

[Placed in Library, See No. LT-4117/65].

- (iii) The Central Excise (Third Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. GSR 420 dated the 13th March 1965, under section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944; and

[Placed in Library, See No. LT-4118/65].

- (iv) The Income-tax (Third Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. SO 860 dated 9th March 1965, under section 296 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT-4119/65].

12.29 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 31st March, 1965, agreed without any amendment to the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Continuance Bill, 1965, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 19th March, 1965".

12.29½ hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS*—contd.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: We will now continue with the discussion of the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of

External Affairs. Out of 5 hours, One hour and 15 minutes have been taken and 3 hours and 45 minutes remain.

How much time would the hon. Minister require for reply?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): About 45 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: That is, I will call him at 3.30 P.M.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): The time may be extended by one hour at least.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): This year we must review the working of the External Affairs Ministry in the context of the disappearance of a giant, one of the greatest human beings that existed, who managed the external affairs of our country. Shri Swaran Singh, who has the honour of being the first Foreign Minister of India, has been doing his work in a distinguished manner.

There have been consistent attacks on the policy of non-alignment, and some parties have made it an article of faith to misrepresent this policy in various aspects and in various respects. This policy has grown out of our traditions, and we know that the entire people of this country support this policy. We all realise that this policy of non-alignment is only an international extension of our national freedom. The growth of our nation and its healthy progress can be achieved only by our remaining non-involved in the power politics of the world and power blocs that vitiate world politics today. Various arguments are given as to how by joining this bloc or that bloc we can stand to gain a lot of advantages. These are all shortsighted reasonings; unstable advantages can be obtained by probably joining this or that group, but it is very obvious to all right-thinking

*Moved with the recommendation of the President

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

men that without steadfastly remaining attached to this policy of non-alignment, no real progress can be made by any newly independent nation of the world.

A point that I want to bring up before this House, which we have discussed on several earlier occasions, is our link with the Commonwealth. In my opinion, the time has come when we should scrutinise and analyse the advisability or otherwise of remaining in the Commonwealth. We should calmly analyse the advantages that accrue to us from our membership of the Commonwealth. According to me, there are no advantages whatsoever. There are all kinds of disabilities and disadvantages that are associated with this membership, however sub-conscious or subtle they may be. As a matter of fact, I think it is some sort of negation of the policy of non-alignment, not in the practical sense but in the psychological sense.

In the days of imperial preferences, there might have been some advantages in trade and commerce, export and things like that, but today, in the context of the European Common Market where we are suffering a great deal because of our membership of the Commonwealth, it is open to good reasoning that if we had left the membership of the Commonwealth, our exports and imports from the European Common Market could have been much better and much more advantageous to us.

The political advantages of the Commonwealth are almost nil. We have seen how the British Government sides with Pakistan in respect of Kashmir and almost every other matter. America, which is closely related to the Commonwealth, also sides with Pakistan as far as Kashmir is concerned.

Therefore, I would request the hon. Foreign Minister to tell us the present thinking of the Government of India in this respect. This question is always present in our minds, although it may not be mentioned here all the

time, and whenever we analyse our foreign relations, this particular question always strikes us whether it is good or desirable for us to remain a member of a group which does not give us any tangible advantage, but, on the other hand, imposes on us several sub-conscious disabilities in our international affairs. There has been a lot of agitation about Sheikh Abdulla's visit abroad. Whatever mistakes might have been there in scrutinising the application of Sheikh Abdulla, I personally feel that to grant him a passport to go abroad was a right decision. None could ever think that by stopping a man or not allowing him to go abroad, he could have been less dangerous to us or he would have caused less harm to us. By his conduct abroad, he has not only exposed himself but he has also shown his true colours and Kashmiris particularly have known how unreliable and unpatriotic he is. It is something like allowing the devil a long rope to hang itself. I am quite sure when he comes back to India, if at all he would never have the same influence and respect that he had in our politics, particularly in Kashmir.

In the sphere of international relations, I am glad that our Prime Minister has taken the first opportunity of fixing a date to visit the USSR. It is in the fitness of things that our Prime Minister should go there because that country has been helping us in practically every matter. It has stood by us unflinchingly on many things, particularly in Kashmir we cannot forget its continuous support to us in the Security Council. We cherish this mutual respect and friendship and I am sure the Prime Minister's visit to the USSR will further strengthen this un-ending bond. May I request the Prime Minister to fix a date for visiting Yugoslavia also very soon? There has been a long-standing invitation from Yugoslavia and unfortunately the Prime Minister has not been able to find time. But in view of our very deep and abiding relations with that country. I hope the Prime

Minister will soon find time to make such a visit to that country. In the debate so far nothing had been mentioned about the negotiations with hostile Nagas. I must say that the negotiations with hostile Nagas were started with out much fore-thought. The very fundamental on which the negotiations should have succeeded or without agreeing to it the negotiation should not have started was the settlement first that whatever settlement might be ultimately arrived, it will have to be within the framework of the Constitution of India. This fundamental understanding was not arrived at. First of all before the hostile Nagas were brought round to the Conference table we should have told them: there is no use negotiating with the Indian Union as far as the hostile Nagas are concerned unless they agree to negotiate for some settlement within the Constitution of India. This was ignored and this brought us to situation where, if the negotiations failed, there would be more tragic situations and greater calamities and violence in Nagaland than ever before. The second mistake is that we have appointed a civil servant to negotiate a political settlement there. We could have easily sent a political or a public man as the head of the negotiating team, and that public man with political consciousness and political ideas could have been a better negotiator for us than a civil servant. I do not under-rate the capacities of Shri Gundevia who is a distinguished civil servant. But the background of a civil servant and the political and public background are entirely two different things and I am quite sure that the colour and the progress of negotiations in Nagaland would have been different if it was a public man who was negotiating on behalf of the Government of India rather than a civil servant.

Similarly, some very unsavoury precedents have been set up during these negotiations. Surprisingly, the Chief Minister of a State was made to act under the leadership of a civil servant which is very unusual. Secondly a rank foreigner, an alien, a very un-

desirable one at that, Mr. Michael Scott, has been allowed to dabble in our internal affairs. It never happens in any independent country where a rank foreigner, officially or demi-officially, is allowed to come and dabble and arrange for negotiations and even act as a go-between for two sets of people in the same nation. In Nagaland we have set up some very wrong precedents and I hope that in spite of this there would be some settlement forthcoming.

I was a little surprised when I read through the report of the Members of Parliament who went to Nagaland. In the report, which was laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of External Affairs, it is said that they met Rev. Michael Scott, the Church leaders, Army Officers and the representatives of the Naga Federal Government. They themselves, the Members of Parliament, belonging to various groups, wittingly or unwittingly, referred to the Naga hostiles as the Naga Federal Government. It is not given in inverted commas; it is given as if it is a Naga Federal Government.

An hon. Member: Typing mistake.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Then it should have been made clear before the report was laid on the Table of the House by the External Affairs Minister. They should have taken care on the very first day.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): This question of Naga Federal Government was raised by the Peace Mission proposals and it is on the basis of the Peace Mission proposals that our Government are negotiating.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: We never recognised a Naga Federal Government. (Interruption). Then, the question has been raised very often, and I hope the Minister will be able to declare whether the subject of Nagaland administration is going to be transferred to the Home Ministry or is going to remain with the Ministry of External Affairs. This matter was referred to by the

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

Prime Minister also, and he promised that a decision would be soon taken on the subject. We could, however, understand the position about Nagaland, because the Naga insisted that the late Prime Minister should handle their affairs. But we cannot understand why even NEFA should be kept under the External Affairs Ministry. NEFA at least should be transferred immediately to where it belongs; that is, the Home Ministry. It is not that we are sceptical or that we are not confident about the proper handling of the situation or its administration by the External Affairs Ministry. But from the point of view of the psychology and otherwise, it always gives a bad impression that this part of our country should be handled by the External Affairs Ministry.

Then, we must pay a great deal of attention to African matters. I will not go into the details of this because I have not so much time at my disposal, but I would just give only one example of how we are not doing very well in Africa or we are not doing as well as we should do. Kenya, with which we have had good relations and where lots of migrated Indians live, has opened an embassy in China, but it has not thought it fit to open an embassy here in India. They have not even put a diplomatic representative here. This gives an idea of the trend that is current in Africa today. I would request the hon. External Affairs Minister to pay great attention to this susceptible area of Africa.

Let me in conclusion say that in spite of the obvious difficulties of those who follow in the footsteps of our late, great leaders, Sardar Sahib has been doing extremely well, and he has the support and complete confidence of all right-thinking men in the country.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, till some years ago, our role in world affairs

would often exhilarate and even make up to some extent for our failure in spite of the plans to do nothing more than plod in and around poverty. Then a decline began to set in and this decline is painfully prominent today as Government flounders and demonstrates its peculiar lack of initiative and of a sense of perspective, even lack of confidence in the fundamentals of our foreign policy. It is a pathetic situation, which might spell danger, danger which is seen not only in certain happenings abroad but also in the Swatantra screech which seeks to be strident in this House.

It is a good thing that Government says, it stands strongly by non-alignment, a policy which we chose for ourselves and which has also been called for by the requirements of our defence and development. We have friendly relations with the socialist world as also with the west and we get aid from both. But we do not have to let that aid deflect us from paths that we wish to pursue. However, expectation of aid from western countries seems to produce often on Government a peculiar psychosis. We hesitate; we fumble; we fear being forthright, as seen so clearly over recent happenings in Vietnam. It sometimes appears as if, like some of our Swatantra friends, Government also fears that we cannot afford the luxury of a foreign policy and that our so-called dependence on the United States' assistance rules out an independent and positive role in world affairs.

In this House, I am sorry Mr. Masani is not here, but to listen to his homilies on freedom is a cross which I have to bear. With a straight face, he says things which go against the grain. Our frontier is, he said, on the Mekong river and we should be part of a security system underwritten by the United States of America. How John Foster Dulles must chuckle in his grave over his performance! But this country, I hope, has sense and sensibility and will spurn such suggestions.

So, it is clear from whatever is happening for quite a long time to anybody that the United States has no business to be in Vietnam, spending 600 million dollars a year in a country of 14 million people for military and political manipulation, putting up puppet regime after puppet regime in Saigon and now beginning to bring in tens of thousands of United States marines, mounting devastating and inhuman air attacks, augmenting their Seventh Fleet by rushing a nuclear-powered task force from the Atlantic and all that kind of thing. I discover that Mr. Masani is even more royalist than the king in his espousal of American activities in that part of the world. I saw an article by the U.S. Senator Wayne Morse, which was reprinted in the *Times of India*. He wrote:

"With our great wealth we can sustain the current war effort in Vietnam indefinitely, even if it is escalated. But it will never end because our presence and our selection of Saigon's rulers will always inspire rebellion."

The Senator goes on to say:

"The only question is how much blood and money we will waste first, trying to turn the clock back."

Mr. Masani wishes to turn the clock back. But even Mr. Masani's capabilities will not enable him to stop the processes of history.

Shri Masani seems to think that the gas being used by the United States in Vietnam is good for our poor Asian souls. Let us see exactly what is happening. I am quoting from the *New Statesman* of the 26th March, the latest copy which has arrived in the Parliament Library—which is no Communist rag—and it says:

"...all the instruments of modern barbarism are being employed. Vietnamese villages are being smothered in napalm. Secret gases—allegedly non-lethal—are being rained . . ."

A little further on it says:

"..... and the outrage is, if anything, aggravated by the statement that these methods are being used 'on an experimental basis'. Thus the Americans, like Hitler and Mussolini in Spain, are treating the helpless inhabitants of Vietnam as a living laboratory in which to test their new weapons. The last fragment of America's moral authority in Vietnam has gone whistling through the bombs-bays."

Then, the *New York Times* itself in an issue of 25th March 1965 says:—in regard to the point that the gas is not lethal—

"But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old, and those ill with heart and lung ailments."

It goes on further to say:

"In Vietnam, gas was supplied and sanctioned by white men against Asians. This is something that no Asian, Communist or not, will forget."

This is what the *New York Times* says in its editorial on the 25th March, and Shri Masani has the gumption to come forward in this House to justify the employment of the so-called non-lethal gas against the people of Vietnam. This is the kind of thing that goes on and the fumbblings on the part of our Government also continue.

The human tragedy in Vietnam, the use of gas and bomb and undeclared war goes on against an independent country, while the United Nations, unlike in the case of the crisis over Cyprus or the Caribbean, is in a frozen state of forced impotence. This is a situation which will grow into a more widespread tragedy. India must do all it can to prevent it. But it requires a lot of goading in this House to get the Foreign Minister get up and say a few words, and it took

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

a great deal more goading to get the Prime Minister add the more crucial words. I am glad he said them at least. But we hesitate even to communicate our sense of horror and revulsion at something which even the *New York Times* says is abominable, this kind of poisonous gas being used against Asians which we must never tolerate. We hesitate and we fumble. Even now we hesitate.

That is why I say that for us it is clear, we must ask the United States forces in Vietnam to go. Shri Shastri at one point of time did say that the United States Army had no business in Vietnam and it should go out of that territory. Now we do not say that. But even so, let us impress on the world that there are certain categorical imperatives which India has always followed, even before we were free. We always tried to raise our voice in cases where the moral stature of mankind was sought to be subverted, whether it was in Abyssinia or in China or in Czechoslovakia or in Spain. Therefore, this is an inescapable duty which India cannot shirk.

It is a good thing, of course, that India has joined other non-aligned countries in the recent meeting in Belgrade which has demanded a political solution in Vietnam through negotiations without any preliminary conditions. Even though I wish the American forces to be withdrawn straightaway without preliminary conditions, a discussion should take place with a view to a settlement through negotiations. But in regard to this Belgrade meeting, I wish to say that I desire that India had played a more spirited role. I desire that India do not appear from time to time to be somewhat pusillanimous in its approach. I wish India is careful about certain things. I wish the "triangle of friendship", to quote the words of an intrepid journalist, between India, UAR and Yugoslavia, which the late Jawaharlal Nehru had

built and which had become, as it were, "the envy of the nations," does not fall apart, as sometimes we fear it might fall apart. It is reported—I do not know how far it is true—that the old practice of our foreign office constantly to consult Cairo and Belgrade has practically ceased. It appears even that before Shri Shastri's promised visit to Yugoslavia, to which a very welcome reference was made by my friend Shri Shukla, some bright soul in the Ministry has thought out the plan of a prior visit to, of all places, Canada. It is clear that in spite of the unfailingly friendly attitude of President Nasser towards us we could not persuade him or even try to persuade him to desist from lionising Sheikh Abdullah. It seems the Government have a genius for losing country whatever friends it has and neglecting our former non-aligned contacts either through ignorance or malice or, worse.

When the French Premier Monsieur M. Pompidou accompanied by a very astute Foreign Minister, M. Couve de Murville, came to this country, India's pathetic pre-occupation with the idea of aid from wherever we can wrangle it, prevented proper utilisation of a splendid opportunity. Perhaps, we even surprised the French guests by our attitude. In World affairs it is common knowledge that France has won a special and un-orthodox position, and in regard to such things as the Indo-Chinese situation and the posturings against India of China and of Pakistan, we might conceivably have made some international advance by direct highest level contact with a country like France.

In regard to China, apart from stepping up all necessary preparations for defence, which we must do, we have a confrontation which is not compatible with a unidimensional approach. We seem to seek no initiative except to leave it to the Colombo powers, and even in regard to the Colombo proposals sometimes the ministers say that they are as good

as dead. It may be, Sir, that we can see no alternative to break the stalemate, but the search for a peace break-through somewhere should be made in earnest. The French Premier perhaps could have been conceivably of some long range assistance in this regard. But we are totally in the dark as to whether anything in that direction has happened from the Government's point of view.

Our country has made hardly any move for an atom-free zone in our part of the world. Shri Shastri has asked the nuclear powers to consider assuming responsibility for the safety of non-nuclear nations from an atomic attack. This, unfortunately, has been differently interpreted in different countries. He could have made the proposition more attractive, more widely acceptable, especially to the Afro-Asian countries, by stressing the immediate need of a process of voluntary disarmament by the nuclear countries which alone could be the best safeguard for non-nuclear countries. But he put his case the other way around, thanks perhaps to his wonderful advisers, and he caused misunderstanding in certain quarters.

Nobody wishes to exacerbate Indo-Pakistani relations. We are ready for the utmost possible forbearance, even when Pakistan goes on firing on our borders in the east and in the west for more than a fortnight and goes on hurling abuses at us at the same time. It is a good thing, anyhow, that over these enclaves question talks between India and Pakistan are going to be held. Pakistan, however, has to be very sharply told off its miserable game, and India which has had occasion frequently to take up with the United States the question of Pakistani troops in Kashmir using United States weapons must take up also with SEATO the reports in our Press that standard SEATO mortars have been repeatedly picked up after recent Pakistani firing on our Cooch-Bihar frontier. I can only add for the information, particularly of Shri

Shukla, who raised the question of Nagaland, that in Nagaland also U.S. marked weapons smuggled via Pakistan have been discovered and it was reported to the delegation that went there. All these things have got to be taken up.

13 hrs.

It is unfortunate that India's image is by no means a pretty one today in countries that should be our real friends. Whether in Cambodia, where Prince Sihanouk once called Jawaharlal Nehru his "Guru" and named the main road of the capital of Cambodia as "Jawaharlal Nehru Road", or in Algeria where Monsieur Abdullah is confabulating with all kinds of people, it is the same story of India having an image which is not particularly savoury.

And what a predilection for doing the wrong and foolish thing the Government has got, which has made the Government to allow Sheikh Abdullah to go on his peripatetic crusade against India! Here is a man who, whatever his record in the past—it was a good record—works against the interests of India today, who goes with a peculiarly-phrased passport and with lavish foreign exchange made available for his little gang to do the dirty on us in friendly countries. I do not mind his fulminations in the United Kingdom—the British have never forgiven us for being free; and I am glad Shri Shukla said something about the time having come to examine our continuing relationship with the British Commonwealth; I do not mind his fulminations in the United Kingdom—but I hate the idea of Sheikh Abdullah muddying the waters for India in Cairo and in Algiers. And what has happened? Only this morning there was such a furore in the House and the Government has not given us the information why a political decision at the highest level was taken to allow Sheikh Abdullah to go on this fantastic journey. I ask specifically for an explanation to Parliament, here and

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

now, of the so-called political decision. I hate to wait till tomorrow for the External Affairs Ministry to say something in regard to Sheikh Abdullah's meeting with Chou En-lai. Quite apart from that, Government have announced in the other House that a political decision was made at the highest level to give a fantastically-worded passport to Sheikh Abdullah and to allow him and his gang to go abroad with a lot of money in his bag to spend as he liked. That is a political decision made by Government and to this House the Council of Ministers is answerable. So, they must tell us what were the reasons. Did they anticipate that Sheikh Abdullah would do quite a good job for India? If they knew that Sheikh Abdullah was doing the dirty on us, what steps have they taken in this regard? Did they ever try to get in touch with countries like UAR and Algeria to tell them something about it? We also can pay back certain people in the same coin and every country has its own difficulties. Did we ever try to exert our weight and try to convey to President Nasser our stand on the Kashmir question: "this is our position and surely, you should be well-acquainted with this; we are not going to have any international muddying of the waters over Kashmir by an Indian national who is going to your country because ostensibly he is on a pilgrimage tour to Mecca or somewhere". What have we done about it? I want the Minister to explain this. Quite apart from what Sheikh Abdullah might be doing—1, 2, 3, 4 a hell of a lot of misdeeds, a whole catalogue which is the definition of unsavouriness—I want an explanation here and now in this House why such a political decision was made at the highest level, leaving Shrimati Lakshmi Menon completely helpless in the Rajya Sabha. The political decision at the highest level taken to allow Sheikh Abdullah to go with a miserable passport in this pocket was itself a demonstration of India's lack of even elementary self-respect in

regard to certain matters. All the world is talking about it, a person describing himself as Kashmiri Muslim of the first class or second class going round the world and that kind of thing. No wonder perhaps that such decisions are taken in the establishment which flourishes, which queered the pitch even for Jawaharlal Nehru, and finds his successor very small meat.

Our Ambassador to the United States speaks in public, misconstruing the Prime Minister's suggestion regarding the guarantee by the nuclear powers. This particular incumbent is notorious for opening his mouth and every time putting his foot into it; but he flourishes, of course, and queer things happen in the Establishment. Then the Foreign Secretary—Shri Shukla also mentioned it—the official who was in charge of the Nagaland negotiations—for right or wrong, I do not know, he was given charge of the negotiations with Nagaland hostiles—he is suddenly shifted. To become what? The Secretary to the President, to look after the comforts and amenities of the Rashtrapathi, the most amazing sort of thing.

An attempt is made to take over economic matters, which might have been handled in a comparatively progressive way by some people with Jawaharlal Nehru infection, in the External Affairs Ministry, into other hands. So, it was but natural to see, when the International Chamber of Commerce was meeting here, the South African representative attending that meeting, much to the chagrin of the External Affairs Ministry officials. But some officials, very influential with the Prime Minister, are trying to take over economic jobs which might be done in a somewhat progressive fashion by people who have seen what such institutions as the World Conference on Trade and Development could do, and that is why this sort of thing goes on.

For long periods Indonesia, Ceylon, Burma etc. had the ambassadorial

posts lying vacant. During the Olympic Games in Tokyo our Embassy virtually ignored the Indian contingent altogether, never even giving a cup of tea to the gold-medal winning hockey team. It never raised its little finger to help them. I belong to certain organisations which get to know these things and I have got reports that our Embassy in Tokyo did not think it fit to make the stay of the Indian contingent in Tokyo slightly pleasant.

To cap everything, we know that Members of Parliament who go abroad—I am not in that number; I am not too lucky they hardly have one good or kind word to say about our Embassies anywhere. To cap everything, our Ambassador in Cairo absents himself when President Nasser receives at the airport the Head of the German Democratic Republic and later gives him a banquet. We are told that the Indian Ambassador in Cairo had to go to Libya and his *charge de'affaires*, poor man, knew nothing about it, he had no intimation from the UAR Government. All the world was talking about Herr Ulbright's visit to Cairo in the face of West Germany's attacks and the whole idea of the *charge de'affaires* in Cairo not knowing about it seems fantastic. And the Ambassador thought it fit to go to Libya; must have been a very important job which could not be postponed even for a day. The poor Ambassador got cold feet and his bosses here also, who thought that the Bonn Government would be very angry if the GDR Chief had his hand shaken by an Indian diplomat. It is common knowledge that when Bonn threatened President Nasser he took some steps and he slapped West Germany down to size with the result that West Germany had to approach the Arab countries with its tail between its legs. The pucca sahibs of the External Affairs Ministry do not seem to realise it.

India's inhibited role in World politics is seen most clearly in the

case of our relations with the German Democratic Republic. At the Leipzig Fair had the best stall in the World Fair. With GDR unofficially we have trade agreements, cultural agreements and shipping agreements; in ten years since 1954 trade between GDR and India has increased ten-fold; GDR was the first country to introduce rupee payment to help us ease our foreign exchange difficulties. The former Prime Minister of GDR and other dignitaries have come to this country on friendly visit. While informally there is friendship and a great deal of intercourse, the Government of India does not recognise GDR diplomatically or have been consular representation. It has no trade office in Berlin, it does not enter into official agreements, does not recognise GDR passports but issues its visa on special sheets of paper and practises other pin-pricks. And all because of what? Because, the money bags of West Germany would be angry with us. How badly it compares when UAR and little Mauritania set up diplomatic relations with such countries as the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

If the image of India is dusty in the eyes of exactly people in Africa and Asia, with whom we should naturally be friendly, there are reasons for it. And we must make an effort to restore the effulgence of India's image, and that is why it is important that we should make serious preparation for the Algiers Conference, the second conference of the Afro-Asian countries, going to be held at Algiers. In spite of the queering of the pitch and the muddying of the waters that goes on because of Sino-Pakistani-Sheikh Abdullahite machinations, we have to go ahead with real preparations for participation, effective participation in the second conference of the Afro-Asian powers. But this kind of effort will not happen till our Government wakes up.

The External Affairs Minister seeking to please everybody with the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

most carefully non-committal array of words will deceive nobody. By avoidance of issues, by hoping for something to turn up to solve our problems, we shall get nowhere. We live in a changing world whose spirit and contours often appear unfamiliar to the best-informed among us. It needs very serious mental effort to understand and grapple with the emerging world. That effort cannot be made by the bureaucrats in the Ministry; that effort requires to be conscientiously and earnestly made by the country's leaders who are in Government.

I sometimes even feel like complimenting our External Affairs Minister—he is a very affable man—on saying at great length almost nothing at all. But the country deserves something very much better. My last word to Government is: Please try to make the effort and please do not fail India.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hem Barua says that he has to attend some meeting. Congress must be given some time.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, this time the Report of the External Affairs Ministry is a notable departure, thanks to the persistent efforts of my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, who pointed out on three successive occasions that the reports must be more informative. This Report gives a rapid but well-informed survey of things from disarmament to the Chinese bomb, from the UNO to Pakistan and I want to congratulate all those who are responsible for the preparation of this beautiful report.

Once again, the world, particularly South East Asia, is in torment today and the situation is deteriorating every day. Unfortunately, India does not occupy the same position of prestige today in the international community of nations that she used to occupy in the past; but this process of the decline of India's international prestige started with the declining

years of Shri Nehru after the Chinese attack of 1962 and what has happened today is that this process has reached its full height.

Our Government's performance at the Cairo Conference of non-aligned nations as also the steady diminution of India's prestige in South East Asia are sufficient evidence to establish my contention that Indian prestige in South East Asia has slumped considerably.

What happened in Cairo? Did any of the nations, except perhaps for one, lend any support to our Prime Minister's laudable suggestion of a delegation on behalf of the Conference to dissuade Peking from indulging in the atomic race? Nobody supported us. To say that the Conference succeeded in adopting a unanimous resolution against the atom bomb is to say the obvious. Yes, it was a unanimous resolution—unanimous resolution by a group of nation, none of whom can produce an atom bomb even if it wants to.

I have a grouse against the Prime Minister also. Before making the suggestion of a delegation to Peking he made it such a closely guarded secret that nobody of the Indian Delegation knew anything about it. I doubt very much whether our External Affairs Minister knew anything about it before it was made in the Conference by our Prime Minister. An official, a member of the Indian Delegation, who was entrusted with the task of briefing the press in Cairo, looked astounded. He was flabbergasted; he was surprised, when he was confronted by the press with the request to give a fuller detail of the suggestion that the Prime Minister made. He could not, because he knew nothing about it except what he heard in the Conference hall and, mysteriously enough, this Report is ominously silent about what happened to our Prime Minister's proposal *vis-a-vis* China in Cairo. There is nothing about it there.

Let me come to South East Asia now. So long our Government have concentrated their attention not on this vital sector but on big powers. I remember, on one occasion in the course of a conversation I told the late Prime Minister, Shri Nehru, "Sir, China is suffering from big power chauvinism" Our Prime Minister, Shri Nehru, immediately retorted, "Yes, without being a big power". India, I know, does not suffer from any big power chauvinism, but that our Government suffers from a big power psychology, there is no doubt about it and that is why they are neglecting the smaller countries of South East Asia.

I want to tell you that South East Asia must occupy an important place in our strategic thinking. Our neglect of South East Asia has cost us dearly. It has cost us dearly. When General de Gaulle plans a high-level conference for South East Asia, unfortunately, enough, he does not think of India as a participant. When sketching the outlines of a possible political solution for South East Asia, Mr. Walter Lippman, otherwise very sympathetic to India, does not think that India needs to be consulted. Even very recently when Mr. Harold Wilson, the British Prime Minister, formulated a plan for a political solution of the Viet-Nameese problem, he did not think it necessary to consult India. He consults France, China and Russia.

The use of gas by the US in Viet-Nam has shocked the conscience of the world. There is a controversy, no doubt, whether this is lethal gas or non-lethal gas and the US spokesmen have come out with a suggestion that this gas cripples people only temporarily; but I want to say that there are US scientists who have come out with a different opinion. They say that this gas is capable of crippling people permanently. Apart from conveying our dismay and distress, our repulsion and repugnance against the use of this gas in Viet-Nam, our Gov-

ernment should try to create world opinion, and, at the same time, pursue that path very vigorously that in warfare nobody should use any weapon beyond conventional weapons.

May I tell you, Sir, that both Peking and Djakarta today are interested in creating an atmosphere of tension and distress so far as South East Asia is concerned? They have succeeded in doing that and our Government, when the situation is so tense and disturbing, are following a policy of complacency as they are following today so far as South East Asia is concerned. We protested when Britain sent troops to Suez and we protested rightly I say. But, have our Government protested when Indonesia sends troops to Malaysia? Have our Government come out with that unqualified support for Tengku Abdul Rehman, the man who came out with unqualified support for us when the Chinese aggressed on us? We have not. It is because of such negligence, indifference, callousness and apathy that the Indian image is getting destroyed and eroded in South East Asia particularly. It is this policy of bifurcated logic that our Government is pursuing so far as West Asia is concerned. Our Government's diplomatic apathy to Israel is an instance in point. The Report says about Israel that India cannot support any state established on the basis of religion. If that is true, why did India agree to the creation of Pakistan, a highly theocratic state? If that is true, why is it that India maintains diplomatic relations with Pakistan, a State that is established on the basis of religion? I would say that it is double standard and hypocrisy of the worst type.

May I tell you that a sterile anti-China policy will not lead us anywhere? China is interested neither in the Colombo proposals nor in negotiations. What she is interested in is mounting humiliations on India. The so-called boundary pact recently enacted between China and Pakistan at

[Shri Hem Barua]

Rawalpindi is a fraud on human conscience and it poses a great threat to us.

Recently, Sheikh Abdullah has been invited by China to visit China. This shows that Pakistan has succeeded in organising a thorough-bred campaign over Kashmir against India with Sheikh Abdullah as an accomplice. China attacked NEFA and Ladakh in 1962. I have an apprehension that China might launch an attack on Kashmir on behalf of Pakistan and the latest news that China has mobilised her military strength all along the northern frontiers of Kashmir must be an indication of that; at the same time, Pakistan's indulgence in military activities across our frontiers, violence and all that are also an indication that there might be a joint Sino-Pakistan venture on Kashmir.

Yesterday, when the Prime Minister said that he would not allow Sheikh Abdullah to go to China, I had immediately an apprehension that Sheikh Abdullah might meet Mr. Chou En-lai in Algiers—that was the apprehension I had yesterday—and this morning the newspapers have carried the information that Sheikh Abdullah has already met Mr. Chou En-lai in Algiers. This is a pre-planned conspiracy against India and the conspiracy was hatched in Paris. It was hatched in Paris. My latest information is this that Sheikh Abdullah might go to Sinkiang where he proposes to set up an emigre Government for Kashmir under the aegis of China. That is the latest information about how Sheikh Abdullah's mind is working and that is corroborated by his statement to La Monde in Paris to the effect that he might decide not to go back to his country after his pilgrimage to Mecca when Sheikh Abdullah becomes a Haji Abdullah.

Another thing that we have come to know—that was only last night—is that the Foreign Minister of Nepal gave a banquet in honour of Marshall Chen Yi in Kathmandu and our Ambassador there, Shri Shriman Narayan, was present in that banquet. On previous occasions also, I had the honour of pointing out in this House that in Peking our Charge d'affaires attended the banquet that was given in honour of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. That was in 1963. Then, in 1964, our Ambassador in Cairo attended the banquet given in honour of Mr. Chou En-lai. And in 1965, our Ambassador in Nepal attends the banquet given in honour of Marshall Chen Yi. There is an old English adage: The surest way to the heart is through the stomach. Possibly, our Government are working on that principle. Possibly, our Government thinks that they would be able to win the heart of China through the stomach which is almost an impossibility. I would say this much that our Government, by facilitating this movement of Sheikh Abdullah in foreign countries by granting him a passport, has done a signal disservice to this country. Our Government have let down the national interests of this country and it is on this account I would say that Mr. Shastri's Government should resign because that Government has let down the national interests of our country. You might say, "You are in a minority and you cannot throw out a Government." I would appeal to the Congress Party, the ruling Party, that it is high time for them to mobilise their strength and throw out the present Government because the present Government has betrayed the interest of the country.

Mr. Speaker: He may conclude now.

Shri Hem Barua: Just a few minutes more.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We have surrendered our Group time for Communications Ministry and also for the Department of Civil Aviation.

Mr. Speaker: He prepared his schedule and gave it to me.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I gave it yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: I am giving more than what he has put down.

Shri Hem Barua: The veil of illusion vis-a-vis China has been completely shattered. China has grabbed our territory by force of arms and there the matter ends so far as China is concerned. Why should she come to the negotiating table to negotiate over a piece of land that she has already occupied? Do you think China is as foolish as we are? There are people who go about putting a question to us, whether China is going to attack us again or not. To me, whether China attacks us again or not is immaterial. What is material is whether our Government are prepared to recover 14,500 sq. miles of our territory under the illegal occupation of China today or not. That is the material thing. There is the series of intrusions by China and there is the series of surrenders of our interests by our Government to China and, at the top of that, Mao Tse-tung has thundered: China has every right to ask India to withdraw from the more than 90,000 kilo metres of China's territory south of the illegal McMahon line. The situation is not as rosy as our optimistic External Affairs Minister an affable man, thinks it to be. It is not as rosy as that.

Recently, there is a hue and cry, a storm, raised over the alleged request made by our late Prime Minister for a U.S. aircraft carrier to be lodged in the Indian ocean during those hectic days of November, 1962. On 21st October, 1962, the day after the Chinese mounted their massive attack on India, we, Mr. Kamath and myself,

were the first to run to our Prime Minister and we were with him for full one hour, from 9 to 10 A.M. I remember every word of the dialogue that took place between us. I had never seen the more agonised portrait of a man than what we saw that morning. That sad, pensive face of our Prime Minister haunts me today and it will haunt me till I lapse into the eternal silence. During that conversation, Mr. Kamath—and I hope Mr. Kamath remembers it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Very well, every word of it.

Shri Hem Barua: He suggested to the late Prime Minister that he should immediately write to all our friends for immediate military aid. To that, our late Prime Minister said, "We have already done that." And when I suggested to him, "Sir, since China has attacked us, why don't you sever diplomatic relations with China?". Do you know what he told us—I remember every word of that? He said, "Well, in that case this undeclared war becomes a declared war and China might immediately bomb Delhi, Calcutta and other cities". Now, those of our friend who possibly drawing their inspiration from the Chinese teapot or from the Russian samovar, are raising a hue and cry today over a thing that did not exist, would they have liked to be the witnesses of the tragic spectacle of Calcutta, Delhi and other Indian cities being reduced into ruins and ashes by the Chinese bomb? If the late Prime Minister would have asked for a Soviet aircraft carrier.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Is it open to the hon. gentleman to disclose a private conversation which is off the record? What will happen to our public life? He should not be allowed to do that.

Shri Hem Barua: Don't be conscious about public life? We are very conscious of that. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Hem Barua: There is nothing wrong. Sir, I am finishing in two minutes.

Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna): That is absolutely a private conversation. The late Prime Minister would have said it in confidence.

Shri Hem Barua: I tell you, in the name of God and man, that the late Prime Minister told us these things and I may not have anything but I have a good memory. (*Interruption*) If Mr. Nehru would have asked for a Soviet aircraft carrier, would these people have raised a hue and cry that they are raising today? Sir, I remember what Mr. Winston Churchill once said. Mr. Churchill said, "I will willingly shake hands with devil if it meant saving my country." In these words, I hear the voice of a patriot welling up in determined titanic language. And who can, not even his worst political enemy, say that Mr. Nehru was not a patriot? Mr. Nehru was a patriot of the highest integrity who loved India and the Indian people and if he had asked for the U.S. aircraft carrier, he must have done so out of the highest patriotic motive.

Coming back to China, I will say that it is high time for our Government to announce to the world that the Colombo proposals, so far as India is concerned, are dead as dodo because China has rejected them in toto. We must be prepared to pay China back in her coin and I am quite confident that we can beat back China lock, stock and barrel provided our leadership is determined—it is dedicated leadership—and means business.

Mr. Speaker: Now he should resume his seat.

Shri Hem Barua: I am concluding—just last sentence.

India should play her diplomatic cards well. On so many occasions, our

Government have slipped on the banana peel of Chinese and Pakistani diplomacy that we are still being pushed back. Our Government has allowed diplomatic initiative to pass into the hands of the enemy. I would say that the traditional Indian virtues the traditional Indian postures of goodness and nobility, humility and modesty cannot stimulate and nourish the nation's external policy into sinews of strength.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Mr. Speaker, in the ultimate analysis the foreign policy of a country, the foreign relations with other nations are guided both by the principles and objectives for which it stands tempered by enlightened self-interest. The conscious thinking of India from time immemorial to the time of Gandhian technique of non violence has led to the present position.

There is no doubt that a world figure dominated the Indian scene and laid the basis and fashioned the policy of non-alignment, which is the basic tenet of our foreign policy today, and of large number of developing nations in the world. At the same time we have gone through many experiences, not the least of which is the experience of the gigantic deception that China practised on us.

13.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

There was a time when without second thought we gave up the position that we had inherited as successor Government of British in Tibet and recognised the nominal sovereignty of China over Tibet which first led to the horrible massacres there. Our eyes were further opened when we ourselves became the victim and when our land was invaded. These are experiences from which we cannot get away and our eyes are wide awake now.

Let us now turn to the question, i.e. Vietnam, about which so much has been said in this House today. Let us dwell on that for a moment and see whether our Government's policies have been vacillating or hesitant. I for one do not think that they have been vacillating on this question of Vietnam. I think India is well aware and the Indian Government is well aware of the position of China and China's intentions, about which Mr. Masani said something about being careful that she does not to enter through the backdoor into India. We are well aware and perhaps more than any other nation on this side of the world, and the U.S.R and the U.S.A. might also share this view that China has become the potential enemy of world peace, not only potential but the real enemy of world peace and China is the country through which world annihilation is most possible. That is the context in which we have to consider every problem that we in India are facing and considering it in that context, I think our Government have unhesitatingly taken the right approach. We cannot and will not stand in the way of any nation that tries to curb the activities of China that has gone made in her lust for power. But, at the same time we stand by the objectives in which we inherently believe. What Mr. Masani tried to point out that even today we are thinking in terms of political settlement and thus betraying ones own interests, I think, is very wrong. Of course, India will think in terms of of political settlement because it is the only way through which we can possibly hope that this world, which is escalating towards war, will be stopped from doing so. It is the only way through which a normal civilised nation should function and that is why our Prime Minister has unhesitatingly pointed out that we shall try to bring about a peaceful settlement and support other nations with the same objective.

Sir, the U.S.S.R. is very much interested in North Vietnam and the
42 (A1) L.S.D.—5.

U.S.S.R. knows, perhaps as no other nation does now much, China wants to impede the influence of U.S.S.R in North Vietnam. Therefore, we face an entirely new situation in this world today. This is a new world, a world of space ships, a world of atom bombs and a world where the old pre-conceived ideas have to be abandoned. . .

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाय (देवास) :
हाउस में कोई कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर नहीं है ।

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): Mrs. Menon is sitting there.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Old ideas are giving place to new and in this context I would like to say that it is time the leaders of the two power blocs woke up to the situation. The division of the world into communist and non-communist has already been blurred. It can never be what it was in the past and I dare say and I do believe that it will disappear in future altogether. The new divisions, the new alignments . . .

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष मेरा
व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, हाउस में कोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The bell is being rung....

Now there is quorum and the hon. Member may proceed.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I was saying that new alignments are already showing themselves and it is time that we also woke up to these things. Not only we in this country but all the world outside will have to wake up to the significance of these new alignments and the new things that are coming in, which might destroy the world much fast than the two power blocs whose positions have changed not only subtly but really also. Therefore, I would say that

India must be certainly wide awake to the Chinese threat to the Chinese menace, which is a threat not only to India or Vietnam or Asia or Africa but a threat to the whole world itself. It is not a small threat especially after the Chinese explosion of atom bomb. Hitler also did not appear very large or important at one time. These two nations, the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. were then waiting on the bring; but later they were forced by circumstances to enter the arena of war. This time also they may delay before they combine. But before they combine to curb this nation whose leaders, as I said earlier, are running mad in their lust for world hegemony; they might well find that it is too late not only in preventing threat to world peace but also too late to prevent total destruction. Therefore, the time has come to do a great deal of re-thinking and our Government has done nothing wrong in the attitude they have taken up in the case of Vietnam. I don't think they should rush into actions there. If a peaceful settlement could come, then it will be helping the people of Vietnam. But whatever settlement comes, it must not come at the cost of letting China continue unrestricted in her advance towards her objective. The U.K. under a Labour Government should also be better prepared than was under Chamberlain before World War II. I have spoken about this subject, though not in great detail, because our minds are exercised over it.

Now, let me turn to our relations with our neighbour Pakistan. These relations, through these years, at times with greater force and at times with lesser force, have been disturbed. We have just faced on the eastern border near Cooch Behar a very difficult situation, a situation of the type, which, of course, in the past also we have faced many a time, with shootings and killings and incursions from Pakistan into India on the eastern border. The position regarding even the enclaves Dahagram or Berubari

is nothing so new, except that there is one very significant factor which I think is absolutely new, and that new factor arises out of the visit of President Ayub to China and that of Mr. Chou En-lai to East Pakistan. And that new factor is that today Pakistan is using the Chinese technique that offence is the best form of defence, and to spell it out further, she has come out with the statement that India has invaded or transgressed into the territory of Pakistan before she started her attacks.

When I am dwelling on this subject, I would like to say one word about the para-military troops that were deployed by Pakistan and the SEATO armies that they use. I want to ask the USA—I hope that our Government has already protested to them about this use of American arms and—why they are allowing Pakistan to make use of American help in her designs made in collusion with China.

Take the Kashmir question. What is the situation there? Our neighbour Pakistan has made over Indian territory to China. Does the USA support this? If she does, not, then why does she not prevent the use of US arms by Pakistan against India, before it is too late?

There is one other point that I would like to mention while I am on this subject, namely that whatever has happened recently on the Cooch-Bihar border has had to be met by the police force of West Bengal who with their limited resources had to man our national borders there. I do hope that the External Affairs Minister will take it up with his colleagues and see to it that assistance is provided to Assam and to Bengal to man these borders better.

I would also like to suggest something which concerns the Ministry of Defence particularly but which also concerns the Ministry of External Affairs, namely that we should have a huge land army; we should be able to recruit a large number from among those who are unem-

ployed today, in order to man our borders, because the situation is quite acute there.

Now, let me turn to the question of what our Government's attitude is towards the explosion of the Chinese bomb and whether it is right or wrong. Here again, I think that the attitude of Government has not been wrong. It has been the right and the correct attitude. Will the proliferation of bombs help our self-interest or that of the world? If India could have the bomb, then why not Pakistan and why not Indonesia? If that happens, then any day, we may face a position of annihilation. But apart from that, a nuclear stale-mate would be created which would only prevent us from getting on with our economic development. If we want to retain our prestige and to win it back,—for we are indeed humiliated now by the Chinese invasion of India, and our prestige too has suffered—I think the best way we can do it is by getting on in the race for atoms for peace.

Now, I come to external publicity. Time and again I have pointed out on the floor of this House right through all these years that our external publicity had been wanting. But from chapter XII of the Ministry's report this year I find that external publicity Department is very happy, because on one occasion at least, Government have been able to place before the world through television something that had happened, and that was when 1500 Christians fled from Pakistan to the Garo Hills of Assam; the world outside knew for the first time that there was an influx of refugees from Pakistan to India. All through these years, was it not possible to have done something like that? What is more tragic still is this. I do not know if everyone is aware of this. When the television authorities wanted to enter the area, when the invasion of India was taking place, due merely to delaying tactics, they could not get there in time. So, today, when China tells Africa or any other part of the world that she never invaded India, we have

no record to show what had actually happened because of the delaying tactics that was practised. A great deal has to be done to project the image of India in Africa and in many Asian lands to counteract the villifying propaganda let loose by China.

I had spoken the other day about the implementation machinery of Government. In regard to the Ministry of External Affairs, I would like to reiterate it with even greater force. I have not the time at my disposal to go into the running of our Embassies and the way in which things are managed, but I do endorse what others have said on this subject.

In conclusion, I would like to say one word about Sheikh Abdullah. I must say that for the life of me I cannot understand....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Enough has been said about him already.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: ...how Government have put forward such a confused idea about this matter. I hope that they will rectify their position, because I think that much of the criticism is true.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Inder J. Malhotra. The hon. Member is not here. Now, Shri Bakar Ali Mirza.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): When a Member is not present here, why should his name be called?

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): A Member who wants to speak should catch your eye.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): In framing the foreign policy of our Government, we have to take into account not only the vital interests of the country but also the objective realities around us. On the political map, we have the regions of cold war with two blocs armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons sufficient in power to destroy the whole world in a shorter time than it took God to create it. ~~It~~

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza] .
 spite of that we find that in all these regions and blocs, not a single bullet has crossed any frontiers. You may explain it away by the theory of balance of terror or that of power equilibrium, but still the facts stare us in the face.

Then, we have the emergent nations in Asia and Africa, whether non-aligned or camp-followers, all of them poor, all of them under-nourished, defenceless, born into the world of freedom only the other day, who have not dropped their milk teeth yet; and if you take the map of Asia and Africa and close your eyes and put your finger at random at any place on that map, you will find that there are conflicts, racial and tribal, communal feuds, and border disputes etc. for small patches of land. This is the reality that is facing us. In Africa, there are about 40 border disputes. In Asia, from the Suez to Hong-Kong there is hardly any country which is not involved in these border disputes, except perhaps Japan.

So, if we take the objective realities around us, peace becomes a vital factor for this region. If we turn to the economic map, we are exporting raw material as we used to do in pre-Independence days but at continuously falling prices, and we are importing machinery and know-how at continuously rising prices.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष
 महोदय, हाउस में इस समय कोरम नहीं है ।

Shri Joachim Alva: This hon. Member who has been once expelled from the House is worried now about quorum in the House. If he persists in raising this again and again, we shall have to move for his permanent expulsion from the House.

Shri Shankre (Marmagoa): What sort of observation is this?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : कोरम का सवाल उठाने का हमारा अधिकार है । माननीय सदस्य को अपने शब्द वापिस लेने चाहिये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing unparliamentary. It is a question of fact.

श्री प्रकाशबोर शास्त्री : उन को यह नहीं कहना चाहिए था ।

Shri Khadiikar (Khed): That threat is your right. The hon. Member who has made this observation does not have that right, but in case you feel that he is behaving in a manner which is not inkeeping with the dignity of the House etc. then it is within your authority to do such a thing. But the hon. Member cannot say that he must be permanently expelled. That is not fair.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The quorum bell is being rung—Now, there is quorum.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza may resume his speech.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: Sir, the position is that we are asking for tariff protection and tariff world but also in the European Economic Community. Should we make the situation which is bad enough to go worse, by getting arms? The United States of America is giving aid, roundabout 8,000 million dollars, and one-third of that is in arms aid. We are not satisfied with that. We are queuing at every arsenal in Europe for more and more arms. We have been that in Viet-Nam a power like the United States of America is finding difficulties in going ahead. The idea that arms can solve these problems is incorrect. So, if this idea is discarded, is it not necessary for us to seek another way, because war has lost its effectiveness as an instrument of policy? This is increasingly being realised. The Soviet Union has suggested about the solution of border dispute by peaceful means and the non-aligned countries have also advocated the same idea, but Sir, this

mere wish and declaration is not enough. We have to create the machinery which should be so objective that it would create confidence and should be so quick in taking decision that the situation does not deteriorate with time. We have tried bilateral talks and the African nations are trying to use the Organisation of African Unity. Friendly countries, while mediating can exercise certain influence but they themselves are subject to friendly pressure. We must create the machinery which is really a machine, something like the International Court at the Hague or any other body. I think, Sir, that the countries of Asia and Africa should make a firm resolve that peace is vital for us, not only as an ethical concept or as desirable spiritual goal, but as an economic necessity and political compulsion of our times.

Sir, our hon. External Affairs Minister. Sardar Swaran Singh is going to Algiers. I hope he will be able to persuade other countries of Asia and Africa to pursue this path.

With regard to China, we are the people who are wronged and there are other countries also similarly placed. Decision of a body like the one I suggest may be unfair to some, or may be entirely wrong. Even when some decisions are wrong, even then, the entire effect on the whole region will be immensely beneficial and lead to the progress of that region, because the other way, namely, the way of war, leads to a blind alley, Piling up of armaments, therefore, will lead us nowhere.

Now I come to the question of Vietnam. While speaking about this, Sir, I am reminded of the speech of my hon. friend Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit. She was bubbling with divine discontent, and she said with a flourish, from Sheikh Abdullah to Vietnam, our Government is a prisoner of indecision. Then, Sir, she quoted Mr. Harold Wilson, the Prime Minister of England, as a model for us for

firmness and decision. Now, I will match her quotations with my own quotation from the New Statesman, which is not a conservative paper. This is about Mr. Harold Wilson. I quote:

"The country wants smack of firm Government and not a moist handshake. Mr. Wilson must encourage his Ministers to stand up to pressure groups, whether in industry, the unions, or the professions and he must set a resolute example himself. What this Government needs more than anything else is a streak of ruthlessness...."

It is not enough to preach sermons on the T.V. The business of Government is not to exhort, but to decide. Today, as in 1940, the spirit of Dunkirk must begin in Downing Street."

Now, let us turn to the White House. This is what Mr. Walter Lipman, the famous columnist has written. I quote:

"The Economist of London complains recently that there is a "lack of decision" in Washington..... The Economist concludes, if U.S.A. is to be a leader, then "it must lead somewhere". The Economist does not say, where we should lead and apparently does not know."

I hope Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit will be gratified to learn that this disease of 'indecision and weakness' is not only a peculiarity to the Government of India, but it also exists as an epidemic at high altitudes.

Sir, where is this indecision? Where is this weakness? If there is any department where there is a continuity of policy, it is in the External Affairs Department, and Sir, if her criticism was correct, then, it has come too late. The policy even about

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

Sheikh Abdullah and Viet-Nam was decided long ago. Even when Panditji was alive, there were people who used to say that he was weak. They used to compare him to Hamlet—the Prince of Indecision. The unfortunate thing is this, that, if you work as a democrat and give way to opinion of others such thing are said. If you expect the attribute of dictatorship in democracy then, that is wrong. We must remember that we are not a great power. Our position in the world does not depend upon the strength of arms or economic power. Our position in the world entirely depends upon what we stand for and the integrity and the vigour with which we hold to those ideas and ideals.

If people like my hon friend Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pandit who, as a diplomat, has been trained in the art of restraint and under-statement, make such a general charge like that, then, it tarnishes the image of India abroad and does the greatest dis-service to the country.

An Hon Member: Certainly not. That is my view. You may not agree.

14 hrs.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: As regards Vietnam, for the last 20 years it is a battlefield, off and on. There are several interests at work, the least important of which it seems, is the interest of South Vietnam itself. The United States of America wants North Vietnam to withdraw from South Vietnam; not only that, it wants also to see that the Viet Cong stops its activities. The US has also decided to hold on to Vietnam so as to prevent South Vietnam from falling into the hands of China. Great Britain is interested because American presence in that area is of help to her in connection with her commitments in Malaysia. The goodwill of America is necessary to maintain the strength of the China surely would like America to pack up and go, so that she could slide through Vietnam tunnel and reach the Bay of Bengal.

Russia does not want her image in North Vietnam to be tarnished as the leader of the communist world. France has advocated neutrality, international guarantee and negotiations, a suggestion that is most beneficial to Vietnam and, therefore, the least heeded, because de Gaulle acts as an irritant on other counts.

America is obsessed with the idea of communism. People who hold this view, specially Shri Masani, do not realise that the theory that Mao Tse-tung is controlling Ho Chih-minh, and he is in turn directing Viet Cong is not correct, because it was Chiang Kai-shek who after the last war, cleared that area above the 17th parallel and accepted Ho Chih-minh as head of the government of that territory; below the 17th parallel it was the British Government and the British General, Gracey, who was in charge. Hence this political muddle.

Therefore, even if North Vietnam wants to act according to the desire of the US Government, how can it be guaranteed that it will have control over the Viet Cong? Can they control the Viet Cong? Is it not possible that there will be a split if they tried to do it? Even if all this is possible, even then is it possible to expect the nationalists to support South Vietnam? What are the prospects before them? There political and economic stability is non-existence. Governments there fall before they are formed. There are no rural help programmes, no land reforms, no industry. The only source of livelihood is to mislead the gullible Americans.

This being the situation there, it is very difficult to see how American can pursue this policy there. If elections had been held in 1956, Ho Chih-minh would have formed a communist state, but an independent state. He is not a stooge either of China or any other country, because even today he is resisting the induction of volunteers from China into

Vietnam. He is in his seventies. Very soon we will be faced with a situation where there will be nobody of sufficient stature to lead the whole of S. Vietnam as a distinct entity and prevent it from falling into the hands of China because the younger lot are more influenced by China than Russia.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His time is up.

Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra (Khandwa): Mr Deputy-Speaker, I am very thankful to you for calling me so early because in the afternoons I feel very tired.

Discussing our foreign policy in the post-Nehru times becomes a little embarrassing, because the architect is no more, and the influence that he enjoyed in international affairs and world politics has been snatched from us, according to certain Opposition members who feel that India is now at the mercy of foreign powers, and therefore, she will not be able to make the same impact on world affairs as she had done in the past.

Although we have suffered a shock in the passing of our late Prime Minister, because it is the most tragic event of the year. Mortality took him away from us, though everybody knew that he was not to be with us for a very very long time even we wished that he should be with us to guide the destiny of the country. But it should not be a cause for distress or disappointment and we should not lose courage because our policy that he shaped was based on various factors that were essentially Indian. It emanated from our past, it emanated from our culture, it emanated from the heritage we have in this country, cultural and socio-political.

I need not go into the details of all those factors. But I think this policy of non-alignment, or whatever you may call it the policy of peace, has got firmly rooted in the soil of the country. The entire nation, barring a few people who make it a profession or who are obsessed by opposing

Government on every minor detail and characterising the policy as a most unsuccessful policy, has supported it. We stand behind this particular policy of peace, co-existence and co-operation in world affairs. Naturally in the complex world we are living in, it is possible that some of our immediate gains may not be visible; it may not be possible to discern some success on small or minor points or even on certain major points at times. But taking stock of the whole situation in the past 17 years, we can say that it has brought us dividends. It has established a place for India in world affairs. I think we will carry on that policy and our collective wisdom in this country will not fail us.

Three Big personalities have been snatched away from the political scene in the world, two of them in the physical sense and the third overthrown from his premiership of the Soviet Union. I think this is the end of the personality cult and we are being ushered into a new era where the rule of democracy would be the test of everything in world affairs. As we have formed an international forum, i.e., the democratic forum of the UN, we should not bother about the personalities any more. I think for some time to come, may be the immediate future, there would not be any big personalities guiding the destiny of the world. There may be countries, there may be certain policies, certain trends, that may be there to guide the destiny of the world and solution to the various problems in cold war spots. Therefore, I think India will not fail in displaying this collective wisdom, may be in the form of Foreign Minister or MPs or politicians. I am not disappointed that India will have no place; may be on certain occasions we will find that our voice not be heard, but so long as we continue to stick to the basic tenets of our foreign policy, there is no ground for disappointment because the 20th century world, specially the last half of it

[Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra]

after 1950, has begun to utilise the latest channel in diplomacy, that is, diplomacy by conference. Diplomacy by conference has come to story to such an extent that it is in a way displacing the normal channels of diplomacy, that is, negotiations between countries through embassies. Therefore, if diplomacy by conference is to be the main channel through which negotiations would be conducted, I think there would not be very great importance attached to personalities.

The policy of this country is backed by the people and is continued by its able statesmen. So long as we continue to support the U.N. which is growing into a larger body comprehending all parts of the world, I think there is no cause for any kind of disappointment. Our policy is supported and followed by others. The Afro-Asian nations emerged out of this following of the non-alignment policy. Of course we do not want to take all the credit for this. There are so many countries which are now sticking to this policy and are trying to make it a success. I think that if the U.N. to-day has survived from the attack it is because of the non-alignment policy followed by most of the Afro-Asian nations. Had there been no non-aligned block or group of countries—big or small—I think the U.N. would not have survived. So, we have strengthened the U.N. by our policy and I think that if we continue to strengthen the U.N., it should be possible in the near future to have a strong international police force which might be able to control the nations—the erring countries—going against the policy of peace. I hope that there would be a better international organization which would get more and more strength in course of time. The international law would be really an international law and political sovereignty of the countries would not come in the way of peaceful settlements. So, I think we should continue to stick to this policy.

Of course after the passing away of our Prime Minister, it was only natural that there would be some pressures or pressure groups in the country which have led to all sorts of extreme things to be propagated and it is very natural that people might have been influenced by these things. In so many places they come through groups or various kinds of agencies that operate in this country from the right as well as from the left. But the rightist agencies sometimes are more subtle because they have various contests in this country and they try to bring pressure on Government and they try in a general way to change the policy if they so desire. In the world opinion we have to guide ourselves and I think my party and members of my party will have to be careful against these pressures coming from the extreme right or extreme left. If we can show some courage and if we can maintain a balanced outlook, it is possible that we will not be lagging behind and we shall do more or less the same type of job that our late Prime Minister was doing. But the only thing is that we have to build up a collective leadership in this country, to pool all our resources—intellectual, material, political and everything. In foreign policy, of course, if it is to be successful, it must be backed by our country's material strength. We have, therefore, to develop our country so as to become self-sufficient in many fields. So long as we continue to remain depending on foreign aids and things of that sort, our foreign policy will suffer from limitations. In order to make our foreign policy more strong and more effective, we have to build ourselves economically and materially. The coordination between the material progress and moral strength is necessary and I hope this will be pursued by our leadership.

Then, Sir, the non-alignment, as it is called, has brought a new shift in the diplomacy of the world. The

whole concept of diplomacy as it continued in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries is changing. The U.S.A. is also realising that. We can very well compare their present foreign policy with that of the early or even late fifties. We can see as to how many shifts there have been in the U.S. foreign policy in the last few years because they had to recognise certain forces in the world and they had to recognise the Afro-Asian influences. They had to recognise the emergence of the Afro-Asian countries. Therefore, they try to make adjustments to that extent. Formerly, according to the U.S. people, neutrality was more of a sin. Now, after the Chinese aggression, they had to recognise that India's policy was correct and that it cannot be disturbed. They not only tolerated our policy but they praised it in so many words. They even went to the length of saying that India-U.S.S.R. friendship is not only in the interest of India but even in the interest of the U.S. This recognition of our foreign policy has not only paid dividends to India but it has also paid dividends to the whole world. So, where is the need to deviate from our policy? I am very happy that barring a few Members in the Parliament who want us to change the policy by bringing in certain pressures all others are in favour of this policy. Let me also tell you Sir, that I have been carefully listening to the speeches of the Opposition Members. I find that some members want us to resign on a particular issue while the other Opposition Members do not want that.

Then, there are issues on which some Members of the Opposition would like us to do something according to their own likes whereas other Members of the Opposition do not like us to deviate from our path. That shows that our foreign policy is succeeding well and maintaining a balance between the extremes.

So far as Vietnam is concerned, there has been a good deal of stir inside as well as outside this country because of the use of napalm. Now, according to International Law, everybody knows that there are certain conventional weapons that are permitted. All these new weapons that we have discovered after the first world war have been condemned upto now. They are not conventional weapons. Those inhuman and obnoxious things should not be permitted to be used. But, as I said, the International Law is not very effective and it does not have a very effective sanction behind it, it is not possible to check the use of these weapons. In practice all such weapons have been used against Asians; they might also be used against Africans. It shows that the world is divided into races—whites and others. Racial superiority tries to dominate the world. The world is not static. Whatever one would say, the Afro-Asian Solidarity would surely play an important role in the world affairs and it would get all advantages from the U.N. The U.N. should be a strong agency to maintain peace in the world. It has to see that such things do not happen or they are not allowed to happen by the international public opinion.

Before winding up, I would like to make a few observations about Kashmir. We should not be afraid of Sheikh Abdullah going out of this country or remaining outside this country and creating a problem for us. There are so many people who have left this country—Shri Phizo for example—and have remained outside and tried to carry on anti-Indian or sabotaging activities. The crux of our problem about Kashmir is whether we can maintain our secular mould in this country. Kashmir cannot be taken away from us by any power on the earth. The only drawback that we are suffering from in the case of Kashmir is about the tendency of the communal parties in this country who try to make the Indian minds communal. If we can kill communalism in our land Kashmir shall remain with us and no-

[Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra]

power on earth can take it away from this country.

In conclusion, I should congratulate very much our hon. Minister Sardar Swaran Singh for the very significant part that he is playing in the world by sticking to this policy of non-alignment and by maintaining his amiable quality for which he is known throughout the world. I hope that he will continue to make this policy more and more effective and contribute to the world progress and peace.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Malenkov wanted to come to terms with the United States of America on the question of East Germany. There was no response from the United States of America. He was driven out of office.

Mr. Khrushchev publicly stated that he wanted Russia to withdraw from South-East Asia. There was no response from the United States of America. Mr. Khrushchev was driven out of office.

By supporting the United States of America on the question of Vietnam, the Government of India would not be antagonising Russia, because the establishment of American hegemony over the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean is the condition precedent to the establishment of Russian hegemony over Africa and Western Asia.

The assumption behind the concept of the Geneva conference is that the bipolar world is going to remain stationary, or that it will break up into a multipolar one.

The assumption behind the concept of a summit meeting between Mr. Kosygin and President Johnson, a summit meeting on the Yalta pattern, is that the bipolar world is going to be transformed into one world.

The assumption behind the concept of the Geneva conference is that the

power to solve the problems of South-East Asia has passed out of the hand of Russia and America.

The assumption behind the concept of a summit meeting is that the power to solve the problems of South-East Asia lies in the hands of Russia and America.

England and France are the champions of the cause of the Geneva conference because they want to drive out the USA and the USSR from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands, with the object of facilitating the establishment of Sino-Pan Islamic hegemony over the Heartland and the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands.

India should neither enter into any political settlement with China and Pakistan, nor manufacture atom bombs, nor seek any joint guarantee from Russia and America. No useful purpose will be served if India becomes a nuclear power either of an inferior or of an equal stature to that of China. Assuming for the sake of argument that India is capable of becoming a nuclear power of the stature of China, the establishment of a dictatorship in India and of a military alliance between India on the one side and Russia and America on the other, are the two conditions which must be fulfilled before India can become a nuclear power of the stature of China. Russia and China have become nuclear powers not with the consent of the electorate. Russia and America will have to join hands with China to prevent India and the other countries of Asia and Africa from becoming nuclear powers.

Russia and America are India's allies as long as there is a danger of the Chinese invasion of India. The invasion of India by China and the emergence of China as a nuclear power have weakened the hands of the pro-Chinese elements both in the Kremlin and in the White House. Their hands will be strengthened if

India decides to manufacture atom bombs.

The common aim of the foreign policies of both Russia and America is to divide China into two spheres of influence, Russian and American. The condition precedent to the dismemberment of China is that India should never become a nuclear power.

Russia and America are not going to state publicly that they will throw nuclear weapons over China if China attacks India by conventional weapons. It is the fear of the thermonuclear attack on China by America with the consent or connivance of Russia that prevents China from attacking India by conventional weapons. Russia and America will throw thermonuclear weapons over China if China attacks India, however friendly Russia and America may be towards China, and however hostile India may be towards Russia and America.

A joint guarantee by Russia and America connotes that India will never resort to force to recover back Aksaichin, Hunza, Chitral, Gilgit, Nagar, Baltistan, Puniyal and the so-called Azad Kashmir. A joint guarantee by Russia and America connotes the neutralisation and demilitarisation of India.

All the problems of international politics are the problems of the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands. No international problem has ever arisen or will ever arise in the New World because American hegemony prevails over the whole region. The vacuum created in Europe as a result of the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian and the Ottoman Empires and the Houses of the Romanovs and Hohenzollerns has been filled by the division of Europe into two spheres of influence, Russian and American.

The German problem is not a problem which, if not solved, will lead to the outbreak of a world war.

The establishment of the thermonuclear stalemate, the emergence of China as a nuclear power and the dissolution of the Ottoman, the British and the French Empires in the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands have created a power vacuum of unfathomable depths.

The solution of the problems of Western Asia and Africa are dependent upon a solution of the problems of South-east Asia.

If Pakistan is an ally of America, a political settlement between India and Pakistan may lead to the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact.

If America withdraws from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands, Europe, Western Asia, Africa and the off-shore Asian States will be integrated into one political unit on the basis of Russian hegemony; South-east Asia will be integrated with China; India, North America and South America will be divided into two spheres of influence, Chinese and Russian.

India will become a satellite State of America if the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact does not lead to the withdrawal of America from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands.

If Pakistan is an ally of China, a political settlement between India and Pakistan may lead to the withdrawal of both Russia and America from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands.

If both Russia and America withdraw from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands, Europe from Gt. Britain to the Ural Mountains will be integrated into one political unit. India and the Heartland will be divided into two spheres of influence, Chinese and Pan-Islamic. The New World in general and the United States of America in particular will be divided into two spheres of influence, Chinese and Western European. South-East Asia will be integrated

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

with China. Africa and Western Asia will be integrated into one political unit on the basis of Pan-Islamic hegemony.

If Pakistan is an ally of Russia, a political settlement between India and Pakistan may lead to the establishment of a Sino-American entente.

If Russia withdraws from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands: Europe, the Heartland, Western Asia, Africa and the off-shore Asian States will be integrated into one political unit on the basis of American hegemony; India will be divided into two spheres of influence, American and Chinese; South-East Asia will be integrated with China.

If disarmament is the next step in political evolution, the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands will be divided into two spheres of influence, Russian and American.

The division of the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands into two spheres of influence, Russian and American, connotes the transformation of the bipolar world into one world, the establishment of Russo-American hegemony over the United Nations Organisation, the transformation of the United Nations Organisation into a world government, and the achievement of the goal of world disarmament.

If a war breaks out either between India and China or between China and America, the capitalist class in India will be liquidated, and China will be divided into two spheres of influence, Russian and American.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): May God bless you.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Russian hegemony will be established over Africa, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Tibet, Sinkiang, Mongolia, Manchuria and North China; and American hegemony will be established over South China and the continental and peninsular

regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean if the Russo-American entente is established.

The alternative to the division of China into two spheres of influence, Russian and American, is the division of India into two spheres of influence either Chinese and Pan-Islamic or Chinese and Russian or Chinese and American.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I propose to confine my remarks to what I consider to be the critical danger posed to India by the developments in South East Asia. I feel today that the imperative, the immediate need for India, if we can do it, is to have a bold, decisive policy, unequivocal, which alone will be able to guarantee the security not only of this sub-continent but of South East Asia.

Today, Sir, I do not know whether it gives any comfort to our communist friends, but today China has projected an image of the giant of Asia, determined, ruthless, utterly unprincipled. And it is a giant that has an obvious strategy for substituting a colonialism more brutal, more conscienceless than anything that Asia or South East Asia has ever known.

Fortunately for India we have the geo-political position; fortunately for India we have the size and the manpower; and I believe also that we have the resources. If only we could supplement it with the will and a decisive policy, I believe India could stand in the way of this strategy of Chinese neo-imperialism to overrun human freedoms, human decencies, in Asia and ultimately in this country.

I do not want to criticise the Shastri Government, because I feel it must be given every chance of finding its feet. But I feel that today there is a complete paralysis of policy, at any rate in the international field. Quite frankly I do not believe it is the

Shastri Government—I believe that this paralysis is a legacy to a large extent the Nehru era.

I was one of the critics of the late Prime Minister, not because of the word "non-alignment"—at sometime it might have been applicable between two clearcut, antagonistic power blocks—but because we had raised it, non-alignment, we had elevated it to a religious principle, we had made it into a mantram, almost into a religion. And that was my quarrel with the interpretation, or the misinterpretations, of non-alignment. Because, I felt—I forget who it was who said it—that in international affairs for any country, and at any rate for a country of the size and importance of India, there are no permanent principles, there are only permanent interests. And we lost sight of that, because we elevated non-alignment to a religious slogan. And we are, in the final analysis, an impractical people. We tend to substitute slogans for solutions and we tend to invest them with some kind of spirituality, and then we completely end with it. That is what we did.

I do not understand the furore about what the late Prime Minister is alleged to have done in November, 1962. The Press has had it that on the 19th November, 1962, the late Prime Minister applied for massive American aid. I just do not understand why we should be obsessed by what he did. Obviously he did it. I agree that in terms of the misinterpretations or the perversions of non-alignment, that we would never accept military aid, that we would never allow foreign military personnel in this country, it meant a complete resiling from that position. But that is my quarrel, that we treat non-alignment like some virginal proposition, that if we ask for the necessary aid and if it is not only military aid but aid by way of personnel it means some kind of violation of that virginalism. And that is what we seem to do today. Yes, the misinterpretations of the Nehru era were cast into the nearest dust-bin, I agree with you, when we

asked for massive American aid. And I would like the Government to say this—why is the Government afraid of telling the country; is there any reason for being afraid, is there any reason for being ashamed—tell us whether Jawaharlal Nehru asked the Americans for massive military aid, aid by way of planes, at least fourteen squadrons, I am told, massive military aid backed with all the power that America could give us in terms of munitions and men.

Now, after the danger receded we have gone back—and that was my quarrel—to all the shams, the hypocrisies, the ambivalence, to our misinterpretations of non-alignment. We have done it, and we seek to continue to do it.

And my quarrel with non-alignment is this—of course, my friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee wants it to remain a mantram with us—Because I object to the use of the word "non". We are mesmerised by this dominant negative complex. Non-alignment has become a symbol for negativism, for inhibition, for a demoralising paralysis—call it anything you like. And that is my quarrel. It was my quarrel with the late Prime Minister, that we have become so obsessed with this negative aspect of non-alignment, with the mesmeric power of the word "non", that we are non-aligned to our own interests! Call it anything you like, I don't mind, but let us at least be aligned to our own interests. Let us call it an aligned, a pro-Indian, policy, if it will, as I say, make us do something which is not aligned to China.

Today the country is merely paying the price for the misinterpretations of non-alignment in the Nehru era.

What did we do? Didn't we acquiesce in the rape of Tibet? That was a misinterpretation and perversion of non-alignment. It did not happen in the Shastri era. What price have we paid? Only part of the price was the humiliation in NEFA. We

[Shri Frank Anthony]

still continue to pay the price in massive defence burdens. It is a price we will have to continue paying increasingly, it is a price that we must pay. My friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee regards as some kind of fallacy, this question of inner and outer frontiers. Thank God, better late than never, India today realises that Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim are the inner frontiers of India's security because the communists tell us that these three countries are three of the five fingers of the Chinese hand. I agree with Mr. Masani here—I do not always agree with him—that our outer frontiers—that is where we do not seem to have this realisation borne on us—lie here. Have we realised today where our outer frontiers are? I agree with him here, that they lie in South Viet-Nam, Laos, Thailand and Malaysia. Are these not the outer frontiers of India's security? Of course. These countries of South-east Asia have been correctly characterised as the soft-under-belly of South-east Asia. I would go further and say that they are the soft under-belly of the Indian sub-continent. Let them be taken over, as my hon. friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee impliedly suggests by China and the Chinese communists' satellites. Let them take over this whole area and China and Chinese satellites will be able to strangle India not only militarily but economically by subversion and infiltration strangle India as and when and how she pleases. Perhaps that is why the Indian communists would like to see this process whereby we are left at the mercy of China and her satellites to strangle us. Why I object to this slogan and mantram of non-alignment is because it has inhibited us to stand by supporting people against our own interests. My hon. friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee's indignation, it seemed to me, was simulated and he did it with typical communist casuistry. He is a great personal friend of mine and I do not think I have got anything against him. He did it cleverly; he said:

look at this gas used against Asians; the conscience of Asia must be outraged. We have played to the communist gallery. That is precisely what they have done because a few members impelled more by emotion than by knowledge or by vision on this side began shouting a little and then my friend, the Minister, got stampeded into expressing his distress and shock at the use of gas. Did not we use gas? Did we not use tear gas?

Shri Swaran Singh: I am not likely to be stampeded by them or by yourself.

Shri Frank Anthony: Unfortunately, my friend was stampeded because it was an utterly misconceived statement to have said that we were distressed and shocked by gas which has been used over and over again for riot-control purposes. Have we not used it? My friends talk about conventional weapons. Are not conventional weapons, napalm bombs and lazy dogs much more frightful and mutilating than any kind of riot-control gases. Didn't we use the napalm bomb against the Naga hostiles? These are all horrifying concomitants of war.

Shri Joachim Alva: When was napalm bomb used against the Nagas?

Shri Frank Anthony: I am open to correction.

Shri Joachim Alva: It is an utter lie.

Shri Frank Anthony: If we had not used it, it is all right... (*Interruptions*). This is the trouble. This is the trouble of simulated indignation. The Napalm bomb is an accepted conventional bomb used everywhere without protest; it had been used before.....

Shri Joachim Alva: It had been used by the French in Indo-China and at that time we protested against it... (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Why should the hon. Member be interrupted in this manner?... (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Frank Anthony: What has happened to our conscience, aroused at the instance of—who? —the most barbarous, most conscienceless people in the world and their Viet Cong stooges, who were using every form of barbarism... (*Interruptions.*) Must I put up with this sort of thing?

Shri Kapur Singh: If they make interruptions like this, it will be recoiling and retaliate on him.

Shri Frank Anthony: What has happened, Sir, to the conscience of India that it is rather sensitive in the wrong places and at the wrong times, to matters that affect us intimately! Recently, no less a body than the International commission of jurists put out a report underlying—where are my sensitive communist friends?—the calculated genocide of the Tibetan people in Tibet. Have we heard an expression of shock or distress from the Indian Government? Calculated genocide, forced marriage of nuns to Chinese soldiers, forced mass marriages of Tibetan girls to Chinese soldiers, forced deportations of young Tibetans to China, destruction of their monasteries and all their tremendous historical monuments, calculated extinction of the Tibetan people as an ethnic entity. What has happened to our sensitive conscience? Is it not to our interest to keep the Tibetan freedom movement alive? I was glad to know the other day that the Tibetan freedom movement; underground movement; underground movement is growing, that the Khampas are fighting. If we had any manliness in us, would we not give them not only moral support but other support also? Would we not support the Khampas? Because, I believe that there will be a final reckoning with China, with all the ahimsa that we preach, with

all the philosophising that we indulge in and with all the offering of the other cheek, there will be a final reckoning with China. It will not be only with us. In that final reckoning, I believe that the Tibetan people will walk again in freedom, away not from gas, but away from the barbarisms and sadistic horrors of Chinese communism.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): History will repeat itself. The Dalai Lama is here, in India.

Shri Frank Anthony: Where is our conscience? It reacts wrongly at the wrong time. Where was our conscience when we knew that the Viet Cong, armed and officered by the North Viet-Nameese people, instigated by the Chinese, had invaded South Viet-Nam, were committing every form of atrocity and barbarism? Where was our conscience when the Pathet Lao, armed and officered by the North Viet-Nam Government, instigated and helped by the Chinese, committed similar atrocities and barbarism in Laos? Where was our conscience? What I do not understand is this. Of course Mr. Hiren Mukerjee does not like it.

What are these people doing? They are fighting our frontline battles for us, the South Viet-Nameese, assisted by the Americans, as they were prepared to assist us when China attacked us. The least we can do is to give moral support, lip support even which we do not do... (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Joachim Alva: We gave moral support and President Diem was disposed of. You have to answer that question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Frank Anthony: I do not think the House takes these rather raucous and unthinking interruptions of my learned friend very seriously, neither do I... (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Running commentary cannot go on like this.

Shri Joachim Alva: They have disturbed the Prime Minister, both the past and the present; fifty times (Interruptions.)

Shri Frank Anthony: India must be against the escalation of this brush-fire wars into a world conflagration. But surely we realise even at this late date; that China is committed to brush-fire local wars, and surely the least we can do is to applaud, if we can do nothing else, the fact that for the first time China has been told in South Vietnam, none of this subversion, none of this infiltration, none of this aggression, and we will teach you the lesson of retaliation in the only language you understand, the only language that the Chinese thugs can understand, in the words of the leader of the Chinese thugs—through the barrel of a gun. Our battles are being fought; can't we applaud it? Again and again, we are a talking nation. But at least let us talk a little in applauding the people who are fighting our own battle on the front line. That is what I want to say to the Minister of External Affairs today.

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

Shri Frank Anthony: I will finish in five minutes. My hon. friend asked for a decisive policy. Yes; let us have a policy that is decisive, that is vigorous, that will give heart to our friends around us, that will heart to our own people, that will give them a new measure of self-respect, a fresh morale. What kind of policy? It is not a policy of alignment here or non-alignment there. I believe that we should pursue a policy of friendship with Russia because I believe that Russia also will be increasingly menaced by China's acquisitive eyes on Russian territory. I believe ultimately that it only by India being aligned to her own interests, friendly with the democracies, friendly with Russia, seeking to ensure a *detente* between Russia and the western democracies that we will be able to contain the menace of China.

I believe that there are certain steps that we could take towards this vigorous policy. China has said that she will send in volunteers into South Vietnam. Can't we make a counter offer? Let Indian volunteers go in. Many things immediately will be achieved; immediately we will give the young men of this country a chance of wiping out the humiliation on NEFA. We will give them the opportunity of showing—which we will show over and over again—that given the proper arms we are more than a match for the Chinese bandit. We will give our young people the chance of being trained, probably at no expense to ourselves, in the ground and in the air.

On Nepal, I would suggest this. Our relations with Nepal must be strengthened. As a result of this multipronged offensive against India, China is dumping increasingly cheap goods into Nepal. She is projecting the image that she has a prosperous efficient economy. Let us not only have counter-economic measures; let us raise some battalions. We have already got a 1st-class Gurkha battalion—technically Indian Gurkhas but many of them have their residence in Nepal. Why can't raise five to ten battalions of Nepalese Gurkhas which will strengthen our relations and help to strengthen the economy of Nepal? If China assails Nepal, which may be sooner than we expect, you will have these Nepalese Gurkhas ready to fight for the freedom of their homeland.

I only wanted to add this: that we have to integrate with this overall policy certain economic policies. I feel that here, fortunately, there has been welcome change of Government in Ceylon. There was a rapid infiltration of Chinese influence, economic and otherwise, in Ceylon. Overnight, the Chinese achieved an overwhelming position in the textile field. We can strengthen our relations with Ceylon. We must strengthen our relations with Malaysia. I feel, as Shri Masani has

said, we can make a gesture; we do not want to send troops, but let us at least send ambulance and hospital units. I know that Malaysia would welcome Indian capital and Indian goods.

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit (Phulpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I had not intended to intervene in the debate this afternoon but the speech of the able hon. Member who has just preceded me made me ask for permission to say a word to set the records straight, as it were, on non-alignment.

No policies are sacrosance. Policies obviously are in the interests, first, of oneself, and then possibly in the larger interests as well. But all too often people in this House are inclined to forget the origins of our policy of non-alignment, and the dividends that have accrued to us from that policy. If we are losing out to-day it is because we tend to depart from this policy.

Shri Frank Anthony quoted somewhat incorrectly, the famous British statesman who spoke about only permanent interests but no permanent principles.

An hon. Member: Lord Palmerston.

Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit: Yes; it was Lord Palmerston. But the point is this: we have from the very beginning been a little different from other countries. Our whole foreign policy was moulded by a man who did not accept old conventions; who believed in the impossible and who made the impossible possible, as is demonstrated by the fact that we are a free nation in a free Parliament and are discussing this question here today.

Now, from the very beginning of our freedom struggle the emphasis was not on Indian freedom alone but Indian freedom as a means of freeing all countries then under the foreign yoke. Again and again, our leaders reiterated that we would stand by and assist in every way possible all those people who are still suffering under colonial

domination, and that is why we were able to project the image that we did in those earlier days.

Then came freedom and we declared that we would not be associated with any military blocs. That was the beginning of non-alignment. Later it got further wider implications. There is no time for me to go into the whole process. But the point is that, then and now, our Government has repeated that our policies, though obviously intended for our own betterment to begin with, are policies that are also in the interest of the wider good. Time and again, our Government has suffered because it has clung to a policy which it believed to be useful to a larger group of nations than India alone. This is the reason why in the United Nations we rallied the Asian and African countries around us, and this is the very reason why suddenly the African countries are not so close because they are beginning to doubt where we stand. I think there is no need for them to doubt us. I am sure the Government and the people of India have made it clear, barring a few dissentient voices, where we stand, but nevertheless, the reason why we are losing the trust of those whom we should have with us, is because they are suspecting our stand on this very policy of non-alignment.

I have heard Members on every side of this House admit that we should have closer relationship with the African nations as well as, obviously, with our own Asian neighbours. But the fact remains that the nations of Africa are not all prepared to follow us at this moment. They have some doubts in their minds and partially these doubts are aroused by people like my hon. friend who spoke before me, reiterating from the floor of the House that we do not believe in non-alignment. We are pledged to this policy not only for our own selfish ends, although speaking in diplomatic terms that would be justified but we are doing it because the world at the moment admits the correctness of such a policy and when I say that

[Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi Pandit]

dividends have come to us, I do not mean the help that came to us at the time of the Chinese aggression. That help has unfortunately been misquoted and misinterpreted. The assistance that came to India had nothing to do with non-alignment. That assistance came by virtue of India's geopolitical position on the map, and would have come to India no matter what her policy has been, because, at that moment, it was not India that was threatened. It was a whole concept that was threatened. It was a whole pattern of life that was threatened. It was a whole ideology that was threatened. It was the democratic design in the whole of Asia that was threatened. Therefore, it is no use getting emotional everytime the word non-alignment is mentioned, somebody getting up and attacking it, calling it a Nehru policy, or a Shastri policy and so on. It is the well-considered policy of a group of men who happen to be ruling this country, supported by a very large number of people, who put them in their seats.

15 hrs.

I would like to say that the day this policy is abandoned we shall find it very difficult to put something in its place. Therefore, it is important to look at non-alignment in the face. Let us not get frightened by the word. If some changes have to be made, let us make those changes for goodness' sake. But for a country of India's size and potential greatness—I make no apology for saying this; we have potential greatness and we shall achieve this one of these days, if we are given the time and backing—it is important for us to see what other parts of the world to whom we are more closely allied, than to America and Russia, think about . us. With all this talk of Russia and America bandied about in this House, one sometimes finds oneself almost living in a world where there are only these two countries

and India is sand-wiched between them. But this is not so. There are a great many countries on whose friendship we do rely. We must cultivate them more than we have done for inspite of our failings and weakness and we must build a pattern that which attracts, but which always fits in with wider good. So long as this is kept in mind, I have felt that we shall achieve, if not all of our objectives—it may not be possible—but at least some of them.

Therefore, I would suggest to at least hon. members on our side of the House, that these things we kept in mind, always remembering that it is upto India to give a lead on the various matters that will assure importance in the years to come. We should not only talk in terms of moral strength or material strength or friendship with this one or that one. We have to cultivate certain things in this country. Today our morale may be down; it is possible that we may be still smarting over certain tragic things that have happened, but if you turn the pages of history, are we the only nation to be attacked? Are we the only nation whom a friend has stabbed in the back? These things have happened in history. People rise above them, forget them, go ahead and achieve their own destiny linked with the destiny of all those who have the welfare of the human race at heart.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella): Sir, I was a little surprised to listen to my hon. friend, Mr. Anthony.

Shri Frank Anthony: You agreed with me in the lobby!

Shri Ravindra Varma: My hon. friend thinks that I agree with him. He is one of those who understands the English language very well, since it is his mother tongue. I do not know what I have said either on the floor of this House or outside has given him the impression that I agree with him in his impugning the basis of our

foreign policy,—non-alignment. A few years ago if Mr. Anthony had spoken as he did today and as he always has done—he would agree with me—one could have understood it, because the policy of non-alignment had not been put to the test. But when it has been proved beyond a shadow of doubt that the policy of non-alignment is a policy which we have deliberately adopted to pursue the enlightened self-interest of our nation, that this policy does not in any way preclude our asking for or receiving assistance to save the sovereignty of our nation, when it has been proved that the very basis on which people like Mr. Anthony once believed that the world was divided into black, and white no longer exists, when it has been proved that the blocs themselves have been breaking up by a process of fission into many focal centres, I was a little surprised that an eminent and intelligent member of this House like Mr. Anthony wanted to harp on old tunes.

Sir, the objectives of foreign policy are known to the House. The Government has to protect the interests of the country. Self-interest is no crime for a Government. I am one of those who believe that no Government has a right to be ashamed to say in the councils of the world that the objective of its policy is the pursuit of the interest of the nation. It has to protect the interests of its citizens abroad. It has to protect the interests of nationals who claim Indian origin. It has to protect our frontiers. It has to see that the flames of war are as far away from our frontiers as possible. It has to stand for justice. It has to stand for peace and for the easing of tensions and for the strengthening of international organisations that are dedicated to the rights of man and to the promotion of peace. I believe that the policy that this Government has pursued, and is pursuing, is calculated to serve these national interests.

In recent years especially in the last year, there has been a considerable improvement in our relations with our neighbours which no one can gainsay. It is true that our relations with them are not as close as we want them to be, but it is also true that our relations with Nepal, Burma and Ceylon, partly because of our activity and partly because of the activity of the Ceylonese electorate, and with Malaysia have all improved during this year.

If we believe in non-alignment I would like to tell Mr. Anthony, it is not because we believe in it as a fetish or fad. We do not believe in ideological immolation for fetishes or fads; it is because we believe that this policy serves our interest more than any other policy.

Sir, it is easy to say that we believe in non-alignment and in the Five Principles. But I myself have said more than once in this House that the enunciation of these Five Principles by itself is no guarantee of the success of our foreign policy. It is like referring to the Sermon on the Mount and the commandments and saying that society does not need a penal code because it has been commanded, "Thou shalt not steal". Our foreign policy must be based on the acceptance of reality. We must accept the fact that in spite of our best efforts to be good samaritans in the world, we have enemies. A foreign policy which ignores this fact is an unrealistic foreign policy. We have enemies, and they are working in collusion. Ever since India became an independent State, Pakistan has been engaged in a diplomatic war against us. After 1962 and even before 1962, China entered the scene, and after the Chinese aggression on India, the collusion between Pakistan and China became something which no one, who has eyes, can deny. These enemies of ours happen to be our neighbours. Not only is it strange that these enemies of ours happen to be our neighbours, but when we look at the fact that

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

these powers which are ranged against us—I have named two; I do not want to name the third which forms part of the triangle—when we look at the fact that these powers come from the under-developed world, the irony of the situation becomes even stranger. They come from the under-developed world. Some of them come from among the countries which make a mockery of alignment by their ideological debauchery. Some of them profess non-alignment while practising the most blatant type of alignment. Some of these countries are keen on setting up rival focal centres and would even like to work for the creation of a rival United Nations. These are countries that profess faith in democracy and practise the rankest form of totalitarianism. Our diplomacy has therefore to be primarily aimed at disabusing the minds of the non-aligned and the under-developed. These enemies of ours, since they happen to come from the non-aligned and under-developed countries, have the advantage of being able to work against us amongst the non-aligned and under-developed.

Pakistan, it is true, is spear-heading a diplomatic offensive against India in the West. China is spear-heading a diplomatic offensive against India among the under-developed. And I must say with great regret that an erstwhile friend of ours, Indonesia, is spear-heading a diplomatic offensive against us among the non-aligned. Their objective is to isolate India to strengthen the forces aligned against us, to sow seeds of suspicion about India in the non-aligned world, to weaken sympathy for India, to make the sympathetic silent, to creep towards our frontiers and aid the forces of disruption and subversion within our country. The primary object of our diplomacy, therefore, should be to combat these efforts of China. Pakistan and Indonesia, especially in the under-developed and non-aligned world.

How shall we do this? The hon. Member who spoke before me referred to the need to take unequivocal positions on matters that affect the under-developed world—questions of economic progress, economic justice, colonialism, discrimination and human rights. International conferences constitute a forum which is utilized by all the powers of the world to present their points of view before the world and to muster support for themselves. I am not sure that, as far as international conferences are concerned, we have every time come away with the success that we would have liked our delegations to achieve.

When we think in terms of participation in an international conference, whether it be a conference of non-aligned nations or a conference of under-developed countries, we have to examine the objectives, the agenda, and the nature of the parties who are likely to be invited. We have to be careful about the choice of our delegations. And we have to get rid of this idea that whether another country supports us or not, we are bound to support everything that any so-called friend of ours demands from us. It is not a shame in international affairs to believe that a *quid pro quo* is called for, as far as support is concerned. Instances are not wanting which would convince every discriminating student of politics that we have not only put all our cards on the table but we have, even before negotiations have started or discussions have concluded, declared that we were willing to accept every demand of every other nation, even though that nation professes friendliness and prefers to be silent on issues of vital importance to us.

We have had to come away from conferences with the comforting thought, the consolation, that we have managed to see that the communique of the conference is silent on the problems that are of paramount im-

portance to this nation. We have had to take comfort in the thought that nothing extolling or eulogising our enemies has been incorporated in the communique. We cannot walk out of conferences for fear of being called peevish or childish. We are a great nation and, therefore, we believe we cannot act as some other nations do. We cannot withhold assent to paragraphs that do not directly concern us but are included to satisfy the insistent demands of the vociferous, the boisterous and the bumptious, firstly because we want to maintain the reputation that we judge issues on merits and, secondly, because we cannot give the impression that a nation which believes in principles, like India, can indulge in horse trading and make its support to others conditional on their support to matters which affect our interests, even our vital interests.

Sir, I must also refer to the question of diplomatic representation because one of the ways to fight this offensive of China, Pakistan and Indonesia in the under-developed countries of the world is to strengthen our diplomatic representation, especially in Africa and Latin America and all parts of Asia. And Sir, what is the position here? Year after year, I have stood up in this House during the debate on this Ministry and pointed out to the paucity of our representation in Africa and Latin America.

We must understand that there are priorities as far as areas are concerned, that emphasis has to be laid on the quality and calibre of our representation in some areas. We are working in an emergency, we believe; it is not a normal situation but an abnormal situation in which we are called upon to combat the diplomatic offensive of these countries in a short time. But look, at the pattern of our diplomatic representation today. It is oriented more towards the West and the East and the countries that belong to the blocs rather than to the non-aligned.

Sir, I wish to place before this House some facts about Chinese diplomatic representation in Africa, for comparison. It may interest the House to know that of the 46 countries in which China has diplomatic representation, 12 are in Communist countries, 11 in Asia and the Middle East, 8 in Western Europe and 15 in Africa—more than in any other region of the world. Look, again, at the calibre of the representatives sent to these countries. In Communist countries the average years of diplomatic service that a Chinese Ambassador possesses is 7 years; in Asia and Middle East it is 9 years; in Western Europe it is 10 years, and in Africa it is 12 years. Now, it is very clear from this that China has fully realized the importance of manning the Embassies in Africa with people with experience, people with vision, people with the dynamism necessary to cope with the situation in the developing countries.

What Sir, is the position, as far as our country is concerned? We know that China has been concentrating its attention on building up its influence in Algeria in the north, in Congo (Brazzaville) in the west, Tanzania in the south and Burundi in the north east. But, what is our position? In some of these countries we have no representatives at all. The number of our resident diplomatic missions in Africa is practically the same as it was in 1962. When we say that diplomatic representation is not enough and we do not have representatives in those countries, a rabbit is produced out of the hat and we are told—that by means of concurrent accreditation we have established diplomatic representation in many more countries. There are ambassadors of our country who are concurrently accredited to five different countries in Africa. We are given the impression that we have increased the strength of our representation in Africa, while in actual fact it is only an increase in concurrent accreditation, and this is hardly fair either to the House or to the interests of the

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

country. What is the position in Latin America? We still have the same number which we had three years ago. Again, according to the Government, concurrent accreditation is the answer. As my time is up, I shall not deal with this point in detail.

I must say a few words about the choice of our Ambassadors and para-diplomatic activities. I have been saying in this House every time the Demands for Grants of this Ministry has come up that if we look at the way efficient diplomatic work is carried on by other countries, the way their diplomacy functions, we will understand that we have to strengthen and supplement the efforts of our governmental diplomatic staff with the work of non-governmental organisations. Thousands of delegations visit China every year from Latin America and Africa. What do we do? Do we invite or send out representatives of workers' organisations, women's organisations and many other organisations which mould public opinion? I would like the External Affairs Minister to answer this question of mine.

15.19 hrs.

[MR. THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

I would also like to refer to the choice of Ambassadors'. We have very many efficient men in our foreign service, no doubt. But nobody thinks that everybody is efficient, I suppose. In the areas which are vital to our country, often times it happens that we do not have able representatives. We have representatives who suffer from coronary thrombosis or psychological paralysis. People seem to think that an Ambassadorship is a landing place for a mechanical escalator, that once you join the Service you should automatically reach the landing place of ambassadorship. Sometimes it seems as though ambassadorship is considered a consolation or good conduct prize meant for the superannuated or the supernumeraries or a warrant of

exile for the politically ineffective or inconvenient; at least, there is some political ability in those men who are inconvenient. But not to choose the best people who can operate in these areas, which are the most vulnerable and crucial areas for us, is something which cannot be pardoned in the name of paucity of finance.

Sir, I will conclude by saying that our policy is such, our requirements are such and the pressures on us are such that nothing but a dynamic policy which is based on a positive well-planned diplomatic offensive can serve the interests of our nation abroad..

Shri D. N. Singh (Muzaffarpur):
Mr. Chairman, it is for the first time that we are discussing the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs in the absence of our beloved leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, who, to quote Gurudev Tagore, "was greater than his deeds and truer than his surroundings". India's diplomatic edifice is largely his creation and for a country like ours it has accomplished much and we are proud of it. It accomplished much because in formulating his policy he took into account our past traditions and the needs of the world and the ageless striving of mankind for truth, justice and peace.

It had become imperative after the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan that the restraint of violence by mutual tolerance had become one of the necessary conditions for the mere survival of mankind and it was because India under Panditji's able leadership gave expression to this truth truly and fearlessly that she acted as a focus for conciliation in the world forum.

Here, I would like to quote a few lines from a book, *India, Pakistan and the Rise of China*, published in America after the death of Panditji:

"A world seemingly at war listened to the words of India and wanted to believe them. Madame Pandit's discourse on the 'Bridges to peace' were a welcome balm in the days of Korean War, multi-megaton weapons and the frightful psychosis of Washington and Moscow. . . From the Forum on the East River in New York India's delegates built from weakness and became accepted spokesmen of the weak nations who gained great strength as the cold war passed from encirclement to deadlock and finally to competitive co-existence."

I know that we are living in a fast changing world and the remedies of yesterday cannot be applied to the maladies of today. For a foreign policy to be effective, it has got to be adjusted to meet the requirements of the changing circumstances. And what I would like to suggest is that the policy of peace and non-alignment does not stand in the way of flexibility of approach to problems for there is no scope for rigidity and dogmatism in this. Therefore it has got to be dynamic and forward-looking.

I do not say whether it is right or wrong, but of late there has grown an impression in this country as well as outside that our foreign policy has started becoming a bit timid and lacks its former dynamism. I hope, Government will take note of it. For example, I think, in the *Indian Express*, the other day K. Bhaskar Rao reported from New York:—

"Thus we are now a nation with neither a vision nor a goal and as Selig S. Harrison comments on the January issue of 'Foreign Affairs', India is tottering along with no clear destination yet in mind".

15.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then again, to quote from the *Times of India* of March 29:—

"For all those who believe in a vigorous and enterprising non-

alignment policy nothing could be sadder than the recent comment by the London Times in which it was noted that India is no longer playing the part of an 'Asian leader' whose words have any weight in the Western world. . . . Neither the death of Mr. Nehru nor the border dispute with China is an acceptable explanation for this collapse of policy. There appears to be an undefined feeling that India cannot afford the luxury of a foreign policy."

I do not blame the Minister entirely for this. It may be because of the failure of our external publicity and the way in which our missions function abroad. It is their duty to interpret and to explain our policy and the stand that we take on various issues; but somehow or other it seems that our missions abroad do not take their work very seriously and they just do not care to interpret and explain our policy. There was a comment, a few days ago by James Cowley in London Notebook regarding India House and this is what he says:—

"Ridiculous as the suggestion may seem, I have begun to suspect that a hoodoo hovers over India House in Aldwych. How else to account for some of the inexplicable things that happen from time to time under its roof. The place has a gift not much short of genius for attracting the wrong sort of publicity."

This is indeed not a very happy state of affairs and I beg of our Foreign Minister that he should try to put these things right.

Having said that I would like to say a few words regarding China and Pakistan. The recent posture of China in South East Asia is a regional encirclement of India and friendship for the erstwhile American, SEATO and 'CENTO' ally, Pakistan. The recent visit of President Ayub to China has got very great sinister

[Shri D. N. Singh]

significance for us. In the words of a Pakistani journalist, Mr. S. M. Ali:—

"He had not gone to China with cap in hand nor as a messenger for the Third power. Already assured of Peking's support on Kashmir and that China would come to the assistance of Pakistan if her security were threatened especially on her eastern frontiers, he had nothing new to ask for from his hosts."

Then again, Mr. Zulferi writes in the *Pakistan Times*:—

"Our policy now calls for closer relations with China, a newer approach towards Russia, and friendly confrontation with the United States."

It is no secret that China and Pakistan have proven themselves immune to Russian and American strictures and theology and they can go to any length for the furtherance of their expansionist design. It is high time that we took stock of these things. I plead that now that the gesture of our present Prime Minister, who in his first broadcast to the Nation on the 11th June, stated—and rightly stated—

"We must reverse the tide of unfortunate relations between India and Pakistan"

and praised President Ayub Khan's wisdom and understanding, has not been reciprocated, we have got to take a fresh look and have also got to tell those friends of ours, who are never tired of saying that we should arrive at some sort of settlement with Pakistan, that aggression is aggression whether it is committed by a Communist country or by a non-Communist country and that we cannot purchase peace by appeasement.

Now, a word about the forthcoming visit of our Prime Minister abroad. I hope his visit will succeed in projecting the real image of India abroad

and we will try to retrieve some of our recently lost ground. Here, I would also like to point out that it should be the duty of our Missions abroad of those countries which he is visiting to see to it that his visit is well-planned and I hope he will get the courtesy that is due to the Prime Minister of a great country like India. I am quite sure that if we follow the policy of peace and non-alignment which our leader pursued and which has paid good dividend to India, we will tide over the present crisis and the present difficulty which to a large extent, I suppose, is a crisis and a difficulty of adjustment and nothing else.

With these words, Sir, I have done. Thanks.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शारदा (बिजनौर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के निधन से जहाँ हमारे देश की राष्ट्रीय शक्ति हुई है, वहाँ अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में भी भारत की बहुत बड़ी हानि हुई है। भले ही उनके विदेश मंत्री होते हुए हम मध्यम प्रश्नों के समाधान में अपेक्षित सफलता प्राप्त नहीं कर सके, लेकिन इस सत्य को छाँचों से छोटान नहीं किया जा सकता कि उनके निधन से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में एक प्रभावशाली व्यक्तित्व से विहीन हो गया है।

नये विदेश मंत्री सौभाग्य से मधुर-भाषी भी हैं और परिश्रमी भी हैं, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से न तो उनका कोई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यक्तित्व है, न विश्व की समस्याओं का गहरा अध्ययन है और न दूर तक जाकर निर्णय लेने की प्रतिभा। इस दृष्टि से इन उलझी हुई परिस्थितियों में भारत को जिस प्रकार के विदेश मंत्री की अपेक्षा थी, दुर्भाग्य से आज वह उस प्रकार के सन्नी से रहित है।

विदेश मंत्री बनने के बाद सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने तीन देशों की यात्रायें कीं—उन्होंने

बर्मा की यात्रा की, नेपाल की यात्रा की और अभी वह तटस्थ राष्ट्रों के सम्मेलन में काहिरा गए। जहां तक उन की बर्मा यात्रा के परिणाम का सम्बन्ध है, एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में स्वयं ही उन्होंने कह कि मेरे बर्मा से लौटने के बाद बर्मा से भारतीयों के निष्कसन में कोई कमी आ गई हो, ऐसी बात नहीं दिखाई देती है। उनकी नेपाल-यात्रा के परिणामस्वरूप नेपाल से भी हमारे सम्बन्धों में पहले की अपेक्षा कोई अनिष्टता बड़ी हो, ऐसी स्थिति भी दिखाई नहीं देती है। जहां तक काहिरा में हुए तटस्थ राष्ट्रों के सम्मेलन का सम्बन्ध है, जिसके बारे में विदेश मन्त्रालय ने अपने इस वार्षिक प्रतिवेदन में कई पृष्ठ रंगे हैं, उसमें भारत की जितनी दुर्दशा हुई और भारतीय प्रतिनिधियों का जितना अपमान हुआ, मेरा अनुमान है कि इससे पहले विदेशों में हमारे जितने भी शिष्ट मण्डल गए भारत को शायद उनमें किसी में भी इतना नीचा नहीं देखना पड़ा। उस सम्मेलन में हमने चीन को एक शिष्ट मण्डल भेजने का सुझाव दिया, लेकिन हमारे इस सुझाव का कितना उपहास उस सम्मेलन में किया गया। हम उस सम्मेलन के समय कोलम्बो-प्रस्तावों के देशों की एक बंठक बुलाना चाहते थे, लेकिन हमारे शत्रु राष्ट्रों की गति-विधियों के परिणामस्वरूप हम इस दिशा में भी सफल न हो सके। इसी लिए मैं नहीं कह सकता कि कौनसी भारी सफलता इस प्रकार की है, जिसके लिये आज नौ विदेश मन्त्री को बर्खास्त या घन्यवाद दिया जाये।

जहां तक श्रीलंका के साथ हुए समझौते का सम्बन्ध है, उसके बारे में मैं एक बात याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। 1953 में जब लन्दन में कामनवेल्थ कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी, तो जो अब श्रीलंका के नये प्रधान मन्त्री बने हैं—श्री डडले सेनानाथके, उन्होंने हमारे उस समय के प्रधान मन्त्री और विदेश मन्त्री, श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू, के सामने एक प्रस्ताव रखा था कि और नहीं तो कम से कम आप पचास हजार भारतीयों को श्रीलंका से वापस लीजिए। लेकिन श्री

नेहरू ने बड़ी दृढ़ता के साथ कहा था कि पचास हजार तो बहुत होते हैं, पांच भारतीयों को भी वापस लेने का कोई प्रश्न उपस्थित नहीं होता लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से अब हमारे नये प्रधान मन्त्री और विदेश मन्त्री ने श्रीमती श्रीमामो भंडारनायके के साथ जो समझौता किया, उसमें उन्होंने सवा पांच लाख भारतीयों को वापस लेने की बात मान ली और डेढ़ लाख भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में यह कहा गया कि उनके भाग्य का निर्णय बाद में किया जायेगा।

मैं विदेश मन्त्री से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि श्रीलंका में जो भारतीय हाई कमिश्नर बैठे थे, वहां पर जो हमारे राजनीतिक प्रतिनिधि थे, क्या उन्होंने विदेश मन्त्री के कानों तक यह बात नहीं पहुंचाई कि श्रीमती भंडारनायके की गवर्नमेंट का भविष्य बहुत लम्बा नहीं है। इस स्थिति में जो समझौता इतने दिनों से नहीं हुआ था और जिसके बारे में पहले प्रधान मन्त्री और विदेश मन्त्री 1953 में दृढ़ता के साथ श्रीलंका के प्रधान मन्त्री को निषेध कर चुके थे, उस समझौते को करने में इतनी तत्परता दिखाने की क्या आवश्यकत थी? फिर जब श्रीमती भंडारनायके की सरकार का पतन हो गया, और उनका भविष्य निश्चित रूप से अंधकार में चला गया, तो भारत सरकार के अधिकारियों को वहां भेज कर सवा पांच लाख भारतीयों को वापस बुलाने से सम्बन्ध समझौते को कार्यान्वित करने की दिशा में अगर कुछ और रुक लिया जाता तो भारत का क्या नुकसान होने वाला था?

आज यों ही दक्षिण भारत को और बहुत सी समस्याओं के बारे में हम से शिकायत है कि उत्तर भारत के लोग कई गम्भीर प्रश्नों के समाधान में हमारे साथ पक्षपात करते हैं अब अगर ये सवा पांच लाख भारतीय वापस लिये, तो एक और शिकायत का मौका उनको मिल जायेगा और त्यागीजी के लिए एक और नई समस्या खड़ी हो जायेगी। उन लोगों को पनर्वास दण्डकारण्य में किया जायेगा या उन को राजस्थान में बसाया जायेगा?

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

कहाँ ले जाकर उनकी भ्रवास समस्या का समाधान लिया जाएगा ?

आज भारत का करदाता नये विदेश मंत्री से एक प्रश्न यह करना चाहता है कि जब बजानते थे कि श्रीमती भंडारनायके की सरकार का भविष्य कोई बहुत अच्छा नहीं है, तो चुनाव के समय तक की जो भ्रवधि थी, उसमें वह थोड़ा चुप क्यों नहीं रहे ? उस भ्रवधि में स्थिति यह रही कि वहाँ पर सरकारी भ्रधिकारी भेजे जा रहे हैं, शिष्ट मंडल जाते रहे, सांस्कृतिक शिष्ट मंडल भेजे जाते रहे हैं, उन सब का लाभ श्रीमती भंडारनायके ने अपने चुनाव में दल के हित के लिए उठाया। अगर उस समय थोड़ा चुप रह कर नये चुनाव को देख लिया जाता, तो इस में सरकार को क्या हानि होने वाली थी ?

श्री सेनानायके ने श्रीलंका का प्रधान मंत्री बनते ही भारत के पक्ष का समर्थन किया और चीन के आक्रमण की निन्दा की। पहले तो भारत सरकार ने इतनी तत्परता दिखाई थी, लेकिन अब उस ने उसी तत्परता के साथ श्री सेनानायके के साथ मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ा कर उन की सहानुभूति क्यों नहीं प्राप्त की ? हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय का दुर्भाग्य यह रहा है कि जिन छोटे छोटे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध और अधिक मित्रतापूर्ण एवं अनिष्ट होने चाहिए थे, पीछे भी यों तो हम अपने उच्चाभिमान में आकर उन की उपेक्षा करते रहे पर चोट खाने के बाद भी अब भी उन की उपेक्षा कर रहे हैं। कहां नेपाल की यह स्थिति थी कि वह महाराज त्रिभुवन के समय में भारत के साथ भारतीयता बढ़ाने के लिए आतुर था, यह विदेश मंत्रालय की पुरानी फ़ाइलों में उन के आए हुए पत्रों से स्पष्ट प्रतीत हो जायगा। फिर हमने उस की उपेक्षा की, जिस के कारण वह हम से हट कर अब दूसरे देशों की ओर देखने लगा। आज उसी का परिणाम यह है कि 46 करोड़ के राष्ट्र को नेपाल के साथ अपनी

मित्रता बढ़ाने के लिए इतना नीचे गिरना पड़ा है कि भारतीय राज-दूतावास में नेपाल नरेय के लड़के का जन्म-दिन मनाया गया और उसमें प्रधान मंत्रों का संदेश पढ़ कर सुनाया गया। क्यों 46 करोड़ के इस विशाल राष्ट्र को इस स्थिति तक उतरने की आवश्यकता हुई है ?

बर्मा और श्रीलंका के सम्बन्ध भी लगभग यही स्थिति है और इस से भी आगे चल कर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि फ़िजी और मारिशस जैसे देश जिन देशों में भारतीय अधिक मात्रा में है, उन के साथ भी विदेश मंत्रालय की उपेक्षापूर्ण नीति चल रही है। छोटे से छोटे देश का प्रधान मंत्री जब यहां आता है तो लालकिले में उस का नागरिक अभिनंदन किया जाता है। मैं श्री स्वर्ण सिंह से बड़ी स्पष्ट भाषा में यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पीछे मारिशस के प्रधान मंत्री, श्री राम गुलाम, ने जो कि एक महीना भारत में रह कर गए, क्या अपराध किया था कि वह लालकिले में नागरिक अभिनंदन प्राप्त नहीं कर सके। क्या उन का अपराध यही था कि उन के पूर्वज भारतीय थे और वह एक ऐसे देश के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, जहां भारतीयों की संख्या अधिक है।

इन छोटी छोटी बातों का परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि हमारे जिन पड़ोसी देशों को भारत के साथ भारतीयता है और जो इस सरकार के दुर्व्यवहार के बाद भी भारत की और सहयोग का हाथ बढ़ाये रखना चाहते हैं, सरकार की इस उपेक्षापूर्ण नीति से उन देशों के नागरिकों में भारत के प्रति एक प्रतिकूल स्थिति उत्पन्न होती चली जा रही है और वह उस का सामना नहीं कर पा रही है।

यही स्थिति प्रवासी भारतीयों के सम्बन्ध में है। स्वतंत्र होने से पहले हम प्रवासी भारतीयों की स्थिति पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक ध्यान देते थे लेकिन स्वतंत्र होने के बाद

हमारे मन्त्रिपरिषद् में ये समस्याएं तो हैं कि रूस के साथ हमारी क्या नीति रहनी चाहिये, अमरांका के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध कैसे रहने चाहिये मैं इस बात को नहीं कहता कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में बड़े राष्ट्रों के साथ अपने सम्बन्धों की उपेक्षा की जाये लेकिन पिछले सत्रह वर्षों में प्रवासी भारतीयों के हितों की तरफ जितना ध्यान भारत सरकार को देना चाहिए था, उतना ध्यान उसने नहीं दिया।

जहां तक राजदूतों की नियुक्ति का सम्बन्ध है, मुझे यह कटु सत्य कहने के लिए क्षमा किया जाये कि इस समय विदेशों में हमारे राजदूतावासों में आई०सी०एस० और आई०ए०एस० आफिसर अधिक भरे हुए हैं। मैं उन आफिसरों की देशभक्ति पर सन्देह नहीं करता लेकिन मैं यह बात अवश्य कहता हूँ कि हमारे देश के आई०सी०एस० और आई०ए०एस० आफिसरों का मानसिक पृष्ठभूमि उस प्रकार की नहीं है, जैसी कि इस देश में सार्वजनिक कार्य करने वाले व्यक्तियों की है। इसी का परिणाम यह है कि अभी तक हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय पर नीकरशाही बुरी तरह से छाई हुई है और विदेश मंत्री भी उसके पंजे से नहीं निकल पाए हैं। हम रोम में स्थित अपने राजदूत का स्थान-परिवर्तन रंगून में करते हैं, तो वह यह लिख कर भेजता है कि इजिप्ट के नक्शे में रंगून वहां है, इस बात का भी मुझ पता नहीं है। उसका क्या अधिकार है कि वह इस प्रकार के शब्दों को कहे और इस प्रकार भारत सरकार के निर्णयों की उपेक्षा करे? इमें इस प्रकार की बातों पर गहराई से विचार करना चाहिए।

15.40 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

विदेशों में जो हमारे भारतीय राजदूत हैं, उनको विदेश भेजने से पहले हम को देश में कुछ इस प्रकार प्रशिक्षण देना चाहिये जहां से वे प्रशिक्षण प्राप्त करके दूसरे देशों में जा कर न केवल हमारे

राजनयिक सम्बन्धों की रक्षा कर सकें बल्कि उन देशों के भारत के साथ सांस्कृतिक आदान प्रदान का पृष्ठभूमि को भी बढ़ा सकें। इस का अब तक बराबर उपेक्षा होती चली आई है।

आखिरी बात मैं शेख अब्दुल्ला के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। जैसा मैं ने आज प्रश्नोत्तर काल के बाद भी इस सदन में कहा था, यह एक ऐसी बड़ी भूल है कि इस एक भूल पर ही विदेश मंत्री को त्याग पत्र दे देना चाहिये। शेख अब्दुल्ला को बाहर जाने की आज्ञा देने के बारे में जब कल पूछा गया कि पासपोर्ट अधिकारियों ने आपके पास शेख के पासपोर्ट के आवेदन पत्र को वापस कर दिया था तो विदेश मंत्री ने उत्तर में कहा था, नहीं। लेकिन दूसरे सदन में श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन ने यह कहा कि पासपोर्ट अधिकारियों ने हमारे पास उस आवेदन पत्र को वापस भेजा था और ऊंचे स्तर पर पासपोर्ट देने का निर्णय किया गया। एक ही मंत्रालय के दो मंत्रियों के परस्पर विरोधी वक्तव्य, राज्य सभा में कुछ और लोक सभा में कुछ और, और वे भी कल और परसों में, उसका स्पष्ट अभिप्राय है कि शेख अब्दुल्ला को बाहर भेज कर भारत सरकार ने अपनी स्थिति को और उलझा लिया है। जब भारत सरकार इस बात को बहुत अच्छा तरह से जानती थी कि शेख के जेल से बाहर आने के बाद उनकी गतिविधियां भारत विरोधी रहें हैं, जब भारत सरकार जानती थी कि शेख तब से अब तक बराबर ही भारत की नातियों के सम्बन्ध में और भारत के पहले प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के व्यक्तित्व के सम्बन्ध में विरोधी वक्तव्य देते रहे हैं, जिनका उनको संरक्षण प्राप्त था, तो विदेश जाने की अनुमति देना कहां की बखिमत्ता थी? मैं चाहता हूँ भारत सरकार को एक उच्च स्तरीय कमिशन बिठाना चाहिये जिसमें हाई कोर्ट या सुप्रीम कोर्ट के स्तर का कोई जज अध्यक्ष हो और वह कमिशन

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

इस बात का निर्णय करे कि जेल से छोड़ने का निर्णय किन व्यक्तियों ने किया था जब उस पर एक गम्भीर अपराध में मुकदमा चल रहा था। जब उस केस के परिणाम पर नहीं पहुंचा गया था तो उससे पहले किसने इनको छोड़ने का निर्णय किया ?

दूसरे यह कि शेख अब्दुल्ला को काश्मीरी मुस्लिम लिखने के बाद भी पासपोर्ट कैसे जारी किया गया ? श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन ने यह कहा था कि उच्च स्तर पर यह पासपोर्ट जारी किया गया है। तो फिर उच्च स्तर पर जो इसके बारे में निर्णय लिया गया है क्या उन पर कोई दबाव कहीं से पड़ रहा था जिस दबाव के कारण यह भ्रष्टाचार दी गई ?

तीसरे यह कि एक भारतीय हज यात्रा के बहाने गया है और यह कह कर गया है कि मेरा लड़का जो लन्दन में पढ़ रहा है, उससे मिलने के लिए मैं जा रहा हूँ। तब सारे दुनिया के लिए उसको पासपोर्ट देने की, उन सारे देशों के नाम देने की जो कि उस में लिखे गये हैं, क्या आवश्यकता थी ? जब आप जानते थे कि वह व्यक्ति यहां पर भारत विरोधी प्रचार कर रहा है तो दुनिया भर के लिये पासपोर्ट देने की क्या आवश्यकता थी ?

चौथे यह कि जब वह वहां पर गया है तो जिस तरह से चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों मिल कर के शेख के व्यक्तित्व का लाभ उठा रहे हैं और अपने पक्ष को और अपनी नीतियों को दुनिया में उसके माध्यम से फैलाना चाहते हैं, आज विदेश मंत्रालय को क्या दिक्कत है कि उन के पासपोर्ट को वह कैंसल नहीं करता है और इस प्रकार के अपराधी को भारत क्यों नहीं वापस बुलाता ? क्यों नहीं जहां प्लेविसिट फंड के दूसरे व्यक्ति बन्द किये गये हैं, वहां शेख अब्दुल्ला को भी बन्द किया जाता है ? विदेश मंत्री

की यह जहां सब से बड़ी असफलता है और उस पर जहां उनकी अपनी जगह पर बने नहीं रहना चाहिये, उस स्थान पर बने रहने के योग्य ही वह नहीं हैं, वह भारत सरकार को इसी एक प्रश्न पर एक उच्च स्तरीय कमिशन की नियुक्ति तुरन्त करनी चाहिये जो इन सारी चीजों की जांच करे ताकि भारत के भविष्य को जो एक व्यक्ति के माध्यम से बिगाड़ने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है, उससे इस देश की रक्षा की जा सके।

Shri Swaran Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and have projected various viewpoints about the international situation and have also referred to several issues of an international and global character. A great deal of mention has been made of several problems with which we are more intimately concerned; the problems of our own defence, our own security, relations with our neighbours, etc. have been referred to by hon. Members. I would venture, in the course of my reply, to confine myself to some of the salient points, because it will not be possible within a short time to reply to the large number of points, important no doubt, but of a somewhat local character or involving matters of detail.

I was somewhat disappointed when in the course of the debate the major stress was confined to some of the issues with which we were immediately concerned; they are important, no doubt, and we have to take note of them, and clarify our ideas and reiterate our position. But at the same time, there are some bigger issues to which it has been customary in this House, on the part of very many hon. Members from various sections of the House, to pay special attention. On this occasion, however we have been very much obsessed and gripped by certain immediate points, and some of the other important issues have not received the at-

tention that they deserve. These are, I think, important considerations which should always be before us when a country of the size and importance of India debates in the highest forum, its national Parliament, the international situation.

What are the basic things before the world? What are the basic issues that the world faces today? The most important issue, to my mind, which the world is faced with, ever since the second World War ended, is the issue of war and peace.

The other most important issue is the one relating to colonialism and racialism. Then, there is this important question of economic disparities between the richer countries or the advanced countries and the poorer countries. Which is the forum where all these important issues are being discussed? and what is the State of affairs prevailing in that forum? All these matters have been receiving a great deal of consideration and a great deal of thought in the forum of the United Nations in which our delegations have always played a prominent role.

It was as a result of the great and valiant efforts made by India to end colonialism and the fight that India put up against racialism in all forms and in all shapes, that a greater part of Africa, or a major part of Africa today is free. Some vestiges of colonialism and racialism still subsist, and it will be good for us to remind ourselves that we owe a great duty to the oppressed people in countries still under colonial domination, under the Portuguese domination in Angola and Mozambique, and in South Africa where racialism of the worst is still prevailing. We have to reiterate our determination to end this and to raise our voice very strongly and in a determined manner in support of ending these last vestiges of colonialism and racialism.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Barabanki): What about caste-ism in our own country?

Shri Swaran Singh: If there is caste-ism in our country let us end it. We feel that we have ended it. Our Constitution is such that there is no scope for caste-ism, and this House itself is having the honour of having these distinguished persons belonging to various castes, various communities and various ways of social life and religious beliefs. I think that it is on account of our determined effort in our own country to end caste-ism in all its forms, that our voice in this respect has a special force and a special strength, and we should always use it in favour of ending racialism in all its forms. These are matters which require reiteration so that we might pledge our determination in this respect.

On the question of economic disparities in the world, some mention has been made by some hon. Members about the work that has been done by the Conference on Trade and Development which held long sessions in Geneva. The Indian delegation played a dominant role in that, and the report that has been produced is a very good report, and it can be a charter for further development efforts, particularly in the underdeveloped world. India's efforts are continuing to give content to the various recommendations that have emerged as a result of the deliberations of the Geneva Conference on Trade and Development. These are issues which should always be before us, and we should pay continuous attention to the solution of these problems.

Quite naturally, our attention was greatly concentrated on, and directed to, the situation in South East Asia. In this respect, the situation in Vietnam—South Vietnam and North Vietnam, the situation in Laos to a certain extent, the situation in Malaysia in the unfortunate confrontation

[Shri Swaran Singh]

that exists today between Malaysia and Indonesia—these are the matters that have been referred to. On these issues, it was quite interesting for me to note that there were certain extreme points of view presented and projected by two or three Opposition sections; and the distinguished leaders representing those Groups when they made their speeches, criticised government action from one angle and also from an opposite angle, the objective being criticism, but everyone thinking that Government is being hustled into taking a particular position, according to Shri Frank Anthony, because of communist pressure, and, according to Shri Hiren Mukerjee, on account of the criticism by Swtantra and by Shri Frank Anthony. I think there is some consolation for me in this. This criticism from the two extremes does create a sense of satisfaction in me that the policy I am pursuing is perhaps a correct policy, a policy which is also in the interest of peace in this region.

Shri Solanki (Kaira): Do we have a policy?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Why not?

Shri Swaran Singh: It requires some careful study and also some thought to follow the policy. It is not an over-simplification of the type suggested by the respected leader of the Group to which the hon. Member belongs, that it should be a straightforward policy of tying ourselves to various defence pacts.

Shri Solanki: Right or wrong?

Shri Sawran Singh: Right or wrong.

The point for determination and the important consideration that should be before us is the ultimate objective we have before us in relation to Vietnam—and then there are the other positions that we take of making strong statements in support of one thing or in condemnation of another, as was strongly urged by the

two extremes that I have mentioned. What is our objective, what should be the objective in this area? If we are clear as to what should be the objective, the rest of the thing will be comparatively easy.

I want to make it clear that our objective in this area is to prevent this Vietnamese situation from deteriorating. It is our considered opinion that if these activities that, unfortunately, today are there in North Vietnam and South Vietnam continue in the same fashion and in the same manner, if these pains unfortunately continue and prevail there for some time, then there are very grave risks of the situation escalating, and this escalation may result in a major conflagration which ultimately might hurl the world into a major conflict where even atomic weapons might be used. Let us be clear in our minds: our objective in a situation like this should be to create conditions where peace might be restored, where there should be an effort at a satisfactory solution on political considerations; any attempt to find a solution by military means is something which is both impractical and unwise. It is quite interesting to note that notwithstanding the supporters who have been quite vociferous in presenting their viewpoint, either the one or the other, there is this all-round appreciation among the main contesting parties in the Vietnamese situation that a military solution of this vexed problem of Vietnam is not possible, and in the long run a solution by peaceful means is the only objective and is the only practical thing possible.

Now, if we are clear that the situation in Vietnam demands that escalation of conflict should be avoided, then obviously efforts have to be directed to creating a situation, an atmosphere, creating the necessary background where negotiations might

start. In this respect, we have consistently followed this policy which I would like to enunciate for the benefit of the hon. friend, if he has not cared to follow it. It is that a military solution of the Vietnamese problem is not possible. Secondly, there must be a Geneva-type conference where by negotiations a peaceful solution of the vexed Vietnamese problem should be attempted.

श्री किशन पट्टनायक (सम्बलपुर) :
बियट नाम में कम्युनिस्ट चीन को कमजोर
बनाना हमारा आम्बे.केटर है या नहीं ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I was saying that the objective is to restore peace and to start negotiations. There can be a difference of opinion. There are many hon. Members in this House who talk of escalation. Escalation can never be planned escalation, and once the forces of escalation are let loose, then it might engulf the whole of the globe into flames of real conflict where it will be difficult to find out as to who is the conqueror and who is the vanquished.

Shri M. E. Masani (Rajkot): Question.

Shri Swaran Singh: We sometimes are taking these difficult and intricate questions and situations as simple ones and are trying to simplify solutions for these.

We have taken this clear decision. Then we have to see as to whether the steps that we have taken are taking us in that direction or not. It is quite correct that if the analysis of some of the friends, whose leadership I would concede to Shri Masani, the hon. Member opposite, is that conflict is the only answer, then there is a basic difference of approach. Therefore, the remedies cannot be identical. I would concede that this is the basic difference. Our objective there is to restore peace and to attempt a political solution.

Shri M. E. Masani: That is what Chamberlain had tried.

Shri Kishen Pattanayak: Is it the objective to weaken China in South East Asia?

16 hrs.

Shri Swaran Singh: If this is the objective, have we worked for it? We have done so from a very early stage. When we saw the risk of escalation, we made a very clear statement on 8th February, where the Government of India's position in this respect was fully clarified. Later on, our Prime Minister addressed several heads of Governments and heads of States, pointing out to them that the situation in Vietnam was such that there was risk of escalation of conflict, and therefore we should do something to restore conditions in which talks might start, negotiations might start. Again, on the initiative taken by our Prime Minister, there has been discussion at Belgrade, and as a result of that it is expected that a joint statement subscribed to by important non-aligned countries is likely to be issued, calling upon the parties concerned to start negotiations, so that a satisfactory solution might be attempted.

It will be wrong for anybody to suggest that there is no policy on Vietnam. I concede that the policy is not liked by some hon. Members for one reason, and is not liked by others for a totally different reason, but sometimes in their anxiety to criticise the Government, even extremes can meet and from their own points of view try to project a picture as if there is lack of clarity in our approach.

Shri M. E. Masani: Your policy is Chamberlain's policy—peace at any price.

Shri Swaran Singh: Our policy is this, and it is our intention to pursue this policy, of peace and conciliation, not only in Vietnam, but in all parts

[Shri Swaran Singh]

of the world, because we are wedded to pursuing a policy of peace, of conciliation, of easing tensions, rather than adopting a pseudo-militant role and saying brave words and not doing anything concrete. This is the policy that we intend to pursue.

I do not see any strength in the criticism that has been made either by Shri Masani or Shri Anthony or Shri Mukerjee in this respect. Most of their criticisms cancel each other, and in the balance the policy that we are pursuing of bringing about conditions in which negotiations might start is the only constructive role that is good for South-east Asia, for the peace of South-east Asia, and also in the long run, even in our own interests. I have no doubt in my mind on that score.

When we are faced with this difficult situation in relation to China and in relation to Pakistan, it is quite interesting to find that the two extremes whom I will not name—it is quite obvious whom I mean—in formulating their attitudes, take note of only one of the two basic difficulties that we face today in our relations. One is our conflict with China which committed the massive aggression against India in 1962, and the other is our troubles with Pakistan. It was suggested by Shri Masani that the best course would be to enter into some sort of collective security arrangement with the Western Powers, and that that would be the end of all our difficulties.

Shri M. R. Masani: With our own neighbours and the Western Powers.

Shri Swaran Singh: All right, with our own neighbours and with the Western Powers. I will not comment upon it, but will leave it to the House and the country to judge whether there is any likelihood of an early satisfactory solution of our differences with Pakistan. We have done our best. We carried on talks about Jammu and Kashmir. Our Prime

Minister broke his journey at Karachi on his way back from Cairo and had talks with President Ayub, and we have always expressed our willingness to settle all our differences with Pakistan by peaceful means, by means of negotiations. But you can see the bellicose attitude that is adopted by Pakistani leaders. I do not know how much contact Shri Masani has with the Pakistani leaders, or whether he is in the know of the working of the mind of the Pakistani leaders, but does the way they have been hobnobbing with China to spite and to hurt India, leave any doubt in Shri Masani's mind as to whether there is any basis for fruitful talks with Pakistan?

Shri M. R. Masani: I suggested Japan and Malaysia, not Pakistan?

Shri Swaran Singh: He intervened when I mentioned Pakistan. Now when he finds the position not comfortable, he wants to run away from that.

Shri M. R. Masani: I was suggesting a regional pact against the Jakarta-Peking-Karachi Axis, and for that I want another grouping of Asian powers.

Shri Swaran Singh: Let us take a realistic view. Does entering into some sort of military pact, which is vaguely in the mind of Shri Masani, help us in the situation in which we find ourselves today in relation to these two countries, Pakistan and China? The answer is obvious.

Pakistan, as was pointed out by my colleague here, is already a member of SEATO. And what is SEATO? Originally it was conceived as the main rallying ground, as the so-called bulwark or offensive or defensive against China but at the very first sight of China getting into conflict with India by their wanton and unprovoked attack of India, SEATO melted, and Pakistan, on account of

her hostility towards India, throwing to the winds whatever may be the obligations or the philosophy behind SEATO, started hobnobbing with China.

Shri Hem Barua: SEATO has not melted.

Shri Swaran Singh: This is the situation, and in such circumstances it will be extremely unrealistic and not in the national interests to think in terms of military pacts. We want to clarify our position on this without any doubt, because these types of doubts harm us, as Shrimati Pandit rightly pointed out, in our relationship with many friendly countries, particularly in the Afro-Asian world.

Here is this whole continent of Africa. The countries in Africa, the new, independent, resurgent, vigorous countries, all of them are non-aligned. And in Asia, unfortunately, there are countries which are aligned in military pacts with one or the other of the major blocks. That is the situation which we have inherited in the post-war, post-colonial era. There are serious efforts going on even amongst the members of these so-called defence pact countries to wriggle out of these pacts on one excuse or the other. The whole concept of the defence pact is really on the wane, on the run. This type of concept can be compared to a sinking ship, and Shri Masani and his friends ask us to jump into this sinking ship. I think it is nothing but a counsel of despair. This country has certain traditions, certain inherent strength, with all these vast patriotic people, hardworking people, who value their freedom, who value their independence.

Shri Solanki: Except the Government.

Shri Swaran Singh: who will never fail to shed their blood for the defence of the country. For such a fine country and such a fine people to be misled into a belief or feeling

that they cannot defend themselves and therefore they must enter into some sort of security arrangement, will be compromising our sovereignty. We are determined not to compromise our sovereignty. That does not mean that we should not strengthen our defences or that we should hesitate to get help from all friendly countries. The pursuit of our policy of non-alignment our pursuit of policies for maintaining peace in the world, for working for restoration of peaceful conditions where there are strains, for reducing tensions has not only helped the world, helped the bigger cause as my respected colleague Mrs. Pandit said, but it has also helped us in our own national interest. That is apart from high principles.

High principles are something which we should always value and it would not be a good day for India if we were casually to throw aside the good and high principles and lofty principles and if we feel overwhelmed by the intricacies of our immediate problems, and if we throw over the principle to the winds, it will not be good for the world or for us either. But I would say that even from the purely national interests, our own self-interest, this is the only policy that we should pursue. It is our intention to continue to pursue this policy.

The other attack from my friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee is that we are not very forthright in this. We had perhaps not used strong language. We must remember that in South Viet-Nam we occupy a special position which we have inherited by virtue of our chairmanship of the International Control Commission. It is our duty to see that the Geneva Agreement is enforced and that the Geneva Agreement is not contravened. Mr. Masani says that we should have sided with Canada on one of the last reports, whereas there have been many occasions when we have been criticised that we should have

[Shri Swaran Singh]

joined Poland and not Canada when making our recommendations. Our effort has generally been to examine the issues that come up before the International Control Commission in a dispassionate manner and objectively and to report to the two Co-Chairmen, namely, United Kingdom and the USSR. Therefore, to a certain extent, uneasy peace was maintained in this part of the world for several years. We ourselves are very unhappy that the Geneva Agreement has not been honoured and there had been lapses from both sides. We have never hesitated to point this out generally, in a vast number of cases, by unanimous reports and sometimes in majority reports where sometimes the Polish representative had been with us and on other occasions the Canadian representative had been with us. When we occupy the position of the chairmanship of the International Control Commission which is functioning in such difficult circumstances, it will be too much for me to say or for any Government to say that they will side with one or the other member of the commission. We take an objective view and take the responsibility of taking that view. And that is the way we have functioned. It was through the efforts of that Commission that for several years or for about ten years practically, the situation did not deteriorate. There were complaints. There were lapses; there were contraventions of the agreement but by and large this thing remained on a low key. But the Laos situation that has developed of late is really fraught with serious danger and we should continue to exercise our efforts for restoration of peace and for starting negotiations.

With regard to Indonesia and Malaysia, there is an unfortunate dispute and the House is no doubt aware that we recognise Malaysia and we have got the most friendly relations with Malaysia. The Deputy Prime Minis-

ter of Malaysia Tun Abdur Razack was here and he had very useful talks with the Prime Minister, with me and other members of Government here, and now the Finance Minister is also here, and we are in touch with them and they know fully well our interests and our friendship with them. About this dispute, the Malaysian leaders themselves are anxious that the confrontation should end and that there should be conciliation rather than confrontation and that some peaceful methods should be found for settling this dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia. The Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahaman had done a great deal for working towards the creation of the circumstances in which some talks may start. That is the objective of both and some friendly countries have actually made efforts in that direction. At one time there was that proposal of three representatives, one representing each of the three countries, namely, Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines and a fourth Asian or African country which could be agreed upon by all these three countries so that they might work out a satisfactory solution of this vexed problem. We are hoping and it is our earnest desire that this confrontation should change into conciliation and we have worked for that. We have made it clear that we are not anxious to jump into this dispute and we are not anxious to assume the role of mediation but if there is anything that we could do and both sides want us, we will not be found wanting. That is the direction in which we must move. That is our policy in this area.

Whether it is war or peace, or colonialism or racialism or economic disparities, the United Nations had played a very significant role, and I am sorry that for sometime past, the United Nations itself is facing very grave danger. The last session of the UN General Assembly remained completely paralysed. There was this

dispute about financing of peace-keeping operations and about the contributions to be made by the various countries, and the bigger issue as to which should be the organ for the control of peace-keeping operations. All these issues have arisen before the United Nations and the UN General Assembly last time was unable to transact any business. I am glad that by the efforts of all countries, particularly, the Afro-Asian group, a committee of 33 had been constituted and they are going into this whole question of peace-keeping operations and the control and financing of these operations and other relevant issues involved. India is a member of that committee and they are now working in New York to find a satisfactory solution both with regard to the financial implications and also the future scope of peace-keeping operations. The entire world, particularly the smaller countries and under-developed countries are anxiously awaiting the result of this because the bigger countries may not be very fond of the UN and probably they could exist even without the UN. But let us not forget that there are a large number of small countries for whom UN is a very valuable forum; they could assert their sovereignty and project their individual personality and thus contribute for the world getting together. It is a very desirable development in the world and anything that weakens the UN is a matter which should cause concern to this Parliament and to this country.

Let us hope that the efforts of this committee would yield some concrete results and the paralysis from which the United Nations has been unfortunately suffering will end, and the United Nations will be resorted to its vigour and strength so that the nations of the world might play their useful role for the achievement of the objectives, which is the only hope if the world is to survive a catastrophe or conflagration and engulfment in war and destruction.

It was in this respect a matter of great disappointment for us when a friendly country, Indonesia, decided to quit the United Nations. We feel that there was little justification; merely because Malaysia was elected to the Security Council, there was no justification, there was little justification, for Indonesia to quit the United Nations. Then there was the talk of a rival United Nations body. There was some mention of that move being made, but I am glad that on this issue the efforts which were made by certain countries were not at all favoured by the large Afro-Asian nations and they had to abandon that idea of establishing an organisation, rival to the United Nations, and at the moment, it is hoped that the United Nations will be able to come back to its former usefulness and active role.

There was one other thing mentioned by hon. Members. It was said that India should play a more decisive role, a more dynamic role, in the Afro-Asian world. These are very good expressions, very catchy words, which can be easily reproduced and easily said, but we have to examine whether they have any content in them or whether they are just phrases. We claim that in the non-aligned nations' conference in Cairo, India did play a significant role. The dominant note there was that of peaceful coexistence, stress on non-alignment, conciliation rather than conflict. These were the dominant notes of the deliberations and the outcome at the Cairo conference. This matter was discussed in great detail on the last occasion. I have no intention to go into it again in detail, but the outcome of the non-aligned conference really was something very useful, because it again brought into prominence and to the forefront the concept of non-alignment, of conciliation, and of peaceful coexistence, things which are of supreme importance for the world and for us. It will be wrong to belittle the outcome of the conference of the non-

[Shri Swaran Singh]
aligned countries that took place at
Cairo.

I was rather sorry that Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, who generally makes constructive contributions today disproved that, and he was somewhat annoyed for some reason, and he tried to turn a blind eye to the relations that fortunately exist today between us and our neighbours. I would appeal not only to him but to all sections of the House that we should be very cautious and we should not use expressions which spoil our relations with our neighbouring countries.

In that respect, take, for instance, Afghanistan, our neighbour. Unfortunately, we are not making much headway with Pakistan, but take Afghanistan which lies on the other side. Their Prime Minister was here recently. There was complete identity of views on all issues, and from the communique that was issued at the end of the talks—Shri Prakash Vir Shastri might read it again if he has not read it already—he will be convinced that there was complete identity of views on all the issues.

Then the Foreign Minister of Nepal was here, and he had discussions with us on all matters of a bilateral character and also on matters of international nature I would ask my hon. friend to read the communique that was issued at the end of the visit of the Foreign Minister of Nepal. Our relations with Nepal today are extremely friendly and very close and it is our intention to strengthen them still further. I would appeal to hon. Members that they should contribute for the strengthening of these relations and not throw doubts which unnecessarily would create doubts in the minds of the people in this country and others. This is no service to the country or for the relationship which appears to be truly cordial even to the critics. We are strengthening our economic and political relations and all those

relations with Nepal, I think, are very fine and very friendly.

Take Burma, Gen. Ne Win, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers was here. He toured our country. He had several talks with our Prime Minister and also there were other discussions with him. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : जब आप यह कह रहे हैं, तब चीनी विदेश मंत्री इस समय काठमांडू में हैं

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not give way. Our relations with Burma are good. I claim they could be much bettered. We are doing everything possible to strengthen them still further. But they are definitely towards improvement, and it will be wrong to belittle this turn for the better and it will be absolutely not in our own interest to talk lightly about these things. Let us agree not to make this as a debating point. But we should have some perspective and view them in that background rather than just try to build any argument to criticise the Government.

Take Ceylon. We had friendly relations with Mrs. Bandaranaike's government. We have, I hope, the most friendly relations with the new government. It will please the House if I were to inform the hon. Members. . . . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Only one hon. Member can speak at one time. Let us hear the hon. Minister. He is not yielding.

Shri Swaran Singh: On this issue, I want to be absolutely clear. I would like the hon. House also to bear with me if I were to say that in countries where the democratic set-up is func-

tioning and Ceylon is one—and we are very proud that our neighbour is having a democratic, parliamentary form of government of the same type which we are following—there can be results in the elections where one party comes into power or the other party comes into power, and we have to deal with a country which is following a democratic set-up. It will be absolutely wrong for us not to like a government which is democratically elected and to prefer another government which might again be democratically elected. We have had good relations, fine relations, with the Ceylon Government when Mrs. Bandaranaike was the Prime Minister. We will continue to have good relations and try to strengthen the relations with the new government also.

It will be a happy thought for this hon. House to know that India, after several years, has ceased to be an issue in the Ceylon elections, which is a right thing, because we are not interested in boosting one party or the other. Let us not have the attitude that we prefer one or the other group. We scrupulously avoided taking any interest in the elections which went on there in the normal course and India was not a matter of issue.

Then, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri said—I do not know wherefrom he took it—that our High Commissioner or our High Commission must have known that the government was going to lose the elections and that we need not have entered into an agreement with the former government and should have waited for the new government. I am very sorry. We are sometimes accused of indecision. When we take a decision, it is said; “No, you should have remained undecided and should not have dealt with a government that was established by law and the constitution and should have waited for the off-chance of a particular government losing”. This is a very funny way

of dealing with countries. I think this lighthearted manner in which sometimes we are prone to take our neighbours is a temptation which we should strongly resist, and I would urge the hon. Members to do so. In this particular case, Mrs. Bandaranaike made a public statement...

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : घापका सम-
झीता उनके इलेकशन मॅनिफॅस्टो के मन्दर
प्रयोग हुआ है ।

Shri Swaran Singh: Whatever he may say against me personally, I will not permit our relations with Ceylon to be spoiled. In effecting this agreement about the future of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon, Mrs. Bandaranaike herself was in touch with Mr. Dudley Senanayake, who is the present Prime Minister and who was at that time the leader of the opposition. In the course of the talks, she made it clear that this was an agreement with which even the leader of the opposition was in agreement. I do not know what is the basis for the statement of Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri that at some time in London, there was some talk that India might take 50,000 and we did not try to take even one man. That statement is not borne out by facts. I have not been able to see the source of his information; that is quite incorrect.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : 1953 में
जो प्रधान मंत्रियों की कामनवैल्य कान्फॅस
हुई थी , उसके रिकार्ड को घाप देखें तो
पता चल जाएगा ।

Shri Swaran Singh: In fact, our revered leader, Nehruji, was always anxious that we should settle this matter by some method and this should not be made an irritant between India and Ceylon. These are matters which are sought to be raked up quite unnecessarily. I had no intention of going into them, because I had already reported to the House on our efforts at improving the rela-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

tions with our immediate neighbours. Exactly at the time when they are definitely better and more friendly, here comes a statement which tries to criticise them. I think it is very unwise to take that attitude, howsoever one may not agree in this respect.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): At one stage, even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was deady opposed to the idea of Stateless Indians.

Shri Swaran Singh: My hon. friend himself had been dealing with this matter at one stage. I think even before he went to Ceylon, he had been dealing with this matter. All this legacy was left to us by persons of his way of thinking. I am happy that we have been able to solve it and remove one thing which stood in the way.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I was not given an opportunity. Otherwise, there would not have been any occasion for him to say that.

Shri Swaran Singh: Mention was made that we should consolidate our friendship with African countries. I fully agree with that and our relations with African countries are very cordial and good. We are continuing to improve those relations. I also agree that we should also try to have diplomatic missions in as large a number of countries as we can. But finance comes in the way, because it is pretty costly to establish these missions. But our efforts will continue and we will work in that direction.

We are also having closer economic relations and collaborations with many African countries. That is something which is appreciated by the African countries. This is the direction in which we want to work.

Mention has been made of the forthcoming conference at Algiers. It is true that this conference, which is based on geographical rather than

ideological considerations is bound to be more complicated than the conference of non-aligned nations, because there was some basic ideology which governed the thinking of the countries that participated in the latter conference. Therefore, this conference is likely to be more difficult and the issues that are likely to arise are also of such a nature that we will have to take very good care to see that our viewpoint, is properly brought out and also that the outcome of the deliberations of the conference is in the general interests of Afro-Asian solidarity. Notwithstanding the differences that loom large there are many things common. All these countries are underdeveloped. There are the vestiges of colonialism, racialism and economic matters. And the almost universal desire of all of us, with the unfortunate exception of Indonesia, is to strengthen the United Nations. There are many common matters and it is our earnest hope that the deliberations of the Afro-Asian nations in Algiers will be successful. The Algerian leaders themselves have led their country to freedom after a very revolutionary struggle. They have got some very dynamic ideas of Afro-Asian solidarity and friendship. Our voice should always be on the side of progressive countries, trying to work out the future of Africa and Asia on the basis of ending colonialism and strengthening the forces of peace rather than of confrontation.

I am conscious that within this short-time. I have not been able to cover all the points. But there are one or two points I would like to mention. About our relations with Pakistan, I have said something before and I have mentioned to the House the unfortunate state of our relations as they exist today. Even in this, we should always remember that Pakistan is our neighbour and we have common frontiers several thousand miles long and there are close geographical and historical ties. So, notwithstanding the present difficulties of a diverse nature

some irritants and others long range—ultimately this also will have to be tackled by some sort of settlement. I know at the moment, I can be accused of taking a view which is not realistic.

Shri Kapur Singh: You have spoken well on this point. It is time to settle these issues.

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not know whether his leader agrees with him!

We have always said that the steps which India has taken to strengthen our defences or getting military aid from all friendly countries and also strengthening our military and defence potential are to safeguard the integrity and sovereignty of our country against aggression. We cannot neglect this. I do not want to go into details, because this House discussed the Defence Ministry's demands only the other day. It is unfortunate that Pakistan is carrying on an incorrect and false propaganda against us that we are strengthening ourselves and as such we are posing a threat to our neighbours. It is quite interesting that in their anxiety to say anything to harm to India, they raise some imaginary fears in some other neighbours of ours, which is absolutely unfounded. We have got the most friendly relations with our neighbours. There is this unfortunate conflict with China and Pakistan and it is amazing how, when we make our arrangements for strengthening our defences against the Chinese threat, Pakistan should carry on this baseless propaganda against India and should say that by India becoming strong there will be danger to anybody. India's strength means really stability in this part of the world and it is our intention to continue to make India stronger and stronger so that not only can we defend our territories against aggression but also significantly contribute by pursuing these policies both internally and externally towards stability in this region.

Shri M. R. Masani: Sir, with your permission, I would like to say a word of personal explanation in view of the fact that some things I had said have been very grossly distorted by the Foreign Minister. In my speech I had made two remarks which should make the meaning of my proposal for regional security very clear. I had said that it is only if Japan at one end and India at the other hold the front that with the smaller countries in between will be able to stand up against the common menace. While referring to the danger of Viet Nam and Laos falling I had again stated that "then you will have the Chinese Communists and their satellites all the way from Karachi down to Singapore, India would be encircled". I think in the light of that the hon. Foreign Minister in saying what he did was less than fair to himself and to me.

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंगेर) : मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सवालों के लिये तो अब समय नहीं है। श्री मसानी ने मुझे पर्सनल एक्स्प्लेनेशन के लिये लिखा था, उनको इसलिये बुलाया था।

Mr. Speaker: Is there any cut motion to be put separately?

Shri M. R. Masani: I want my cut motion (No. 7) to be put separately?

Dr. M. S. Aney: I want my cut motion No. 8 to be put separately.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): My cut motions, 13 to 18, may also be put separately.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I will put cut motion No. 7 to the vote of the House.

Cut motion No. 7 was put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put out motion No. 8 to the vote of the House.

Cut motion No. 8 was put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now I will put cut motion Nos. 13 to 18 to the vote of the House.

Cut motions Nos. 13 to 18 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I will not put the rest of the cut motions to the vote of the House.

Cut motions Nos. 23 to 34 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 22 to 24 and 119 relating to the 'Ministry of External Affairs'."

The motion was adopted

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

DEMAND NO. 22—TRIBAL AREAS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,48,07,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND NO. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,89,36,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges

which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 24—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,21,16,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 119—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,25,00,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Civil Aviation for which three hours have been allotted. Those who want to move their cut motions may do so within fifteen minutes.

DEMAND NO. 1—MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,88,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Ministry of Civil Aviation'."

DEMAND No. 2—METEOROLOGY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,50,75,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

DEMAND No. 3—AVIATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,66,67,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Aviation'."

DEMAND No. 4—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,74,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Civil Aviation'."

DEMAND No. 113—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,20,07,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation'."

DEMAND No. 114—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, in respect of 'Other Capital outlay of the Ministry of Civil Aviation'."

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: Mr. Speaker, Sir. I welcome the formation of a separate Civil Aviation Ministry from June, 1964. It focusses attention on the need of civil aviation by creating this separate ministry. Civil aviation in India started just before World War II. It really started in or about 1936-37. I had the privilege of participating actively with one of the concerns which were in existence then. They were Tatas Limited, Indian National Airways and Air Service of India. I was connected with Air Service of India as an active director and I had also played a part in the pioneering work of civil aviation that was done in India. I take this opportunity to pay my tribute to those early civil aviation pioneers, like Shri J. R. D. Tata and Shri P. M. Kabalee. I had personal connections with Shri P. M. Kabalee and we had worked together for the development of aviation in India. The house of Tata deserves all appreciation for progress in civil aviation over 32 years ago when they first established the Tata Airlines which was afterwards nationalised.

16.46 hrs.

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

Even today the Air-India is in charge of a very capable person like Shri J. R. D. Tata. It stands to his credit that Air-India International is one of the best in the world. I am glad to say that the Air-India International has made profits and is able to meet the entire cost of the seventh and the eighth Boeing from the internal resources.

I now refer to the Ministry of Civil Aviation's Report wherein the Air-India International is referred to. The

[Shri Narendra Singh Mahida]

Air-India International now operates over a very wide range. It operates in various countries connecting east and west, north and south. Formerly, it was run only between London and Bombay. Now it has international connections and international reputation of the first order. In the year 1963-64 it made an operating profit of Rs. 384.25 lakhs which was even better than the operating profit for 1962-63 of Rs. 345.44 lakhs. The progress thus made by Air-India International has won for us very valuable foreign exchange and for that reason also we should commend the working of the Air-India.

The management of the Air-India International have taken steps to recruit additional pilots from the I.A.C. which is the main source of recruitment of pilots with suitable qualifications and experience and the first batch of 20 pilots was due to commence training in the first week of February, 1965. The Air India Corporation has to its credit very able pilots, ground engineers and other staff and some of them had even worked with me when I was connected with the airlines.

About the Indian Airlines Corporation, page 52 mentions about the working of the Corporation. In the year 1963-64 they ended with a net surplus of Rs. 104.42 lakhs which exceeds all previous results. There were about 66 aircraft on the 30th November, 1964, with the I.A.C. The I.A.C. had difficulties in the beginning when they started it because after nationalisation they had experienced very great difficulties in regard to the commencement of service and they had only Dakotas then. The Dakotas which gave a useful service before the War and during the War are still operating in some of the air services of the I.A.C.

The future of civil aviation is very bright because India is situated in such a way that we have a very clear

weather all the year round except for one or two months on the western coast of India in monsoon. We have entered into a jet age and we shall soon probably enter into a rocket age as well. We are able to see so many jet planes flying about over India. We also see sometimes space rockets going over India. About the future of civil aviation, I have had some thoughts. I still remember my early views in the year 1937 I had made a speech in Bombay where I had said that a day will come when we can have a breakfast in London, a lunch in New York and tea in Japan and come back home for dinner. That future is now a possibility. I dream that after five or seven years we shall see planes making a verticle take-off and landing. VJ-101|X-1 was at an experimental stage and it has now developed into VTOL I hope that after five years or so in India we shall see such planes making a vertical take-off and landing too.

The increased use of helicopters also, I presume, will find a place in our future civil aviation field. A convertable heavy lift helicopter powered by jet engines that will carry more than 100 passengers, 12 to 20 tons of cargo or gigantic crane will be flying within five years. As a military vehicle also, these helicopters will prove very useful for carrying troops, guns, tanks and supplies in virtually all weather conditions and over the most rugged terrain. It will be stable enough to fire aerial artillery.

Then, I refer to the air cargo. An expert committee headed by Shri S. K. Kooka, the Commercial Director of Air India had undertaken a study and that report has been submitted to the Government. It is a very laudable report and Shri S. K. Kooka is a very experienced and seasoned officer. The recommendations are that a separate corporation be set up to undertake and develop air cargo operations. We cannot underestimate the use of air cargo in our future civil

aviation set-up. Probably, a question may arise why air-cargo cannot be taken up by the Air India International. But owing to international rules, the passenger traffic cannot be commuted into air cargo. This expert committee headed by Shri Kooka has made a very wise suggestion. They have suggested the use of D.C. 4 planes for this purpose to fly over India and other countries. We have a huge cargo possibility which can be taken out and brought in very quickly and rapidly between foreign countries and India. I remember that we had a mishap in the Bhakra Nangl project sometime back, about two or three years back when certain parts were wanted and for want of those spare-parts our electricity works were held up. If an air cargo service was there, in a very limited time, the spare-parts could have been flown from foreign countries to India. This committee has also cautioned that we should not expect any profits from this air cargo corporation for first three years. That is quite true because no aviation company in the world has made profits in the beginning. The company with which I had the pleasure of connecting myself had also lost about Rs. 80 lakhs.

Shri Shinkre: No surprise.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: The present civil aviation development stands on those pioneering efforts and losses as a result of which the present IAC and the Air India are reaping harvest and making money.

Now, I would refer to the last page of the Annual Report of the Civil Aviation Department. There, we can see the progress that we have made during this year in regard to the number of pilot licences granted. The number of licences current as on 31st December, 1964, in respect of A category was 147, in respect of A 1 it was nil, and in respect of B it was 137; the number in respect of pilot instructors was 6. Today, the private pilot's licences number about 263. In regard to Private Helicopters Pilot's licence it was issued only to three per-

sons; Commercial Helicopter Pilots' licences number only 4. So, the progress in regard to licensing of pilot has been very disappointing. Very serious attention should be given to this problem of short supply of pilots in our civil aviation.

It must be remembered that in the past we were able to find good pilots who had gained experience during the last world war. For, after the disbandment of these pilots from military service they were absorbed by the commercial concerns. Those pilots have now become aged and they will be soon retiring and probably a time may come when we shall be facing an acute shortage of good pilots. So, I would request that the airlines should take upon themselves the responsibility for recruitment and training of pilots immediately. We shall otherwise have to start from scratch after these old pilots retire. A civil flying training school cannot be a paying proposition, because we could not absorb the pilots in large numbers. I had the experience of training some pilots and also running a ground engineering school before the war. A pilot was offered about Rs. 250 to Rs. 300, and a ground engineer was lucky if he got about Rs. 100. But soon after the war they were all given a great rise in their pay. They were able to get a pay ranging from Rs. 1500 to Rs. 2000. When we had aviation concerns in the private sector we trained our own pilots and ground engineers. But since Government have taken over these companies, they will have to do this training now, otherwise they will face the shortage of pilots very soon. Before meeting such a difficulty, I would very earnestly recommend to them some scheme for consideration. Particularly in India today the most capable organisation that can produce new pilots is the IAF. The IAF is the only organisation, I might say, which can bring out disciplined and responsible pilots in this country. Therefore, I say that military and commercial aviation has much in common. Pilots should be recruited, and I.A.F.

[Shri Narendra Singh Mahida]

should undertake responsibility and expand short service enlistment programme so that good number of pilots can be trained.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I wanted to suggest many things, but since you have already rung the bell, I shall try to confine myself to just one or two more points. Otherwise, I had a desire to speak at some length and put forward my thoughts on civil aviation. Anyway, I shall deal with only one or two more points now. I shall come to my own State of Gujarat. Gujarat needs a lot of lifting up in the matter of civil aviation.

I was instrumental in creating more than 20 aerodromes in Gujarat State, including Baroda, Bhavanagar and other places. I have some knowledge about the working of these lines. When we started our first flight from Bombay to Bhavanagar, it proved a very popular service, and it is still one of the most popular routes. My recommendations for the development of air travel in Gujarat are as follows: Firstly, the Ahmedabad-Delhi service should be operated *via* Udaipur-Jaipur so as to utilize the capacity and facilitate air travel from Gujarat to Rajasthan and *vice versa*. Secondly, Ahmedabad being a prominent industrial and business centre and capital of Gujarat State, should be linked with Rajkot and Kutch (Bhuj and Kandla). This will also facilitate travel by people in Saurashtra to catch plane at Ahmedabad for Delhi, Jaipur etc. Just now, there is no connection between Saurashtra, Kutch and Delhi. Gandhidham is now coming up, and the port of Kandla is declared a free trade zone, and an air connection is very badly required between Delhi and Kandla. The frequency of service between Ahmedabad and Bombay should be increased and the plane service be operated *via* Baroda as its importance is increas-

ing rapidly. Just now if I have to go to Baroda from Delhi. I have to go *via* Bombay; I cannot go to Baroda straight *via* Ahmedabad.

17 hrs.

Aerodromes like Kandla, Rajkot and Ahmedabad should be provided with better facilities. There are no retiring rooms, canteens etc. In view of the increasing industrial-cum-commercial development of Surat City and surrounding area and its equidistant location between Bombay and Ahmedabad, it is essential that Surat be linked by air with Bombay and Ahmedabad.

Lastly, my suggestion is about making Ahmedabad an international airport. Between Bombay and Delhi on the west coast of India, there is no international aerodrome. So I suggest that Ahmedabad should be made into an international airport. Ahmedabad is fast growing up. There are oil refineries, various industries, petro-chemical industries etc. near about. So its importance must be realised. Also from the military point of view, in terms of nearness to Pakistan, we must see that it should be made an international airport capable of landing even Boeings.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यक्त का सवाल है हाउस में इस समय कौरम नहीं है। 5 बज चुके हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The bell is being rung—Now there is quorum. Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad.

Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad (Baroda): I am happy that I have been given an opportunity to fire the first shot from this side of the House at a Ministry which I consider one of the most inefficient wings of Government. I speak on authority because I claim to be probably the most travelled of IAC's customers. I do about 2,000 miles a week and travel at least twice

a week. Hence I have taken courage to speak today.

I last spoke on this very Ministry four years ago. I thought that in all fairness they must be given some time to correct some of their shortcomings. But I find that instead of correcting and reducing the number of shortcomings, they have increased them. Four years ago, when I spoke, I had occasion to criticise the Ministry of Communications. I had then stated that it was possible at that stage to get, with difficulty of course, a seat to Bombay at short notice, but the chances of getting a trunk call through to Bombay to inform people that you were coming, were very dim. I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Communications that he has been able to reverse the position today. It is now possible, or it would soon be possible, to talk to Bombay over the trunk line in under two minutes, but I am not quite sure if, even after having informed Bombay that I am coming by an IAC plane, I will be able to get there!

The Minister of Works and Housing (Shri Meh. Chand Khanna): How do you do 2,000 miles if you go twice a week?

Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad: I am quite sure that if not all, almost all hon. Members of this House will agree with me that it is very difficult to get bookings on IAC flights. You ring up, or you send your man to book a seat and you are always put on the waiting list.

Shri Shinkre: The worst thing is getting the connection on the telephone.

Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad: And you are always the fortieth or fiftieth on the waiting list. You cannot take a chance because the air terminals are too far away from the major cities, and therefore you have to keep on telephoning, or rely on an agent who has connections in IAC. Eventually you do get a seat, and when you get on to the plane, you find that most of the plane is empty.

I know what the Minister is going to say in answer. He is going to say that months ahead—tourist agencies book seats, and then plans are changed at the last moment, the international service is delayed, and therefore you find a large number of empty seats. This I can appreciate could happen even once in ten days, but I think this has become a daily routine.

I remember an American friend of mine telling me three years ago his very sad experience. He arrived in Delhi and went on to Kathmandu, Nepal, and after a two-day stay he was flying to Calcutta. His plane was scheduled to take off at about 7 O'Clock in the morning. He arrived at the airport and went to the counter, and was promptly told that there was a four-hour delay. Having a hotel room booked until mid day, he asked if he could go back, get a couple of hours more sleep and come back at about 9.15 or 9.30. He was told that that would be all right. He left, leaving his address and room number. My poor friend arrived at the airport again at 9.15 and went to check in. The same gentleman was standing on the other side of the counter. When he handed in his ticket, he was told that the plane had left at 8-30. He said: "But you told me that it would not leave before 10." The gentleman replied, "I was not here." The poor man tried to argue but could get no where.

He had some patience fortunately. He said, "All right, when is the next plane?" He was told it was on the following morning. He asked: "All right, will you re-endorse my ticket for tomorrow morning?" And he was plainly told he would have to buy a new ticket. This is a fact, and I can prove it.

The main terminals in this country are relics of the past. Even the new ones have been very badly planned. We know of the famous incident of the Santa Cruz airport terminal, where I believe almost on the day of its opening ceremony it was discovered

[Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad]

that they had forgotten to build a customs shed!

We all know that in our country we have a habit that if one man is going, there are ten people or even more to see him off. The airport terminals are always congested. In fact many a time I have had difficulty in trying to get through and reach the plane. I would here suggest to the hon. Minister that his Ministry should consider at least four major cities of this country for erecting upto-date ultra-modern air terminals with special passenger lounges as this will eliminate all the visitors after a certain point. One of the most inefficient departments in this corporation, I.A.C. are the ground services. Apart from booking difficulties, once you get to the airport, to check in you have to wait in a long queue and there is only one man checking even for the economy class on the Boeing flight. That is the first check, when you check in at the counter. When you get on to the plane after a mile's walk your tag is taken or torn off; that is the second check. I should think that they should be satisfied with two checks to know how many passengers have boarded the plane. But once you all get in, they recount. I remember an instance, when the Caravelle had just arrived and I was taking the Caravelle from Palam to Santa Cruz in the height of summer. The plane had been standing in the sun. We all get in and the usual, routine counting started. Two air hostesses and a steward started counting. I was, fortunately, in the front and heard what was happening. They came back and discussed it. One said there were 67 passengers. The other said: 68 and the third, 68 plus 1. Here we were all sweating in the heat and a recount was ordered. They came back with the same results. Meanwhile the ladder had been taken away. Since they could not arrive at the correct figure the ladder had to be put back and somebody from the ground had to be called. He counted and he came to the conclusion that

there were 69 plus 1. Having accepted his statement as authoritative, they let him out then the dispute began as to whether it should be 69 plus 1 or 70. Ultimately I discovered that they settled for 69 plus one, the plus one being a child....

Shri J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): I am sure it was not born there.... (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad: Talking of wasteful expenditure, we have seen what has happened in the new extension at Palam airport. I do not know what they are building. I believe they have already spent over a lakh of rupees last year and propose to spend another four lakhs in the current year. I believe that the emergency is still on in this country and here we all have seen this peculiar building activity of constructing galleries for the visitors. I do not know what they are eventually going to do for passenger amenities. In this new contraption it will be too hot to stand in the summer; it will be too cold to stand there in winter and it will be impossible to use in monsoons. I presume it is only meant for use for two months in a year. I do hope that the hon. Minister will look into this and let the House know what exactly they have spent this money on, whether it is on a visitors' gallery or on amenities for passengers.

The other day we heard criticisms mainly from the other side, when the Demands for Grants under the Ministry of Defence were being discussed, that they have too many different types of planes. The Defence Minister, I think, satisfied hon. Members with his answers, but we find the same state of affairs in the Ministry of Civil Aviation. Today, I think they have got four Caravelles which are pure jets, 12 Viscounts which are turbo-props, 10 Fokker Friendships which are again turbo-props, three Skymasters and 36 Dakotas. Coming to Dakotas, four years ago, I had placed it on record—

I wanted to—that had it not been for the Dakotas after the war, the internal airlines in this country could never have been established. I had said then that the Dakotas had done yeoman service to this country, but a time had come I had said when they should now be given a State funeral. I was very happy to read the other day that the Minister had informed the members of the consultative committee that they propose gradually to replace these Dakotas with the Avro 748.

Having been closely connected with the Ministry of Defence, I have so far refrained from taking any part on defence questions, but the point is, when this project was decided upon and commenced and I was present at the first demonstration, many people like me knew even then that this aircraft would never be used by Defence and that eventually the Indian Airlines Corporation would be forced to buy the Avro 748. This has happened now. Anyway, I am glad to hear that at least the Dakotas are eventually going to be given a farewell.

My hon. friend across the floor, Shri Narendra Singh Mahida, referred to the Baroda airport and the Baroda service. I am not saying this because that is my constituency. Today is the 1st April, 1965. This is April-fool-day, and I think if nothing else, the Ministry, or rather the IAC has thought it fit to make us April-fools today. If one reads through the new IAC schedule which commences today, one will find that the Bombay-Baroda service,—IC 77—will leave Bombay at 2.30 in the afternoon and reach Baroda at 16.05 hours take off again as IC 78 at 10.30 hours and reach Bombay at 18.05 hours. As this plane lands at Santa Cruz, we will probably be watching the Caravelle taking off for Delhi, for, this plane reaches Santa Cruz exactly five minutes after the Caravelle takes off for Delhi! I think the Corporation has established some intimate connection with the hotels in Bombay, because we will have to stay overnight in Bombay, as there is no immediate connection from

there to anywhere. We cannot go on to Calcutta the same day and we cannot go on to Madras or Bangalore either. If they are willing to put us up for the evening and the night there, I have no objection.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Even then, one has to waste his time.

Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad: The actual history of the Baroda airport is a tale of woe. As luck would have it, the airport was opened at my august hands in 1937, and it may be because of this that it is a tale of woe! During the war, the British had stationed an RAF squadron there and subsequently the Ambika Airlines, Tatas and so on had their service, but after that, the IAC came. They tried to operate a service, but gave it up for good reasons then. For ten years, that airport lay completely idle. Until a lot of pressure was eventually brought upon the ministry. They discovered that the airstrip was not operative. So, estimates were called for and resurfacing was done. A service was started and given up again. There was a lot of protest, including mine. The Ministry ordered that a new strip be laid. Estimates were made. But as usually happens with this Government, as soon there was the first shovel of soil was dug, they discovered that their estimates were totally wrong. Now the minister informs me in a letter that they have no money. They have repaired it, but I suggest that they should look at it from the future point of view. Dakotas will go and then the service will stop, because they will tell me, this airport cannot take heavier aircraft. So, the new trip should be laid to take heavier aircraft. This House knows how important Baroda is going to become in future. We have a large petro-chemical complex coming up, a fertiliser factory and a refinery, besides a large number of other industries. I do hope the Ministry will give their consideration to this matter.

[Shri Fatehsinhrao Gaekwad]

I must pay a few compliments at least to this ministry. The service in the air is good, but this does not include the food; nor does it include the cracked plastic crockery nor the un-electro-plated and dirty cutlery. But the crew are efficient and courteous. When you are about to reach the destination, a pleasant voice announces in highly anglicised Hindi:

"हमने जो आपकी सेवा की है, वह आपको पसन्द आई होगी। Just look at the audacity! And the voice goes on— और फिर से आपकी सेवा करने की उम्मीद रखते हुए हम आपसे विदा लेते हैं।"

But do I have an alternative, if I do not want to travel by IAC!

My time is up. I request the ministry to look into all these matters. This time I have fired a mild shot, but next time it will be a fatal one, if things do not improve.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Members may now move the cut motions to Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Civil Aviation, subject to their being otherwise admissible.

Shri Daji (Indore): I beg to move:

(i) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced to Re. 1."

[Failure to have two different persons, one as Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation and the other as the Chairman, Indian Airlines Corporation in the interest of safety of air passengers (1)].

(ii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to implement the ICAO Assembly resolution emphasising the need to raise the pay-scales and improve the working conditions of staff engaged in air navigation and communication air traffic services (2)].

(iii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to issue quasi-permanency certificate to staff entitled to it for a number of years (3)].

(iv) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to revise the rates of overtime allowance for Civil Aviation operational staff as per recommendations of the Second Pay Commission (4)].

(v) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide school with boarding and lodging facilities at Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi Airports (5)].

(vi) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to pay daily allowance to staff deputed for training in Civil Aviation Training Centre (6)].

(vii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide Staff Canteens at various Airports (7)].

(viii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to grant overtime allowance to Chowkidars and Sweepers on the same hourly rates as applicable to other operational staff of Civil Aviation Department (8)].

(ix) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to implement assurance of increasing departmental quota for promotion to Assistant Aerodrome Officers from 20 to 50 per cent (9)].

(x) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to implement the recommendations of Central Pay Commission regarding the grant of weightage for night duties (10)].

(xi) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to confirm non-gazetted staff against available permanent posts (11)].

(xii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to publish Recruitment Rules and modifications in the policy of promotions from time to time (12)].

(xiii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide cheap accommodation at the airport retiring rooms, for use of non-gazetted staff on tour as available to gazetted Officers (13)].

(xiv) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide transport for school-going children of employees at various airports at concessional rates, which are at considerable distance from the neighbouring towns (14)].

(xv) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to prevent inordinate delay in settling staff representations (15)].

(xvi) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide Selection Grade posts in cadres which have no promotional avenues as per recommendations of the Second Pay Commission (16)].

(xvii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide posts of Senior Clerks in the ratio 2:1 between Senior and Junior Clerks as in other Departments (17)].

(xviii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide residential accommodation to all Civil Aviation staff in view of their All-India Service liability and remote location of the Airports (18)].

(xix) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to revise pay-scale of M.T. Drivers and Telephone Operators as per recommendations of Second Pay Commission (19)].

(xx) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to convert the E. & M. Workshop repairing and maintaining staff cars of various Ministries into a permanent establishment (20)].

(xxi) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to reduce the working hours of Chowkidars of Civil Aviation Department to 48 hours a week with a weekly day off (21)].

(xxii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to grant weekly off to operational staff of Civil Aviation Department (22)].

(xxiii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to have a single administrator at various airports instead of having two or three as at present (23)].

[Shri Daji]

(xxiv) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to create adequate number of ministerial posts in proportion to increase in the technical and operational personnel (24)].

(xxv) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide adequate incentives to staff who have reached their maximum in the pay-scale (25)].

(xxvi) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to implement the reports of Workshops Committee, Stores Committee and Uniforms Committee (26)]

(xxvii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to implement the revised overtime allowance rates for Civil Aviation operational staff (27)].

(xxviii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for promotion to the extent of 50 per cent to non-gazetted Supervisory posts purely on seniority basis instead of by examination to all posts (28)].

(xxix) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to create posts of Senior Clerks, Head Clerks and Superintendents on the basis of "Yardstick" prevailing in other Departments like Income-Tax and Posts and Telegraphs (29)].

(xxx) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to grant 9 effective holidays for operational staff of Civil Aviation

Department as applicable to operational staff of Posts and Telegraphs Department (30)].

(xxxi) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide free transport for staff posted to Palam Airport consequent on taking over Palam Airport from Indian Airforce by Civil Aviation Department (31)].

(xxxii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to evolve a yardstick for sanction of posts in respect of Ministerial staff in subordinate offices of the Civil Aviation Department (32)].

(xxxiii) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to allow the staff to use community centres at various Airports for recreational purposes (33)].

(xxxiv) "That the demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to provide free transport for marketing trips at least once a week in case of out-of-the-way airports (34)].

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The cut motions are also before the House.

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda (Cachar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at the outset, I welcome the separation of Civil Aviation from the Transport Ministry and putting it under the able guidance of the present Minister of Civil Aviation, Shri Kanungo.

Though the Government is trying to link by air the whole country, yet large areas are still uncovered. I do feel that the areas which are unapproachable by road or rail should be linked by air first. It is not a question of profit or loss but a question of developing and bringing integrity.

It is shown in the report that Air India had a substantial operating profit of Rs. 384.25 lakhs in 1963-64, the highest made so far by the Corporation after nationalisation. The overall load factor achieved during 1963-64 was the highest at 47.8 per cent since the commencement of the operations, exclusively with Boeing jets. Similarly, the Indian Airlines Corporation had a net surplus of Rs. 104.42 lakhs.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हाउस में कोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the hon. Member resume her seat. The bell is being rung... Now there is quorum. She might continue her speech.

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: I am happy to find that the Ministry could come to some agreements with the Air Corporations Employees' Union, the Engineers' Association and the Radio Officers' Association and negotiations are in progress with the Officers' Association.

17.28 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

It seems that an agreement has been reached between Indian Commercial Pilots' Association and the management and an award granted by the National Industrial Tribunal has been accepted regarding the question of flight time/duty time limitations.

As the time at my disposal will not allow me to go into details, I shall try to confine myself to the area to which I belong. Air communication to Assam, if I may be allowed to say so, is not up to the expectations. Imphal, Cachar and Tripura have no proper communication with the rest of India but by air. Fokker Friendship has been introduced from 1st April, 1965 to ply from Calcutta to Silchar via Agartala which takes off at 13.10 hours from Dum Dum and reaches Kumbhirgram at 15.35 hours. It

leaves Kurabhirgram at 16.00 hours and arrives at Dum Dum at 18.25 hours. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the time scheduled for flying from Dum Dum to Silchar and back is not well-considered, particularly in this season. During this season, in the months of April and May, storms which we call 'Kal Baisakhi'—the hon. Minister knows it—visit our area nearly every afternoon. So, it is not desirable to fly in storms and I have every apprehension that the planes will have to return without landing at their destination. I find from the report that they have Meteorological Department reports from which statistics of storms could easily be found out.

May I request the hon. Minister to look into the matter and convince the management so that they may kindly change the timing of the flights and make it in the morning so that the plane may have a chance to reach the destination without making any loss to the Government and to the passengers.

The freighters which used to operate between Calcutta-Agartala-Silchar-Imphal have been stopped for reasons better known to the authorities. Perhaps, the House is not aware that all consumer and essential goods are carried to this region by air because rail and road transport are not satisfactory or easy and, at the same time, no less costly. Sometimes railway wagons are held up for months and months; so, scarcity of foodstuffs for the time being gives rise to prices.

I would urge upon the Government to resume freighter services in this route in no time. Silchar and Gauhati have no air link for the last few years. One Dakota used to run from Gauhati to Silchar twice a week but it was suspended on the ground that it was not economical. The Assam Government also moved to restore it but with no effect till now. Gauhati is the nervecentre of Assam. High Court, University and a medical college are

[Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda]

situated there. The railway line which connects Silchar-Gauhati is linked by the hill section line from Badarpur to Lumding where frequent derailments occur and it is suspended for long hours together. Road communication by Silchar-Badarpur-Jowai Road is not yet all-weather.

May I ask the Government: Do they consider that underdeveloped and unapproachable areas should always remain as such or do they feel it necessary to link those areas with the rest of India though it is uneconomical? May I request the Government to consider to re-open air service from Gauhati to Silchar, if not daily at least biweekly?

It may not be out of place to mention here that the Mizo Hills District has to be fed every year with foodgrains by airdropping for there is no airstrip in the district. Road transport is also lacking even now after 18 years of independence.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सभापति महोदय मैं आपकी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ । हाउस में कोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Chairman: The bell is being rung... Now there is quorum. The hon. lady Member may conclude now.

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: May I submit that the Government should consider about construction of an airstrip in Mizo Hills district for saving wastage of foodgrains and money which are wasted every year.

One Viscount used to run daily from Calcutta to Mohanbari via Gauhati and it is running upto Jorhat only from last July or so. I am told that it was suspended, for the airfield at Mohanbari is under construction and it will take a year to be completed. The rainy season will set in in the near future in our area. So, I request that construction work should be expedited in no time. In this connection, I would like to mention that the terminal building at Jorhat is not at all satisfactory, and even there is

no water in the toilet room, I have experienced that very recently when I went to Dibgoi via Jorhat.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सभापति महोदय, हाउस में कोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Chairman: You should not interrupt her speech like that. Let her complete her speech.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सभापति महोदय, मैं आपकी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ । हाउस में कोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Chairman: There is quorum.

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: The services on the trunk routes are somehow satisfactory. But the services in other routes are beyond satisfaction. Things like cotton and lozenges are not available. I myself had to complain several time regarding all these minor things.

I do not like to take more time of the House but with this humble request to the Government, I would like to conclude by saying that more attention should be paid to maintenance of the terminal buildings and also to the services rendered to the passengers on board particularly on routes other than trunk routes.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सभापति महोदय, क्या बिना कोरम के हाउस चलेगा । मैं चैलेन्ज करता हूँ कि हाउस में कोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Chairman: There is quorum. I have counted the numbers and my decision is final. There is quorum.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बरवा (कोटा) : सभापति महोदय, इस वाद विवाद पर बोलते हुए मुझे थोड़ा सा रिपोर्ट को देखने का मौका

मिला तो उससे मालूम हुआ कि इसमें फायदा तो हुआ है लेकिन घोटाला भी बहुत कुछ है। चूंकि समय कम है इसलिये घोटाले के बारे में ज्यादा तो नहीं लेकिन थोड़े में जरूर बतलाना चाहता हूं। मद्रास के ऐडवॉन्स पेमेन्ट का रिबेट देने के बारे में कुल मिलाकर एक ही महकमे में 14 हजार रुपये का नुकसान हुआ है।

प्राइवेट पार्टियों के नौकरों से, जिनको सरकारी मकान अलॉट किया गया दिल्ली, बम्बई, बंगाल, मद्रास, असम, हैदराबाद में उन से जो बसूली नहीं हुई उससे 19.96 लाख रुपयों का नुकसान हुआ।

435 मकान बने, लेकिन हमारे आवास और निर्माण विभाग ने उन में से 137 मकानों का किराया तय नहीं किया। इस से 64 लाख रुपये का नुकसान हुआ।

बमरौली में फ्लाइटिंग एंड ग्राउन्ड इंजिनियरिंग स्कूल, सिविल एविएशन ट्रेनिंग सेंटर के बन्द होने से सारी मशीन एयर क्राफ्ट और सामान 29.46 लाख रुपये बेकार पड़ा है, वह अभी तक इस्तेमाल नहीं हुआ। यह सामान मई सन् 1962 से बेकार पड़ा है।

केनटोनमेंट बोर्ड मद्रास, बेगमपेट और बंगलौर गवर्नमेंट ने मई 1962 से अब तक 1.47 लाख रुपया कांटेन्समेंट चार्ज में लगाया है, लेकिन यह अभी तक पार्टीज से बसूल नहीं हुआ।

श्री मुख्याल राव (महबूबनगर) : बेगमपेट के बारे में आपने क्या कहा ?

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा : बेगमपेट में मकानों का किराया बाकी पड़ा है। तो इस तरह से भ्रष्टाचार हो रहा है; पब्लिक से पैसा ले ले लेकर विमान सेवा में लगाते हैं और वह इस तरह बरबाद होता है।

सान्ताक्रुज एयर पोर्ट पर टेलीप्रिंटर मशीन, जो डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन सिस्टम के आधार पर फरवरी सन 1961 में 2.25 लाख की खरीदी थी, बेकार पड़ी है क्योंकि दो साल से उसके लिए जो मकान बनना था वह पूरा नहीं हुआ।

राष्ट्रीय पंचांग की कापीज छपाने में प्रति कापी मेहनत का और कागज का दाम एक रुपया था लेकिन इनको बेचने की कीमत 25 नए पैसे रखी गयी। इन के छपाने में 1.50 लाख रुपया सात वर्ष में खर्चा हुआ। इनमें से 21 हजार कापी बेची गईं, 30,262 कापियां फ्री बांट दी गयीं, पांच हजार का ठिकाना नहीं और दस हजार कापियां मैनेजर साहब ले गये उसका कोई हिसाब नहीं दिया गया। तो इस प्रकार भ्रष्टाचार होता है।

मेरा यह भी कहना है कि जिस वक्त ये कम्पनियां प्राइवेट लोगों द्वारा चलाई जाती थीं, तो कार्यकुशलता ज्यादा थी, लेकिन जब से ये सरकार के पास आयी हैं तब से कार्यकुशलता कम हो गयी है। जब हम रिजर्वेशन के लिए जाते हैं तो लम्बे क्यू में लगना पड़ता है और वहां कोई हिन्दी नहीं समझता। इसलिए जो केवल हिन्दी जानते हैं उनको कठिनाई होती है। मेरा सुझाव है कि इसके लिए थोड़ा इन्तिजाम कर दिया जाना चाहिए। ऐसा हो जाए तो बहुत भ्रष्टा होगा।

हमारी हवाई सरविस का अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में ज्यादा से ज्यादा विस्तार होना चाहिए। इससे हम ज्यादा फारिन एक्सचेंज पैदा कर सकते हैं और इन सरविसों के द्वारा आवश्यकता पड़ने पर हमको बाहर से सहायता भी मिल सकती है। अगर चीन या पाकिस्तान का हम पर हमला हो तो ऐसे समय में हमको विदेशों से इन सरविसों के द्वारा ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहायता मिल सकती है।

[श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा]

पाकिस्तान एयर लाइन्स के द्वारा— जो कि कराची से डाका के बीच चलती है— आजकल बड़ी संख्या में चीनी लोग घाने जाने लगे हैं। सरकार इस पर रोक नहीं लगाएगी तो इससे हमारे देश को बड़ी हानि हो सकती है। न मालूम वे लोग हमारे यहां के नकशे लेते हैं या क्या देखते हैं। यह काम केवल पाकिस्तान से लिखा पढ़ी करने से नहीं होगा। इसके लिए सख्त कदम उठाना चाहिए और इसको रोकना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान की चाइना से दोस्ती है, इसलिए वह अपनी तरफ से तो इसको बन्द नहीं करेगा। सरकार को ऐसे कदम उठाने चाहिए कि चीनियों का हमारे देश पर से हो कर उड़ना बन्द हो जाए। अगर इसके लिये आवश्यक हो तो पाकिस्तान एयर लाइन्स का रास्ता बदल दिया जाए।

अब मैं अपने क्षेत्र के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। दिल्ली से जो लाइन अहमदाबाद को जाती है वह जयपुर जाती है, जयपुर से भोपाल और भोपाल से सीधी अहमदाबाद चली जाती है, कोटा (राजस्थान) में जहां पर कि एयरोड्रोम है, वहां नहीं जाती। झालावाड़ नहीं जाती जहां गांधी सागर डैम है। मेरा सुझाव है कि यह लाइन दिल्ली से जयपुर, कोटा, झालावाड़, भोपाल होती हुई अहमदाबाद जाय तो लोगों को बहुत सुविधा होगी।

मेरा कहना है कि हमको ज्यादा से ज्यादा एयर सर्विसेज चलानी चाहिए। अगर सरकार पब्लिक सेक्टर में इस काम को नहीं बढ़ा सकती है, तो वह इस काम को प्राइवेट सेक्टर को भी दे दे, और उसे इस काम के लिए उचित सुविधाएं भी दे तो यह काम बहुत बढ़ सकता है। इससे यह लाभ होगा कि हमारे यहां ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग तकनीकी शिक्षा प्राप्त कर लेंगे और हमको ऐसे लोगों के लिए विदेशों का मुंह

नहीं देखना पड़ेगा। मेरा सुझाव है कि बड़े बड़े शहरों में ज्यादा से ज्यादा एयरोड्रोम बनाए जाएं और ज्यादा से ज्यादा डकोटा चलाए जाएं। इससे लोगों को बड़ी सुविधा होगी और सरकार को भी आमदनी होगी।

आजकल रेलों में इतनी भीड़ होती है और बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति एयर कंडीशन्ड कोचेज में और पहले दरजे में ज्यादा चलते हैं, और इसलिए रिजरवेशन कराना कठिन होता है। इसलिए अगर एयर सर्विसेज ज्यादा चलायी जाएंगी तो यह कठिनाई दूर हो जाएगी।

आजकल के जमाने में हेलीकॉप्टर के प्रयोग के बारे में भी सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिए। आजकल समय ही दौलत है और जितना ज्यादा समय जनता का बचेगा उतना ही राष्ट्र का लाभ होगा। प्रगतिशील देश के लिए आज समय की बड़ी कीमत है। तो मेरा सुझाव है कि इस ओर भी ध्यान दिया जाए।

मुझे यह भी कहना है कि बड़ौदा में जो बम्बई से प्लेन आता है वह 4 बजे आता है। चार बजे कौन मुसाफिर जाने को तैयार हो सकता है। और इस सर्विस से गाड़ियों का भी मेल नहीं होता। तो मेरा सुझाव है कि आपको इन सारी बातों का ध्यान रख के प्लेन का समय निश्चित करना चाहिए।

मैं अन्त में फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि आजकल के समय में एयर सर्विसेज को ज्यादा से ज्यादा बढ़ाना चाहिए। जो बड़े बड़े प्राइमरी आज एयर कंडीशन्ड डब्लों में सफर करते हैं वे इन सर्विसेज का उपयोग करेंगे। इससे उनका समय भी बचेगा और ट्रांसपोर्ट विभाग को ज्यादा फायदा भी होगा। इस ओर अधिक से अधिक ध्यान देना चाहिए यही मेरा निवेदन है।

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Mr. Chairman, the subject of civil aviation has been separated from the Ministry of Transport and given to a separate Ministry, called Ministry of Civil Aviation. This was done last year, June 1964. We welcomed it and we expected great things to be done in consequence of that. But in spite of improvements in many things, to which I will refer later, in many other things, the Ministry has not come up to expectations.

Shri Daji: Mistaken expectations.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: The steady progress in civil aviation underlines the growing importance of the system of quick transportation. The days are gone when people used to do their journeys in a very leisurely way, whether they were on business or they were travelling for pleasure. Today transport has to be direct and also quick. No country, much less a country like India with such a vast and big area, can ignore the developments in this field.

Seeing the report which has been supplied to us by the Ministry, we find that for the second year in succession, the two air corporations, Air India and Indian Airlines, have done good work and better work, handling more traffic, passenger and cargo. They have opened new routes and introduced better types of planes, though I should say that as regards the internal services, there is much more scope for acceleration.

In the first six months of the current period, the operating profit for the first time that the Air India and Indian Airlines made was Rs. 384.28 lakhs. It is in the bulletin; for want of time, I need not go into details. But I would like to say one thing or two. For reasons, which I will refer to later on, two services, one to Tokyo and the other to London had to be cut in December, so that they might ease the strain on the pilots. I will come to the question concerning pilots a little

later. But I must congratulate the Government on introducing the Caravelle service last year. It has certainly made a great impact. We are happy about it. But one thing I would like to say about the service from Hyderabad to Madras. Everyday it is running at a loss. I have been told that now this Caravelle service will be diverted via Hyderabad. The Minister is shaking his head.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a Caravelle service between Hyderabad and Madras?

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: I am sorry—from Delhi to Madras. I stand corrected. I am thankful to you for the correction. The service from Delhi to Madras has been running every day at a loss. On page 54 of the report, they have said that they are giving some concessions to Bangalore passengers to go via Madras. This has not improved matters and now they want to bring it via Hyderabad. I welcome this step. I hope it will be done soon. My latest information is that work in connection with this is proceeding well and fast.

There are three bases for overhaul of planes, at Calcutta, Delhi and Hyderabad. The Delhi base is for the overhaul of the Viscounts, and the Calcutta base is for the overhaul of Skymasters. So far as Hyderabad base is concerned, from 1963, year after year, we Members of Parliament both of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, have been representing to the various Ministers who have been in charge of Indian Airlines and Civil Aviation, that this base which consisted of 1,400 people has been reduced to a small bit of 400. There have been any number of representations of the Air Corporation Employeecs' Union of Begumpet Airport. We represented to Shri Jagjivan Ram, later to the IAC office, then to Shri Satish Chandra who was Chairman of the IAC, and ultimately even to Shri Raj Bahadur. In every reply they have been saying that the base would not be removed. Even the other day the hon. Minister

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

was pleased to say that it would not be removed. But the question is why they have been reducing the technical and other personnel at the Hyderabad base. They had said that the overhaul of Dakotas would be done at the Hyderabad base, but the personnel has been so reduced that this overhauling cannot be done there, and so they are sending the Dakotas to Calcutta and Delhi, saying that they are not able to get this done at the Hyderabad base. But whose fault is it? It is you people, in spite of assuring us that the base would not be removed from there, who have been removing the people to Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi. Today you are saying that you are not able to get the overhauling done at the Hyderabad base.

Few days back I saw a report in the *Times of India* quoting the Minister as saying that they are going to introduce Avros in place of Dakotas. It is very good and we welcome it. He and his predecessors have been assuring us that the Hyderabad base would be entirely devoted to the overhaul of Avros. The hon. Minister is shaking his head, but I can quote to him the assurances, but I have no time. I can quote year by year the date, the place, the person, whether it was on the floor of the Rajya Sabha or the Lok Sabha or outside, how the Ministers, at different points of time, have assured us that the Avros at least would be overhauled at the Hyderabad base. All that we are saying is that at least when the Avros are introduced, Hyderabad should be given its due share.

I was very pleased when Shri Gaekwad mentioned about the time schedules. I wanted to ask whether on the first of April they wanted to make fools of us by this new time schedule. He said almost the very words that I was thinking of. For going to Hyderabad, the Viscount flight is at 6 o'clock in the morning, and now it has been changed to 11 or 12 o'clock, I am not sure. All this time, in the shivering

winter of Delhi, we used to get up at 4 A.M. and go to Palam at an unearthly hour and take the Viscount. Now that summer is coming, it will be impossible to go out after 9 A.M. and so they have made it 11 or 12 o'clock. I do not know who advises this Minister and the Board. At least they must have some sympathetic consideration for the comforts of the travelling public. After all, we are paying. I do not know if it has been done to see that more passengers go to Bangalore via Madras, you can revise it, but why upset services to Hyderabad. It certainly should not be looked at from the monetary point of view. They should have some sympathetic understanding of the hardships of the persons who pay.

We have got a service from Hyderabad to Vizag thrice weekly and it runs at full capacity. Of course, they are Dakotas. Now, for no fault of ours, in spite of the fact that they are running at full capacity, Government says that the State Government should pay the loss, just because I believe even when the Dakota runs at full capacity there is a loss. Then why the hell have it? Why not remove it and introduce Fokker Friendship or something else? Why make us bear the loss?

Mr. Chairman: Do not connect hell with Dakotas.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: I think we see more of hell through Dakotas.

Shri Daji: She is connecting hell with Government.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: There is greater possibility of seeing hell sooner through Dakotas.

We from Hyderabad would like to suggest a direct service to Calcutta. We have no direct service to Calcutta. We have to go via Madras. I suggest that there should be direct service from Hyderabad to Calcutta via Vizawada, Vizagapatam and

* Bhubaneshwar. We assure you that the traffic will be there and you will be connecting at least three different States. We need not have to bear the losses.

There was the difficult time we had with the pilots. It was such a matter of great concern. They should see that the pilots behave. What did they do? They take the plane load of passengers back after few minutes and say that their duty hours had exceeded by a few hours the work load for them according to international standards and they are not going to overwork themselves. The passengers get into the planes and then they are asked to get down. It was rather sad. I have no sympathy for such things. There were two things: overwork, more than 100 hours work a month and the leave question. My understanding is that the work is nearer fifty hours, rather than 100 hours. I believe that most of the pilots do not want to avail of their leave because they want to accumulate their leave upto 90 days so that they may take it when they have private work or the get some illness. Whatever it was, Government had to close down two services to Tokyo and London.

But one major thing to-day we have that is, shortage of pilots. What happened was this. In the 1950s, we suddenly came to jet age from piston age of smaller aircraft and the market was flooded with pilots because less pilots were needed as more work could be done by jet planes. In the initial period there was that sort of pilot surplus. In the world it was period of pilot retrenchment. I must appreciate that the Air India were able, in the initial period, to adjust things without putting the pilots into great difficulties. It is in our country that we did not have any difficulty and it was a great credit to the Air India

Now, for a variety of reasons, because of the jet efficiency, international air fare reduction and economic climate, there is a great boost to international jet air travel and so suddenly we are facing this pilot shortage. It will be there for long time to come. In the earlier period, immediately after the world war, we recruited most of the people from the war elements; and those in service now will retire in 6, 7 or 8 years' time. In India unfortunately we did not have any method of *ab initio* training for pilots and it was never on a sound footing. We recruited our pilots from the war pilots or from whatever we could get from the IAC. What is now happening is this. The IAC is represented by one union and Air India is represented by another union. These two organisations are quarrelling with each other. . . . (Interruptions.)

Mr. Chairman: There is too much of a vociferous support for you. Please conclude.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: In two minutes, I will conclude. So, we have to depend upon the IAC more or less for the recruitment of pilots or on the commercial flying clubs; the amount of pilot training is very little and they have to change from tiger moths to jets; they are not able to do so easily. So, Government should have some sound scheme of giving *ab initio* training of pilots. Moreover since the two organisations do not get together, the IAC and the Air India, there will always be trouble and I will plead with the Government that they should take it up and do something.

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, April 2, 1965/Chaitra 12, 1887 (Saka).