Dr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee while in detention in Srinagar. Time has come when we should forget old wounds. But I want the Prime Minister to make one categorical statement and that will dispel a good deal of misgivings. He must make a statement that Kashmir is not a subject-matter of negotiation. I want this clear and categorical declaration from the Government of India that Kashmir is not a negotiable issue. Once that statement is made, you will realise, a good deal of doubt and difficulty will disappear. We must make it clear that there shall be no question of giving up our own territory or our own sovereignty and that Kashmir is an integral part of India. This must be made crystal clear in view of certain amount of confusion which is sought to be created by the enemies of India. We must have a definite assurance from the Prime Minister that the release of Sheikh Adbullah does not mean any change in the Kashmir policy which had been pursued. My hon. friend, Mr. Tyagi put that question the other day. Unfortunately, there was no clear response from the Prime Minister. But the position should be made absolutely clear that there is no question of our going back on our Kashmir policy and that Kashmir is an integral part of India and shall continue to be an integral part of India.

Now, the British and American advocates of independent Kashmir are simply out to placate Pakistan for their own purposes and they are resorting by this method to secure the loyalty of their stooges in Pakistan and, therefore, we must be very careful that no impetus should be given to any sort of idea of our accepting or tolerating independent Kashmir in any shape or form. We should not forget the supreme sacrifice of one of our great sons of India. That was a martyrdom which we should respect and that martyrdom should be fully implemented by a complete integration of Kashmir and by making the fusion organic and effective. We must also remember the sacrifice of thousands of our gallant jawans and also gallant officers who laid down their lives

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

They fought for what? They fought for Kashmir as an indivisible part of India. Should all that sacrifice go in vain and should we allow Kashmir to be again put into the melting pot? Therefore, I demand that there should be a categorical, clear and definite assurance given that there shall be no going back on the declared Kashmir policy. During the last ten or eleven years, there have been forces operating in Kashmir which were steadfastly and progressively working for bringing India and Kashmir together. We must respect those men who fought against odds. Nothing should be done to make their position weak. Nothing should be done to make their position difficult. Therefore, I am hoping that the momentum of progressive integration should not be at all checked or jeopardised in any form or shape. Therefore, I demand that this annouuncement should be clear that the process of further integration of Kashmir with India will not be obstructed, will not be impeded, will not be hampered, in any manner whatsoever. That will be giving great solace to thousands of people. Look at it! The fate of Kashmir has been linked up with the fate of 9 million Hindus in East Pakistan and 1 million of Buddhists and Christians. Amazing it is! Because the Prophet's relic was stolen temporarily from the Hazratbal Mosque, therefore the carnage started in Jessore and Khulna deliberately fomented by the President of Pakistan State who declared that that must have been done by a non-Muslim and then the carnage was planned and organised. You know, Sir, 92 lakhs refugees are there. Only 2 lakhs have come out. 90 lakhs refugees are still there. Apart from that, 10 lakhs of Buddhists and Christians are there. Their life was intertwined with the fate of Kashmir. Only if the Government had the courage, had the intelligence, had the fairness to declare that President Ayub was telling some fantastic nonsense, this carnage could have been stopped and the repercussions which, unfortunately, took place in West Bengal would never have happened. But they did nothing. I do not know why. Anxiety to placatise, anxiety to appease Pakistan, this whole policy of persistent appeasement, has been the misfortune of India. Even that persisted in that critical hour. Therefore, they waited for days and days and weeks until they ultimately came out with the truth and in the meantime the mischief had been done.

Sir, today, I am sorry to say that I am one of those who had all along said that we have committed three bungles. The biggest bungle was to go to the United Nations; the second bungle was to accept the cease-fire line and the third bungle was to accept or to make an offer of plebiscite. We have been completely defeated in the United Nations. It is an amazing feat. We had a very good case. But we did not put the case properly before the United Nations. I am not singling out a particular spokesman of India. But I am sorry to say that in the international forum we did not do our duty. We put our case at the barest minimum legal level. Pakistan had a weak case. Morally and legally, they had no case. But still they manoeuvred and we are today standing at the dock of the accused although we went there as the complainant and they are now insinuating that India had been guilty of genocide and they are proposing the Security Council meetings and we are either fawning or frowning on them. It is an amazing thing. In the international legal battle, you can never win if you are continually on the defensive. You must put your case properly, boldly courageously and, if necessary, in an aggressive manner, not, of course, distorting truth, not manufacturing any stories. But we did not do our duty and, therefore, we went down in the international forum. We could not put our case properly.

Sir, even today what is happening? This Conference of the two Home

Ministers is going on. According to a statement made by a senior Congress Member, 20,000 people have been killed. According to figures that I have got from a recent tour of the border in Bengal, over 6500 girls have been abducted and kidnapped. And this *tamasha* is going on, the Pakistan representative here solemnly telling us that we must stop the ejectment of illegal infiltrants as if that is the main thing. We have not again put our case properly. We are again on the defensive. We do not tell the world that they have carefully planned the genocide. In the International Commission on Tibet, the international jurist condemned China of planning communal or religious genocide. This is exactly the thing that is happening here. But we have neither the courage nor the capacity to put the case before the world. You are still dilly-dallying or shilly-shalling with the problem. Actually, it is an amazing feat. When the Home Minister of India and the Home Minister of Pakistan are talking solemnly, they prevent the Down Barisal Express from coming to the Indian border station at Patrapole and the talks are going on. It seems farcical. They have sealed the border. The first item of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact is that there shall be safe transit of minorities to the border of each country. If any Muslim wants to go to Pakistan, the Indian Government shall secure safe transit upto the Pakistan border. And any Hindu who wants to come or any Christian who wants to come to India shall be secured safe transit from Pakistan up to the Indian border. Deliberately, they have flouted it. Not merely are they flouting it but they have been shooting down fleeing immigrants, the Christian immigrants on the Garo Hills side, and they are even today shooting down Hindu immigrants, and now when the talks are going on, they are making a parody of the whole thing by sealing the Jessore and Khulna border. I am sorry I do not think that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri or Shri Nanda realises what is happening as a result of the sealing of the Jessore and Khulna border. Sealing this border means that those poor thousands who are coming, trekking all along on their feet, cannot come, and they are prevented. Now, this sort of thing should stop.

Now, I want our Government to declare this in the words of Sardar Patel. When ten lakhs of people were Pushed out from Pakistan, Sardar Patel stood up and said 'I shall demand territory from Pakistan, if they cannot instil a sense of security in the minority communities in Pakistan'. You know, Sir, that I was one of those who appeared before the Radcliffe Commission on behalf of the Bengal Hindus. I know how the case was put, and I know exactly what happened. Deliberately, Pakistan was planned and given much bigger territory, because Mr. Jinnah made a public declaration that 'I shall make no discrimination against the Hindus or any other minority community'. He guaranteed complete protection to all the minorities in Pakistan. He declared solemnly that there shall be no discrimination against anybody on the ground of race, religion or creed. On that basis, Sir Cyril Radcliffe gave this territory to Pakistan so that at least 1,30,00,000 or 1,40,00,000 Hindus, Buddhists and Christians could be accommodated in that territory. Sardar Patel, a courageous man, a brave man, not a man like those who are now ruling India, stood up and said '10 lakhs have been pushed out. If more are pushed out, and if you cannot instil a sense of security. I shall demand territory from you, Pakistan, and the whole basis of the creation of Pakistan is gone.'. Why cannot the Home Minister or the Prime Minister today tell Pakistan that 'If you cannot instil a sense of security, if you cannot give them basic human rights, then we demand Jessore and Khulna and Rajshahi districts from you'? They have no moral right to keep those areas. 10 lakhs had been pushed out at the time when Sardar Patel had made that declaration. 75 lakhs have now been pushed out, and

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

they are still coming. But our Government are simply discussing whether there should be stoppage of infiltrators or not. That is not the thing now Boldly they must declare now that they demand territory from Pakistan. I am glad that there is one Congressman of some position, who was in the Cabinet but who lost his job because of the Kamaraj Nadar Plan, who has said so. Speaking in Delhi last Sunday, he said:

> "India must demand land from Pakistan to resettle the refugees.".

I am very happy to find that there is at least one Congressman of some stature who has got the courage to say that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Who is that person?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Shri Jagjivan Ram.

He said:

> "The Government of India should demand now lands from Pakistan to resettle the refugees from East Pakistan. Pakistan is perpetrating inhuman atrocities on its minorities in East Pakistan. India must protect these helpless minorities. The only practical way is to ask Pakistan to surrender some land which could be utilised for resettling all these 90 lakhs of unfortunate people.".

75 lakhs have come, and you know, Sir, that whatever may be the Nanda-Habibullah agreement or pact, there is absolutely no chance of getting any sense of security there; they have got no Constitution or constitutional safeguards for themselves there. My hon. friend Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya told the truth the other day. From the Congress Benches, he said that Pakistan had declared a total war on the minorities. We must treat that thing on that basis. We must accept that declaration of total war, and we must formulate our policy and our plan of action on that footing. On that footing, I think that we should demand adequate territory for the purpose of resettling all these 9 millions of people; even the Christians and Buddhists who have also lost the sense of security are also coming out of Pakistan. So, I think that that is a legitimate and proper demand. What Sardar Patel said should be again reiterated, and we should not go to Pakistan with small demands of only safe transit and this and that. We cannot trust them. We have lost faith in them. The Nehru-Liaquat Pact has been sunk fathoms deep. During all these years, we have implemented it, but Pakistan did not implement it. Therefore, sterner and firmer action should be taken. That is what I am demanding.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri K. C. Sharma.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आध घंटा समय बढ़ा दिया जाय ताकि कुछ और लोगों को बोलने का मौका मिल सके । मैं समझता हूं कि यह सदन की राय भी होगी ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : तीन बजे से तो नौन आफिशिएल बिजनैस शुरू हो जायेगा ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उसको साढ़े तीन बजे से शुरू किया जाय और हाउस आज बजाय साढ़े पांच बजे तक बैठने के ६ बजे तक बैठे ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Last time, there was no quorum. So, we cannot do that.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): We suffered quite a lot the other day because of that. All our Bills had lost their place in the new ballot. It is not proper that every week the

private Members' business should be postponed in this manner.

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): We have been discussing the Demands of the External Affairs Ministry, and many great and important speeches have been made, and I have been hearing them all through and listening with great care and attention to the studied performance of my hon. friends. But I have found one thing, namely that the central theme of the modern world is missing. What is the central fact of modern life in India and in the world? It is that peace is necessary and peace is inevitable. Neither India nor Pakistan nor any other country has a chance of survival if the peace in the world does not exist. So, the first and most primary objective of India and her foreign policy has been to help in the maintenance of peace and to create conditions in which that peace would be a sure peace in the world so that we may develop our people to an acceptable standard of life. Sovereignty has no meaning to the hungry and the naked man. What is the use of sovereignty to him? What is the use of crying about the protection of our flag? Where is the flag for him when he has no cloth worth the name to wear? What is the use of the sacred shrine, if I cannot walk to pay homage to Gandhiji? I must have strength enough to walk two miles. That means that I must have enough food to nourish my body, my bones and my blood.

This is the question before the world today, with all its emphasis and with all its force, as has never been the case before.

Now, I shall pose two questions. How are we to guarantee food and cloth to the ordinary citizens? For that, peace is necessary. Most of the countries in the world do not produce enough food for their citizens, and it has to come from elsewhere. Where is the guarantee that the population can be controlled in all the countries through medical help? Every country has not got the medical apparatus to control the population. Even for the survival of the human race, peace in the world is necessary.

The greatest contribution of our Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru in the modern world is that he has raised the voice for peace in the world, and he has put that as the first condition and the primary objective of his foreign policy, and his first objective is that peace should be secured.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow. Now, we shall have to take up the non-official business.

15.00 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTIETH REPORT

Shri Muthiah (Tirunelveli): I beg to move:

> "That this House agrees with the Fortieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 8th April, 1964."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That this House agrees with the Fortieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 8th April, 1964."

The motion was adopted.
