

12.19 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS*—contd.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Education. Shri Supakar was in possession of the House. He may continue. The time allotted for him is 15 minutes, of which he has already taken 2 minutes.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): What is the time left for discussion?

Mr. Speaker: After the hon. Member concludes, I will call upon the Minister.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda): There was a difficult situation yesterday towards the end. There were 6 or 7 hon. Members who were keen to speak. I told them that if they agreed to sit, I would call all of them. Then I fixed ten minutes to each of them. Only Shri Supakar had been called and when he had spoken for two minutes, objection was taken on the ground that there was no quorum. If we had continued sitting for some more time, perhaps all those Members could have been accommodated. I do not think we will have time today for continuing that arrangement. After Shri Supakar concludes, the debate may be closed, if it is so desired, and the hon. Minister called to reply.

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur): Sir, yesterday I was trying to point out how an onerous gift or a grant made by the Centre to the States with strings attached to it affects them more as hinderances than as help. I was referring to the conditions which are sought to be imposed, though the words used are very mild, in giving help to the States in respect of free

and compulsory primary education. On page 10 of the Report, it is stated:

"In order to pay special attention to the quality and contents of this training, the following points have been emphasised:—

- (a) The training provided should be on the Basic pattern only;
- (b) the normal qualification for admission into these institutions should be matriculation of post-Basic or higher secondary, some relaxation in this regard in the case of women teachers or in some specially backward areas; and
- (c) the duration of training should be two years as far as practicable."

Let us see what is the practical consequence of these conditions. We find that in most of the States—even in the richer States who can afford to spend very heavy amounts on primary education—usually the teachers in those schools are not very highly educated. Usually they are under-metrics and persons who have passed Middle English or Middle Vernacular and have taken some training before they joined the schools and some of them have not even this training.

Now, if we insist that the teachers in these training schools should be persons who have passed the matriculation or higher secondary and should have taken training for two years, then, naturally, those teachers would be appointed in some of the high schools and very few would be available for teachership in the primary schools.

The second thing is that persons who have these qualifications and higher training would, naturally, deserve and get higher salaries. Of course, there is a conflict between basic and non-basic schools. We find that though the Centre is supposed to have

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Speaker]

been giving much attention to the progress of basic education, still we know it for certain that very few educationists agree as to what the proper definition of basic should be. Besides, the comparative costs of imparting free and compulsory education on the basic pattern and in the traditional pattern has yet to be ascertained. It is stated that research work on the following research projects is continued:

"Comparative costlines of Basic and non-Basic education."

Whatever the progress in this research may be, it is quite a known fact that basic education costs a greater amount at present at least than the non-basic type. So, having regard to the fact that we are in urgent need of having a certain progress in the education of children of the age group of 6-11 years and all those children should be in the schools by 1965-66, if Government pursue the policy adumbrated on page 10 of the Report, I do not think the States will have sufficient funds to adopt the course of having matriculates or higher secondary passed persons with two years' training as teachers of these primary schools. That would make education more costly. Therefore, I would submit that the Government should review this matter to see that in the minimum time possible the States—especially the more backward States where the progress of literacy is not so high as in other States—are given special aid to come up in line with the more advanced States like Kerala where literacy is 99 per cent.

On a previous occasion I spoke about Sanskrit education. Last year I had to say that the help given by the Centre to institutions and States so far as progress of Sanskrit education is concerned is very inadequate. Last year Government provided only Rs. 1,25,000 for the progress of Sanskrit education. This year, of course,

they have provided a little more—Rs. 2 lakhs. But out of this Rs. 2 lakhs only Rs. 50,000 is earmarked for helping the States and non-official institutions. Out of this Rs. 2 lakhs, Rs. 1,50,000 goes to the compilation of a dictionary of Sanskrit. If Government progresses in this way, then, it would be very difficult for Sanskrit education to progress in India.

Although we were told by the Minister last time that he is doing his best to implement the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission, we have yet to learn the steps that Government have taken except for the fact that they have set up a Sanskrit Board which has met only once as yet.

In this connection, I would submit that unless Government takes more active steps to help the progress of Sanskrit education, not much can be done and we shall be losing much of our scholarship and the progress that is desirable.

A few days ago some questions were asked about the help that Government propose to give to the students of Sanskrit institutions like the Gurukuls and the hon. Minister was pleased to state that that was under the consideration of the Sanskrit Board. I think Government should spend more for revitalising Sanskrit which has been, taken during the last 150 years, as a dead language and no importance was attached to it. Having regard to the fact that Sanskrit is the language from which all the 14 languages are derived, and especially Hindi, Government should spend more for the development and research in Sanskrit education.

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall): Mr. Speaker, Sir, first of all I should like to thank all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and who made many valuable suggestions. It is natural

that the hon. Members must be exercised about the problems of education which exist in our country today. Education can be a powerful means of social reconstruction. It is, naturally, the desire of the House and of all the people that the educational system must be geared to suit our national needs and requirements.

First of all I should like to deal with the criticism which was levelled by Acharya Kripalani for whom I have the highest respect. It is not a very pleasant thing to differ from him or to say or to make any comments on what he has said, but I think it is my duty to draw his attention to some of his fallacies.

Sir, he said that no attempt has been made to make suitable or radical changes in the educational system and the old 'anti-national' type of education developed during the British period still continues. His whole charge was that the Education Ministry has not been able to bring about any relationship between the new ideals and purposes of society and education. He also said that there was a great deal of confusion in the country with regard to educational aims and objectives. To me it appears, I submit most respectfully, that the statements which Kripalaniji made yesterday have only added to the confusion and not clarified the issues in any way.

In the first place, he said that the Government starts from the top and goes to the bottom. This is entirely wrong. He knows it fully well that the first thing that the Government did was to decide about the pattern of primary education. As far as primary education is concerned, the broad lines were laid down by the father of the nation, Mahatma Gandhi. We are imperfect. We have not been able to implement the programmes and principles which he laid before us, but Government have accepted basic education.

In this connection, I should also like to say that as far as we are concerned basic education is not a static concept. We are living in a dynamic society, and we are moving gradually towards an industrial, scientific, technological society. As a result of this there will be a great deal of changes in the nature of crafts and the nature of our economy. Therefore, any educational system which caters to the needs and demands of a dynamic and changing society will naturally have to adapt itself to those changes. We cannot, therefore, think of a static concept of education. Basic education will have to undergo a great deal of change if it is to meet the needs of a changing, scientific, technological society.

It is, however, not true to say that we have not laid before us the pattern of education. The pattern of education is clear, definite. At several meetings of the Central Advisory Board of Education, at our conferences, at our committee meetings and meetings of our commissions it has been definitely laid down that basic education will be the pattern of national education. By basic education I mean, and I think Acharya Kripalani also means that, relating education to the needs of society, to the changing and growing needs of society. And, that education cannot be static. It will continuously have to transform itself to meet the needs of the growing society.

We have made some humble efforts to orient the national system of education towards basic pattern. Several schools have been converted into basic schools. There are good schools, bad schools and indifferent schools, but we have been making efforts to convert schools into basic schools. We have also been giving grants to post basic schools. We have now undertaken the task of orienting all the schools towards the basic pattern.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi):
May I offer a little explanation? I said that none of the important

[Acharya Kripalani]

people, whether in the Government or the rich people, send their children to basic schools. I did not say that they have not theoretically accepted basic education, but in practice it is not being carried out.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): Can you force people to send their children to basic schools?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): Government is giving scholarships to public schools to the tune of Rs. 4,90,000, whereas for other traditional schools including basic schools they are giving scholarships only to the tune of Rs. 9,40,000. This is a contradiction—whereas they are adopting the basic pattern they are giving scholarships to public schools.

Shri Barrow (Nominated-Anglo-Indians): Public schools are basic schools.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Then it is good.

Dr. K. L. Shrivastava: I was coming to that point. Acharya Kripalani is also aware that we appointed two important commissions. One was presided over by Dr. Radhakrishnan. He is one of our greatest philosophers and educationists. We have been trying to implement the recommendations of that Commission. One of the important recommendations was that we should set up a University Grants Commission, an independent autonomous Commission which should take care of the universities. The Commission has been set up and the Commission is trying in its humble way to reform the university education. In fact, it has already started making an impact on university education. It is true there are problems in our universities—I am coming to that point a little later—and my head hangs down with shame that armed constabulary had to be called in some of the universities in Uttar Pradesh. But, at the same time, let us not completely ignore the good things that

have come about; some good changes and reforms that have introduced in our educational system.

The problem of Indian education is of great magnitude, and the resources at our disposal are limited. So, whenever we judge the achievements in the field of education we have to keep these two factors constantly in view.

Sir, I was just saying that we are trying to gear our educational system to meet the needs of a scientific and technological society. I should like to enumerate some of the steps which the Government have taken or which we propose to take in the near future. We have set up a consultant service for primary schools. These consultants will advise the educational institutions at the elementary stage so that scientific education can be developed within our limited resources. We have also set up a large number of science clubs in secondary schools to stimulate interest in science. Then, the Government also propose to set up a high-powered science commission which will survey the whole field from the schools to the university and formulate a process which will improve science teaching at all levels, and I am hoping that on this Commission we may be able to get one or two leading scientists from other countries also which have made very great progress in the field of science.

We are already working out a scheme for the publication of scientific, technical and other standard books at low price in co-operation with foreign publishers and other international agencies so that students as well as libraries may benefit. The books on science and technology are expensive when we get them from abroad. Therefore, it is necessary to publish cheap books in this country. We are already working out a scheme, and we are having negotiations with foreign publishers so that cheap books may be available to the students.

सेठ गोविन्द दास (जम्बलपुर) : मैं यह जानना चाहता था कि यह जो पुस्तकें आप प्रकाशित करने वाले हैं, ये सब पुस्तकें क्या इस देश में भी अंग्रेजी भाषा में ही प्रकाशित होंगी, या भारतीय भाषाओं और हिन्दी में भी प्रकाशित होंगी।

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Sir, I was coming to the point raised by Seth Govind Das a little later. These will be, of course, in English.

Acharya Kripalani also suggested that we should close down the public schools, unless we close them down we cannot have a democratic socialistic society. What is the provision under the Constitution under which the Government can order the closure of a school, I should like to ask Acharya Kripalani? Unless we change the provisions of the Constitution there is no authority in the country which can close down any educational institution. Now, I am sorry to say—I am not a great admirer of public schools....

Mr. Speaker: Can't the Government withhold recognition. In schools where specifically anti-national things are taught, is it not open to the Government to say that they would not give any grants?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Kripalaniji did not say that they were anti-national schools. He was only saying that they were expensive schools meant for aristocratic and rich classes.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Kindly read what the history and the geography books say. Whatever is taught there, please read them.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am not a great admirer of public schools. In fact, I have myself been very critical of public school education for two reasons: firstly it is expensive.

Mr. Speaker: Are the Government bound to give grants or subsidies to institutions which they do not favour or, are they opposed to this kind of

education which is creating all kinds of snobs in this country? That seems to be the view of some sections.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: We are not giving grants to them. We have stopped it now. I was trying to explain....

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, you have put it properly. We are producing snobs and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker: I was only reading the point that the hon. Member suggested!

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): There are all-India competitive examinations held for awarding scholarships and there are a large number of boys from public schools who try to compete with each other. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order order. I have no views of my own. From what I heard in the speech of Acharya Kripalani, I thought that our culture is not given sufficient prominence. On the other hand, we are merely copying the public schools of the west where they intended to send rulers to other countries. A different attitude must be there and we must learn to serve and not to rule. That is what he was saying, I think.

Shri Barrow: That is not true.

Mr. Speaker: That is another matter, of course, and the hon. Minister will reply. I am not concerned with the truth or otherwise of such things. Some hon. Members wanted to know that. The hon. Minister will kindly reply to that.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I was going to reply. I have only started. As I said, I have been very critical of the public schools myself. In fact, I have annoyed many of the headmasters at the last Public Schools Conference by saying that admission to these schools was based mostly on wealth and not on merit. We would not like to have any institution in the

[K. L. Shrimali]

country where the students cannot get admission on account of economic barriers. The poorest of the students, if they are able and intelligent, should have access to the best of our institutions. There is no doubt about it, and therefore, I have been critical of these institutions. But they are all free and independent institutions. Formerly, they were getting grants from the Government of India, but we have now stopped the grants. But I cannot close my eyes to the fact that these are very fine schools....

An Hon. Member: In what sense?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Hon. Members may have difference of opinion but let me explain.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members had raised many points, and so let the hon. Minister be allowed to explain.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: They give very good training for leadership and....

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): And for Ministership.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Because they give training for leadership.

Acharya Kripalani: Leadership to whom? To the rich? Are we to have the rich as leaders in a society which claims to be socialistic?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It may be 10 lakhs out of 40 crores.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Leadership is not the monopoly of any particular class. It can come from the rich as well as the poor. It is not the monopoly of any particular class.

Acharya Kripalani: Only the rich can get education! Why cannot the Minister face the problem squarely that only the rich can get education? That means only the rich shall be the leaders of future India.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I am facing the problem very squarely, and I would like Acharya Kripalani also to

face it squarely. There is no rule to order the closure of the schools just because these public schools are meant for rich people.

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू (सीतापुर): श्रीमान् जी मैं चाहती हूँ मिनिस्टर साहब से कि एक इनफार्मेशन मुझे वह दें। जो बच्चे इन पबलिक स्कूलों में पढ़ाये जाते हैं क्या ज्यादातर उनको इसलिये उन स्कूलों में पढ़ाया जाता है कि जब वह सरविस के लिये कम्पटीटिव एग्जामिनेशन्स में आते हैं तो उनसे पूछा जाता है कि तुम्हारी एजुकेशन कहाँ हुई है, और अगर बच्चा कहता है कि पबलिक स्कूल में तो उसको बहुत सारे मार्क्स मिल जाते हैं। तो पहले गवर्नमेंट का यह फर्ज है कि वह इस फर्क को दूर करे कि जो बच्चे पबलिक स्कूल में पढ़ते हैं उनको हायर पोस्ट्स मिलती हैं। इस लिये पहले गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से इस फर्क को दूर किया जाना चाहिये।

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Well, Sir, I have a right to express my opinion about these schools. As I said, I would like to see that these schools give admission to the poorest children and they can benefit from the education given there, and it is my opinion that admission to these schools should be based on merit and not on wealth and that the poorest child should have access to these schools. That is the reason why we have instituted a few scholarships whereby the poorest children are able to join these schools.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: That is completely a wrong policy. (*Interruption*).

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Let us face the realities. Today we need leaders for the army; we need leaders for administration; we need capable men in all fields of life. There is no denying the fact that in the competitive examinations which are held some of these boys come at the top and they are making a great contribution to

the building up of the nation. Let us not ignore the realities.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Why are you fooling the people?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: As I said, I am not an admirer of public schools. (*Interruption*). However much some may oppose it, these schools have a right to exist in this country. One cannot close them. They are independent and they are free and there is no power in the Constitution which can close these institutions.

Acharya Kripalani: May I say that the Education Minister has either misunderstood or he wants to have an argument. What I said was, either we stand by the socialist pattern or we do not. Let them keep these schools but let them not say that they are socialistic institutions. That is all. If they do not claim socialism I have no objection.

Shri C. D. Pande: There are many children of middle class people in these schools. There are poor people who get their sons admitted into these schools at considerable sacrifice.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: And the parents say that when those boys come back, they cannot fit into the Indian life, with their brothers and sisters in the House. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Let the Minister go on.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I ask, how many persons from the poorer classes have been able to get admission into these public schools? Can he give some information?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: We are giving scholarships. Subject to correction, I may say that the amount of scholarships may come to about Rs. 1 lakh every year.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Rs. 4,90,000.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Most of the scholarships are connected with the economic status. There are also students coming from the poorest sections of the society.

Pandit J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): I am told that the boys of these institutions are given special preference for recruitment to the services. Is there any discrimination of that type?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Why not repudiate that pattern?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister is not responsible for it.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I should be allowed to continue.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: But not to continue this policy.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Let us not run down an institution. They need to be reformed of course. To some extent, they should also adopt Indian culture and Indian tradition.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Why talk of Gandhiji?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister must go on.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Yesterday, Acharya Kripalani said that most of the students who go to these schools are sons of a decadent class and are congenial idiots. I have the highest respect for Acharya Kripalani. I would like to sit at his feet and learn the principles of education and Gandhism. But is this the language to be used in a spirit of non-violence and truth? After all,—(*Interruptions*). They are not prepared to listen, Sir. That is the trouble.

Mr. Speaker: I am surprised at these interruptions. Hon. Members had their opportunity to speak. Whatever is happening, the hon. Minister has to show to the world and to the House the attitude of the Government and justify it. I would request hon. Members to have patience.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: He was also making running commentaries while others are speaking.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I can continue for the whole day, but we have not much time.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He will not continue for a whole life.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Probably the hon. Member is immortal (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Such arguments and cross-interruptions should not go on.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It is a matter of policy. They constitute a small percentage, not even 12 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: I am really surprised that members should go on interrupting like this.

Acharya Kripalani: Saying they are a decadent class is nothing disrespectful.

Mr. Speaker: Even, then, saying congenital idiots.....

Acharya Kripalani: There are many who are so and they have their children. I did not say everybody is a congenital idiot. There are many such instances. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): There is an institution where the cost including boarding does not go to more than Rs. 40. The hon. Minister has highly appreciated that institution. I want to know why no grants are made available to such institutions which are appreciated by him.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I have answered all those points.

Mr. Speaker: Enough has been said on this subject. I would request hon. Members not to go on interrupting the hon. Minister. He cannot go on answering questions after questions. We had allotted six hours for

this and we have already spent more than that. I would not allow hon. Members to interrupt like this. We are the representatives of large sections of the community; let us behave with decorum.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: In my opinion, it is strong language to say that it is only the children of the decadent classes and the congenital idiots who go to these institutions. Some of these people are very competent and they do well in our competitive examinations, and they will make great contribution to the building of the society. As I said, leadership is not the monopoly of any particular class. They come from all sections of the society, poor and rich.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Destroy the rich.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: We talk of democracy. I was surprised that Acharya Kripalani adopted a totalitarian attitude and said that outright we must close down these institutions. That is not the way in which education flourishes in a democratic society. People should be allowed, or at least the parents should have the freedom to give the type of education they like.

Acharya Kripalani: I hope you will excuse me again for interrupting. I said that certain institutions will have to be dispensed with if there is going to be a socialist society, if an institution is against the principles of socialism; it must go. I have said that if you cannot abolish these schools, do not boast of your socialism. That is all.

Shri C. D. Pande: Are they incompatible?

Acharya Kripalani: They are incompatible.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: As far as my information goes, students that come to these institutions are from the middle class, upper middle class and professional classes. I do not think it is

the intention of any member of the House to suggest that the children who go there are congenital idiots. I must say here that some parents make great sacrifices in order to give the best type of education to their children. It is not as if some people like to build up houses

Acharya Kripalani: It becomes very difficult for me. When I say all students there are not idiots, then again he is repeating "all".

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I would go on repeating. When Acharya Kripalani spoke I did not interrupt him once. But now after every sentence I am being interrupted. I seek your protection, Sir.

Acharya Kripalani: What can I do? If I make a correction, he does not accept it. It is in my speech. Shall I read it out to?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: Some reference was made to democratise education. Government have been continuously increasing the amount of scholarship which they are giving to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and backward classes. Now the amount has gone up from a few thousands to more than two crores. It is continuously rising, and we feel proud that we have been able to give these facilities to these sections of society which have been down trodden and which were backward and suppressed for a long time. That is a matter about which we feel proud, the contribution which we have made towards democratic education. Let us not run down our educational system in this country as though we are completely ignorant of the good side of it. When something is done in Russia, we say it is wonderful. When something is done in England, it is a success of democracy. If we do something like this then we are criticised. I do not say that there is no failing on our part, that we have no imperfections. I do not say that. In fact, we know that we have many failures. But,

it does not do any good to anybody in the country to run down our education day in and day out. That is with regard to the points raised by Acharya Kripalani.

With regard to the points that were raised by Seth Govind Das, I am very grateful to him for his appreciation of our humble work in the development and propagation of Hindi language. It is a good thing to receive a bouquet occasionally when you are receiving brick-bats all the time. I am glad to inform the House that in order to intensify the efforts which we are already making to afford greater operation and flexibility in the development and propagation of Hindi from the 1st March, 1960 we have set up a Central Hindi Directorate which will work in the Ministry of Education, and I may assure Seth Govind Das that the person appointed will certainly be a person who is worthy of his office of Director. The Directorate will be charged with the execution of Government policy and will be broadly engaged in the evolution of Hindi terminology, preparation of standard dictionary, translation of governmental and procedural literature of a non-statutory character and all other aspects of work connected with the development and promotion of Hindi.

I would also like to inform the House that we are proposing to set up a permanent Standing Commission for the evolution of scientific and technical terminology, and I hope this Commission will come into existence in the near future.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं इस मामले में यह जानना चाहता था कि आप जो सार्वटिक टरमीनालाजी बनाने वाले हैं—जैसा कि मैंने पहले भी कई बार कहा है—यह जो अंग्रेजी टरमीनालाजी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मानी जाती है, और जो नहीं है, उसको आप लेने वाले हैं, या आप वह ऐसी बनाने वाले हैं कि जो पूर्णतया हमारी संस्कृत से प्राये और जो १४ हों भाषाओं में प्रयुक्त हो सके।

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I am an ignorant in this matter. I wish the matter may be left to the experts who can really advise in this matter. The purpose of setting up this Commission is that we should have a body of experts to give really good advice with regard to the acceptance of scientific terminology not only in Hindi but in all the regional languages.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): What about Hindi in non-Hindi areas?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I had explained that the whole purpose of the Directorate is to promote and develop Hindi.

Then I should like to inform the House that we are also taking steps for the translation of books in Hindi in science, technology and engineering so that books of good standard may be available to our students in adequate numbers. The teaching of these subjects is not possible unless books are available on these subjects. The Ministry has prepared an elaborate scheme for translation of selected scientific and technical works which are used either as source books, text-books or reference books in the various universities at graduate or post-graduate level. This work is proposed to be done in close collaboration with State Governments and universities and we are already in touch with the State Governments and universities in regard to this matter.

We are also proposing to produce popular works in cheap editions. These works will include translations of some of the better-known world classics, standard Hindi works reprinted with suitable editing where necessary in popular editions. The main purpose of this is to give incentive to the production of sufficient volume of popular low-priced literature in a form which will attract the attention and interest of the general reader including the school-going children.

A question was raised with regard to the finalisation of the typewriter. As the House is already aware, Government have already finalised the Devanagari script in consultation with the State Governments. The matter is now before the Hindi Typewriter Committee. They have been requested to submit their report as early as possible. It will be our effort to have the Hindi typewriter manufactured through the Ministry of Commerce and Industry as early as possible.

Shri Hifzur Rahman raised the question of Urdu text books.

13 hrs.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : एक सवाल में श्री पृथ्वी चहता था। मैंने ग्रहन्दी भाषा भाषी क्षेत्रों के लिये कुछ सुझाव दिये थे जो कि बहुत जरूरी हैं। उनके बारे में आप क्या करने वाले हैं ?

डा० का० ला० श्रीमाली : जो आपने सुझाव दिये हैं उन पर पूर्ण रूप से विचार किया जायेगा और उनको कार्यान्वित करने का प्रयत्न किया जायेगा।

Mr. Speaker: He must conclude now. We have to take up the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs as early as possible.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I have had so much disturbance that I will have to take some time more before I conclude.

Shri Hifzur Rahman raised the question of Urdu text books. As far as the Delhi education is concerned, this matter of non-availability of Urdu text books in Delhi was brought to our attention some time back. The Directorate of Education has already examined this position. It is true that there was really a shortage of Urdu text books in the primary and middle stage since no private publishers were willing to take the risk of printing Urdu text books the sale of which was not guaranteed. The Director of Education in order to

remedy this situation has given an undertaking to the Urdu Academy with regard to the sale of 1,000 copies of each text book at the primary department and 500 copies at the middle department. I am glad to say that they have since then brought out some text books which are selling in the market. There has been no complaint as far as Delhi is concerned for Urdu text books after the work was given to the Urdu Academy.

I must also inform the House that special grants have been given to Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu so that it may induce people to write better text books in Urdu for use in the libraries.

Some days back Shri Hifzur Rahman had also brought to my notice a book which contained some derogatory remarks about Islamic culture and religion. I am referring that matter to the State Government concerned. I would like to assure the hon. Member that in consultation with the State Governments we shall evolve suitable measures so that in future no such books may be introduced in our educational institutions. It is our duty to inculcate among our children respect and tolerance for all religions.

I must also inform the House, since this question was raised by my hon. friend, Shri Hifzur Rahman, in July 1958 we wrote to all the State Governments inviting their attention to the representations made by the Urdu speaking minority in different parts of the country from time to time alleging that fair treatment was not being meted out to Urdu in some of the States. The State Governments examined this matter. We wrote to them that each State Government should provide for instruction and examination in Urdu at the primary stage for all children whose mother tongue is Urdu. At the secondary stage also adequate facilities should be provided for the study of Urdu not only as one of the secondary languages but also as the medium of

instruction. The State Governments should also make adequate arrangements for the training of teachers of Urdu. Steps should be taken to encourage the production of text books in Urdu. In general, the State Governments should take steps to ensure that there was no discrimination of any kind against Urdu.

I am glad to inform the House that we have received replies from all the State Governments except Assam. They have assured us that there is no discrimination of any kind against Urdu and that Urdu-speaking children are being given every possible facility to study through the medium of Urdu. Whatever other steps are feasible for the development of the language are also being taken. If the hon. Members have any matters which they want to bring to my personal attention, I shall be very glad to take up this matter with the State Governments again.

My hon. friend, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, raised the question with regard to elementary education. She rightly said that in the field of elementary education we have not made as rapid a progress as we had envisaged in our Constitution. The main difficulty has been the lack of adequate resources. As she is aware, we are now aiming to have free and compulsory education for the age group 6—11 by the end of the Third Five Year Plan. The House is aware that in the other House I have already introduced a Bill for the introduction of free and compulsory education for the Union territory of Delhi. I am hopeful that during the next two or three years other State Governments will also introduce similar legislation.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What about Manipur and Tripura?

Dr. K. L. Shrivall: That also will be taken up a little later.

It is true that our progress has been slow but still, I think, during the last

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

ten years we have made quite rapid progress in the field of elementary education. In 1950-51 the number of children in classes 1 to 5 was 1·87 crores. The percentage of total number of children in the age group 6-11 was 42·1. In 1955-56 there were 2·45 crores children and the percentage was 53·1. In 1960-61 it is estimated by the Planning Commission that we will have 3·47 crores children in schools and the percentage would be nearabout 61.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: What is the position today?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: There would be, I think, a little less than 61 per cent because we hope that by the end of this year there will be nearly 61 per cent.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Can you give the break-up of the urban and rural areas?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I have not got it now but I would give that information to the hon. Member later on.

The problems with regard to the expansion of elementary education are twofold. One is that there are some States which are very backward as far as elementary education is concerned. Nearly 65 to 70 per cent of non-school going children are in backward States. Unless we tackle this problem effectively it is not likely that we shall realise our target by the end of the Third Five Year Plan. These backward States are Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Jammu and Kashmir and Orissa. Therefore we have taken a decision in this matter in consultation with the Education Ministers and the State Governments that we should give special assistance to backward States in order that they might come up to the level of other States. This matter has been very carefully examined by our advisers and we have made special studies of the problems of these four or five States which are backward.

Another problem to which Shrimati Renu Chakravarty also drew our attention is the lack of sufficient progress with regard to girls' education. We are making special efforts to speed up the education of girls so that this lag which exists between boys' education and girls' education might be removed.

Some hon. Members said that we are not giving adequate grants to the State Governments for the expansion of elementary education. I would like to inform the House...

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: How many State councils for girls' education have been set up after the recommendation of the National Committee?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I think about Bengal the hon. Member herself would know. I do not have the information with regard to all the State Governments. But I do not think many State Governments have taken action in this regard. We will write to them.

With regard to the expansion of teacher training facilities, I may say that we are giving cent per cent assistance to the State Governments so that they may go ahead with the expansion or teacher training institutions. We will be setting up new institutions if necessary so that they might make preparation for this big programme which we are going to undertake in regard to free and compulsory education.

We have also given special assistance, hundred per cent, for employment of additional teachers under the unemployment relief scheme. We are also giving hundred per cent assistance for improvement of science. For expansion of girls' education and preparation of women teachers we suggested that we would give 75 per cent of assistance, but the State Governments were finding it difficult to find matching funds. So we told them that they could utilise our funds even if they do not have a matching contri-

tribution to make. Therefore, I think there is no justification for saying that the Central Government are not giving liberal assistance to the States for the expansion of primary education.

The trouble is that the State Governments are not giving adequate attention to this problem. Normally we expect the State Government to spend 10 per cent of their revenue on primary education. Actually, some of the backward States are spending less, about six per cent. of their revenue, on primary education.

It is true we have not been able to reach our target as laid down in the Constitution, but I would like to inform the House that both in the fields of primary and secondary education, we have doubled the number of institutions between 1948 and 1958. We have done in ten years what was not achieved in the previous 150 years. Let us not forget it. The achievement is not great, we are not satisfied with it, but we must remember that we have achieved in ten years what was not achieved in the previous 150 years.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: We are not living under foreign domination now.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I have already said that we are making efforts with regard to the production of cheap text and reference books in science and technology. The Ministry of Education has already set up an inter-ministerial committee on this matter, and the University Grants Commission has also decided to develop a national programme of cheap publications of foreign titles. A good deal of progress has already been made in compiling lists of titles in various fields such as engineering, technology, agriculture, science, medicine etc. It is hoped to undertake the publication of a selection of titles in the coming year.

Another matter which has greatly worried hon. Members, and rightly so, is with regard to student indiscipline. The problem is serious and difficult,

but we have to view it in proper perspective. Though there have been occasional troubles in all parts of the country, the problem is really concentrated in one or two big places, U.P. for example. There, the trouble recurs year after year. So, the problem is not nation-wide, but is confined only to certain universities, and mainly the universities in the North, that is in U.P.

I would also like to say that the problem does not affect all the students. It has been found that students who are studying science and technology do not ordinarily participate in these disturbances. Only arts and law students who do not have much work and who think that they can just pass their examinations by cramming in the last two or three months, very often join in the disturbances. It is also found that wherever there are good, conscientious teachers who are able to establish good contact through the tutorial system, the problem of indiscipline does not arise. We have often blamed the students, but we must remember that in some places they have genuine grievances, and wherever they have been redressed with sympathy, the troubles have not arisen.

I would not like to go into all these matters in details, but political parties have also their share in this matter.

Acharya Kripalani: Including the Congress.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: You mean the Congress especially.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): The Congress have a special responsibility.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: In this matter I think we will have to adopt a more or less uniform policy. I think it should be made clear that in this country law and order must be respected by everybody. Whether they are students or teachers, everybody must respect law and order. At the

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

same time, we must, as a long-range policy, try to improve our educational system, provide all those educational facilities like hostels, playgrounds, sports etc., which would give an outlet for the creative energies of youth. This is a long-range measure and I cannot promise that within a year or two this problem will be tackled. All of us will have to co-operate and create an educational climate in this country so that everybody thinks he has a contribution to make as far as the education of the students is concerned.

Students receive their education not only within the four walls of the universities, but in their homes. Parents must exercise their responsibility. They receive their education in society. The members of the society must act with responsibility. All this talk of corruption all the time does demoralise the youth, there is no doubt about it. Therefore, we have to adopt short-range and long-range measures, and we have to attack this problem on both the fronts.

The University Grants Commission is fully seized of the problem. In fact, they have appointed a committee which is at present making an extensive study of the whole problem. They are not only studying the universities where disturbances have taken place, but they are also visiting universities where no disturbances have taken place, and are trying to find out those factors which have enabled those universities to maintain good traditions and good discipline. Therefore, I expect this report will be valuable to us, and I propose to hold a conference of the Vice-Chancellors and Education Ministers after we have received this report of the University Grants Commission on student indiscipline.

Shri Jamal Khwaja (Aligarh): May I know the response of the Minister to the suggestion I made yesterday for mental hygiene, apart from moral science, to be made a compulsory subject?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I think it is a good idea to introduce mental hygiene in our colleges and universities, but I think if we can provide a healthy atmosphere, that will have the best effect on the minds of the growing children and youth. If there is good contact between the teachers and students, and if you can provide an outlet for their creative energies, there will be no mental trouble and no need for mental hygiene.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Are there any textbooks on mental hygiene?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: A number of them.

Acharya Kripalani: As I have to go, I would like to read a passage from a report of their own. My criticism was based . . .

Mr. Speaker: He need not make a speech.

Acharya Kripalani: I am not making a speech. I am only reading out.

Mr. Speaker: Is it a matter of personal explanation as to what he has said?

Acharya Kripalani: Yes. Here is what the report says: . . .

Mr. Speaker: What report is it?

Acharya Kripalani: It is the report of the UNESCO Regional Seminar on Educational Reform for South and East Asia held at New Delhi and published by the Department. It says:

"Firstly, the education given in our schools is isolated from life. Secondly, it is narrow, one-sided and fails to train the whole personality of the student. Thirdly, until comparatively recently English was both the medium of ins-

truction and a compulsory subject of study. It has greatly hampered the studies of the students. Fourthly, the methods of teaching generally practised fail to develop in the students either independence of thought or initiative in action. Fifthly, the increase in the size of classes has considerably reduced personal contact between the teacher and the pupils. And finally, the deadweight of the examinations has tended to corrupt the teachers' initiative to stereotype the curriculum, to permit mechanical and lifeless methods of teaching to discourage all spirit of experimentation and to place stress on wrong or unimportant things in education."

Mr. Speaker: He says his speech is based upon this.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I never said our educational system was perfect. It was too strong to say that our educational system was anti-national and the rotten. After all, who runs the educational system? It is the teachers. We cannot run down our educational system to the extent that was done, I think, by Acharya Kripalani.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): Acharya Kripalani is himself a product of this system.

An Hon. Member: What of that?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: There are two other steps which we have taken with regard to this student indiscipline. As I said, we are undertaking positive measures instead of taking any punitive measures. We appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Shri Sri Prakasa to go into this question of moral and religious instruction. That report has been accepted; and it has also been accepted by the Central Advisory Board; and we are examining now what steps we should take to implement the recommendations of this report, and I hope that by the end of the year, I may be able to tell the hon. Members what steps have actually been taken.

As the House is also aware, this Ministry has under consideration a scheme of compulsory national service. The scheme was discussed at the last meeting of the Central Advisory Board. The Central Advisory Board fully endorsed the whole scheme, and now we have set up a working group to see what we can do to implement this scheme. As far as the principles are concerned, they are generally accepted. The question is whether we shall have the resources available to implement the scheme. That is the matter that is being examined.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh and Shri S. L. Saksena raised the question with regard to the Banaras Hindu University. Last time, when the Demands for Grants of my Ministry were being considered, I gave an assurance to the House that I would place the report before the House, of the inquiry into the purchase of the Zamindari Abolition Bonds. The report has been placed on the Table of the House, and I assured the House that if anybody is guilty of corruption, he will not get any protection from me, and I would like to repeat that assurance. As far as Government are concerned, a *prima facie* case has been established for further inquiry, and, therefore, we propose to make further inquiry into this matter.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai (Kheri): Who shall make the further inquiry?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: The hon. Member will be satisfied that the persons who are conducting the inquiry are persons who are impartial and in whom the House can trust.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): May I interrupt here for a minute? The hon. Minister was speaking about student indiscipline, but he has gone on to something else. I want to know whether he has anything to say about the suggestion that has been made in this respect that though moral teaching is good, yet, the practical way of getting over this trouble of student indiscipline and frustration would be to

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

have some firm machinery to select students at the end of the higher secondary stage and have places in adequate numbers for training them, and with occupations to follow. Are any steps going to be taken on that aspect?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: The University Grants Commission is already examining that question. I think I have not been able to cover all the points because I am already running late, but I would say this that both the Ministry and the University Grants Commission are fully seized of this problem.

The real problem is to provide suitable avenues for students who are leaving the high school and the higher secondary stage, and also to ensure that only those who can derive benefit from higher education should proceed to the universities. If we could have proper institutions, trade schools, vocational schools etc. that would be useful and they must be linked up with our economic life and development programme.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: That would be a reactionary step.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: And that is a matter which is receiving our attention.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: In the Third Plan, some extra personnel will be required. Could that not be linked up now, so that when the Third Plan comes, we shall be able to deal with unemployability on the one hand and also with the problem of having a proper machinery to deal with the Third Plan on the other?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Yes, the proposals are there in the Third Plan. I do not know how much money we shall get, and how much allocation would be made. But that is a problem in education, and we are fully aware of it.

श्री नरदेव स्वामी (भलीगढ़-रक्षित-
धनुसूचित जातियाँ) : संस्कृत के विस्तार के

संबंध में श्री गुरुकुलों को आर्थिक सहायता देने के संबंध में माननीय मंत्री ने कुछ नहीं कहा है।

डा० का० सा० श्रीमाली : अभी मैंने खत्म नहीं किया है।

With regard to the Banaras Hindu University, I only wanted to say this. With regard to the Zamindari Abolition Bonds, a *prima facie* case has been established for further inquiry, and further inquiry will be made into this matter.

Dr. Ram Subag Singh: Regarding this, my point was this. Now, the hon. Minister has been good enough to accept that a *prima facie* case has been established regarding the purchase of the Zamindari Abolition Bonds. But this happened because of the negligence of the Executive Committee and the Vice-Chancellor, because the Treasurer would not have invested that money had he not obtained the sanction of the Executive Committee and the sanction of the Vice-Chancellor; that is why he has succeeded in investing this money in those bonds. What action is the hon. Minister going to take against them. And what he will do particularly in respect of the students, because the students and teachers have been victimised due to this particular reason? May I know whether the action taken against them is going to be retraced now?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I do not know how the hon. Member is trying to link up these two matters. I tried to explain to him, but he just probably would not try to understand. I told him that most of these transactions took place when the previous Executive-Committee was there.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: But the same Vice-Chancellor was there.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: The Vice-Chancellor is not the authority to sanction; it is the Executive Committee

which is the proper authority. I have explained this point to the hon. Member but he just persists in misunderstanding it.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I shall continue to persist in exposing his misdeeds.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: At the time when Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer was Vice-chancellor, some transaction took place.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: He said that it was wrong.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I do not know whether any transaction took place at the time of the present Vice-chancellor. Most of the transactions took place at the time of the last executive committee, which does not exist now; they have all gone.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: But the Vice-chancellor is there.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: A new executive committee has been appointed now, and I would like to tell the hon. Member that the present executive committee consists of men of the highest repute and the highest position in public life.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: We do not want any repetition about that.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: If you doubt their integrity, there is nobody in the country whom I can place on the executive committee.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I doubt the integrity of the Vice-chancellor.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: It is no use talking about it like this. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I said that a *prima facie* case has been established with regard to the Zamindari Abolition Bonds, and I am going to make

a further inquiry into this matter. I have already given this assurance I cannot understand what more hon. Members want. The executive committee which was responsible for this is not there now.

With regard to the Aligarh Muslim University.....

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: Will the hon. Minister suspend the Vice-chancellor and the treasurer, pending the inquiry?

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: Is this the type of question that should be put?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members cannot dictate to Government. They have made their suggestions already.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I only wanted one piece of information.

Mr. Speaker: No, he cannot answer now. (*Interruptions.*) Order, please. The hon. Minister ought to be allowed to reply.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I would like to reply. But this may not be very palatable to the hon. Members who want to ruin our education to get political advantage, but I would like to tell the House that I have all the reports that I have heard.....

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): To whom is the hon. Minister referring? (*Interruptions.*)

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I have not yielded, and I am not going to yield on this matter. I cannot be interrupted like this.

Shri Rajendra Singh: The hon. Minister has imputed to some political parties the motive to ruin the educational system of this country. May I know what that party is?

An. Hon. Member: Which is that party?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He cannot make an aspersion like this.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: During the course of this reply, he has made this allegation about political parties thrice. He should be stopped from making that now. What does he mean by this? He should stop making this kind of aspersion. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is this kind of insistence? Hon. Members have got a right to point out what according to them are the defects in any particular administration, including the administration in the charge of the hon. Minister. Now, they must hear the hon. Minister. No hon. Member is entitled to force his views on the Minister, until the hon. Minister agrees, with regard to dismissal or suspension or the doing of any particular act. If the hon. Member would go on insisting upon it, I am afraid the hon. Minister can legitimately come to the conclusion that there is something behind this, in spite of his statement. I do not encourage such observations, but hon. Members ought not to indulge in this kind of insistence; they ought to know their limits; they ought not to force a Minister to say that he will do a particular thing. (*Interruptions.*) Order, please. All that anybody can say in this House is this. Unless there is a resolution before the House, in which case, the hon. Minister is bound to reply to the specific points, hon. Members, when they have their opportunities, can only place facts before the House without recrimination, and without using any unparliamentary language. That is all that can be done. Therefore, they must keep quiet now. Let him proceed. After he finishes, I shall have to go on to the other Demands.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He is making an aspersion.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: On a point of personal explanation. I only put a question and I wanted to elicit some

information. It was never my intention to force a decision on the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member asked: "Will he dismiss the Vice-chancellor?"

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I asked whether he would suspend the Vice-chancellor. That was the information that I required.

Mr. Speaker: He cannot ask the hon. Minister immediately to say whether he will do that. The hon. Member has only got a right to tell him that these are all the defects, and allow the hon. Minister to take action. Now, the hon. Minister.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I would request the hon. Member to study the constitution of the university as laid down in the University Act. The Minister cannot dismiss the Vice-chancellor. The hon. Member should understand at least this much.

Shri Tyagi: Can he not appoint one?

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: With regard to the Aligarh Muslim University, I am very sorry that an unfortunate controversy started. I was trying to avoid that controversy all the time, but, unfortunately, that controversy has been started. It is a very delicate situation.

The Aligarh Muslim University is one of our greatest national institutions. It has made great contribution to the development of Indian culture, and I have no doubt that in future also, it will continue to make great contribution to the reconstruction of our society. It is our earnest endeavour to do everything in this regard. There are certain matters which have to be looked into. A committee was appointed for that purpose, but unfortunately, that committee resigned due to some initial difficulties which arose in the first meeting which was held for discus-

ing the matters of procedure. Probably in that meeting, or a little later, the Vice-chancellor had suggested that it would be desirable for the members of the Committee, or the Secretary, or the Chairman to interview members only through the Vice-chancellor, that is, he must be apprised before interviewing any member. And there were certain difficulties with regard to the procedure also. They probably wanted to have memoranda and the Vice-chancellor was of the opinion that it would undermine the discipline of the institution if that is done. No definite decision was taken in this matter; the matters were being discussed. While these matters were being discussed, the Vice-chancellor issued a statement and the Committee felt that it may not be possible for them to work under these circumstances.

The whole thing was very unfortunate. I have discussed this matter with the members of the Committee after their resignation. They came and saw me and I have also discussed the matter with the Vice-chancellor. I do hope that the members of the Committee would withdraw their resignation and the Vice-chancellor will make amends and would put an end to this controversy. It is one of our greatest national institutions and it is the desire of everybody in the House to ensure that Universities wherever they are must be clean; the administration must be clean. We should have men of highest integrity and character in our institutions. We should ensure that every pie of the tax-payer is properly utilised. That is the duty which we must discharge and I do hope we put an end to this controversy and we will await the report of this Committee. That is all I have to say with regard to Aligarh University.

श्री प्रकाश बीर शास्त्री (गुड़गांव) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अलीगढ़ विश्वविद्यालय के संबंध में मैं माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री जी से एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। पिछली बार जब प्राधे

घंटे की चर्चा चली थी, उस समय उन्होंने सदन को यह भ्राम्यासन दिया था कि जो जांच समिति इस समय नियुक्त हुई है, यदि किन्हीं कारणों से वह कार्य न कर सकी, तो ऐसी भी स्थिति प्रा सकेगी कि विजिटर्ज कमेटी एपायंट की जाये। उस समिति ने उपकुलपति के वक्तव्य से असन्तुष्ट होकर त्याग पत्र दे दिया है। कल उन्होंने इस संबंध में वक्तव्य दिया था और उसके बाद शिक्षा मंत्रालय की भांगों पर चर्चा चली, जिस में उन्होंने विशेष रूप से और दूसरे लोगों ने एक ही विषय पर ध्यान दिया कि वहाँ फाइनैसिज का मिसयूज हुआ है — वित्तीय अनियमिततायें हुई हैं और उसी के संबंध में चर्चा की। लेकिन मैंने सदन का ध्यान केवल धन संबंधी मामलों की ओर ही आकर्षित नहीं किया था कि वहाँ पर लोग लाखों रुपये लेकर पाकिस्तान चले गये और उनको बट्टे-खाते डाल दिया गया। बल्कि मैंने साथ ही साथ इस बात की तरफ भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया था कि वहाँ पर प्रबन्ध संबंधी अनियमिततायें चल रही हैं, प्रोफेसरों की नियुक्तियों में अनियमिततायें चल रही हैं और छात्रों की एडमिशनज और एग्जामिनेशनज के संबंध में अनियमिततायें चल रही हैं। वहाँ जो लाखों रुपये की बिल्डिंग बन रही है, उनमें गोल-माल चल रहे हैं। माननीय मंत्री के वक्तव्य से यह प्रतीत होता है कि विश्वविद्यालय से संबंधित अधिकारियों को तो वह बचाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन विश्वविद्यालय को बचाने की उनको चिन्ता नहीं है। मेरा निवेदन है कि वह इस संबंध में इस प्रकार का कदम उठाये, जिस से इस समस्या का उचित समाधान हो। अब पानी मुंह तक आ चुका है और विजिटर्ज कमेटी सरकार को एपायंट करनी ही होगी।

डा० का० ला० श्रीमाली : मैं निवेदन

करना चाहता हूँ कि कल मैंने सारी बैकग्राउंड आपका बताई थी।

I had in my statement explained the whole background under which this Committee was appointed. I had practically decided to appoint a

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

Visitor's Committee. At that stage, the Vice-chancellor wrote to me that it would be desirable for the University to appoint a Committee. I had no intention to embarrass the University and, therefore, I agreed that these very members whom I was going to appoint on the Visitor's Committee might be appointed on the University Committee. I had written to the members that they should serve on the Committee and they have given their consent and it was very gracious on their part to have agreed again to serve on the University Committee. As far as Government is concerned, I would like to assure the House that this would be treated as a Visitor's Committee. On this Committee we have men of the highest integrity and character. The Chairman of this Committee after a brilliant academic career in Cambridge, had joined the Indian Educational Service.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: No need for all that history.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: I do not know why the hon. Members are not prepared to listen to me. This is something which I cannot understand.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is really strange why hon. Members should go on interrupting like this. If somebody is appointed, immediately hon. Members get up—some hon. Members, not everyone—and say, what is the status of this man? The hon. Minister says, he is a man of integrity and with such qualifications that he is competent to go into this matter. But the hon. Minister is not allowed to justify. I am really surprised why hon. Members—some of them—want to have their own way in this House. It is not proper. The hon. Minister represents a big party in this House. You want to damn the whole party because an hon. Member is in the Opposition? Then, the Opposition will rule this country and not the party in power. I am really surprised at the way in

which democracy is sought to be handled in this House.

Now, the hon. Minister will go on without any interruption. I will not permit this kind of interruptions. Again and again I am noticing these interruptions. I am giving ample opportunities, much more than the adequate opportunities, to the hon. Members in the Opposition to have their own say. They ought not browbeat the Speaker or the hon. Minister. I am really sorry.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: On a point of personal explanation.

Mr. Speaker: What is personal explanation?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I am sorry you took it the other way. I never meant it.

Mr. Speaker: This is the only way anybody can take it. The hon. Member has been here for a sufficient long time. He must know the rules of Practice and Procedure in this House.

Let the hon. Minister continue.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir . . .

Mr. Speaker: No personal explanation is necessary.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Sir, you have been given to understand that I was perhaps doubting the integrity or the character of any member of the Committee. That was never my intention. Nobody in the House has said anything about any member of the Committee. That is why I said, what is the need of all that history.

Mr. Speaker: He put the question as to why all this is necessary. The hon. Minister is not the only person. He represents about 8 lakhs of people and all of us together 40 crores of people. They are watching what exactly we are doing. The hon. Minister tries to justify to this House

and to the country at large that it is not merely an eye-wash, but really honest persons capable of looking into these matters without fear or favour have been appointed. What else is he to do?

Let the hon. Minister continue his speech.

Dr. K. L. Shrimall: I was saying that we have a Chairman who is a man of outstanding ability and character. He has risen to the highest position in education. He joined the old Indian Educational Service. He was Director of Education and also a Principal of a College. Then he became Vice Chancellor and he was also a Member of the Public Service Commission and what is most necessary is that he enjoys confidence of every section of the society. In fact, when he for the first time went to Aligarh University, he took all the people into his confidence. He told them that he was a great friend of the University and everybody felt that he was a great friend of the University, and when he found that there were certain difficulties, he did not hesitate to resign. That itself should be enough to ensure confidence and integrity and character of a person. In any case, if I have to appoint the Visitor's Committee again these are the people who would be appointed on the Visitor's Committee because I had already decided—as I told the House before—to appoint these people on the Visitor's Committee. In order not to create an embarrassing situation for the University I agreed that these very people might be appointed on the University Committee in addition to the Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Education.

I hope the members of the Committee will withdraw their resignation. I had a talk with the Vice-chancellor and Principal Chatterjee on the telephone this morning. He assured me that if the Vice-chancellor would make amends and he is

willing to withdraw the resignation. The Vice-chancellor told me that he has no intention to create any kind of difficulty for the Committee and he was going to write to him shortly. I hope this will be done within a course of two-three days and the Committee will start functioning. Let us await the report of the Committee.

Another member of this Committee is a Member of Parliament, Prof. Wadia an eminent educationist. The third member of this Committee has been working in the Audit Department for a long time and has a long experience of finance. The Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Education is the Secretary of this Committee. We could not have found a better composition than what we have for this enquiry and I can assure the House that a thorough probe will be made by this Committee which will be treated as an independent and impartial committee and for all purposes it will be a Visitor's Committee. Sir, I do not want to say anything more on this.

Another question was raised with regard to gurukuls. It is true that we have a very little provision, only Rs. 2 lakhs for the development of Sanskrit. As you are aware—you are also greatly interested in the development of Sanskrit as we all are—it is one of our great national languages which is linked up with all our cultural heritage and we should do everything possible to encourage it. The resources at our disposal are not adequate, but you were good enough to tell me that the Finance will be agreeable to give more funds if I ask for them. I would assure the House when funds are available, I will certainly like to spend more on the development of Sanskrit.

As far as gurukul is concerned, we have set up a Sanskrit Board. The Sanskrit Board has appointed a sub-committee and that sub-committee is examining what they can do to preserve these gurukuls—their special

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali]

features—and at the same time bring in line with the modern developments that are taking place in education.

I am afraid I have taken longer time than I should have done. There were continuous interruptions and I had to explain my point of view. I would like to thank the House again for all the suggestions they have given me. I may assure them that the Ministry will take full account of all these and will need their co-operation and every section of the society to build up the educational system. It is not one man's work; it is not the Government alone that can build up the educational system. We want the co-operation of the people and all the agencies including parents who are interested in the education and the reconstruction of our society.

Seth Govind Das (Jabalpur):

अध्यक्ष जी, मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ ।

I want to ask only one question.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. I am sorry.

Shri Rajendra Singh: I want to ask a question. You promised to allow questions afterwards.

Mr. Speaker: No, we have had too much of it.

Need I put any cut motion separately to the vote of the House? I shall put all the cut motions to the vote of the House together.

The cut motions were put and negatived

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums neces-

sary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1961, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof again: Demands Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 109 relating to the Ministry of Education".

The motion was adopted.

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

DEMAND No. 13—MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 38,83,000 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, 1961, in respect of 'Ministry of Education'".

DEMAND No. 14—EDUCATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 32,67,86,000 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, 1961, in respect of 'Education'".

DEMAND No. 15—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,50,48,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st Day of March, 1961, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and other Expenditure under the Ministry of Education'".

DEMAND NO. 109—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,91,000 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, 1961, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Education'".

13.40 hrs.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 16 to 20 and 110 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which 6 hours have been allotted. Hon. Members who have tabled cut motions and are desirous of moving them may hand over at the Table within 15 minutes the numbers of the selected cut motions. Each hon. Member will have 15 minutes and Leaders of Groups will have 30 minutes.

Does the hon. Prime Minister want to say anything now?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Not at this stage.

DEMAND NO. 16—TRIBAL AREAS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the sum not exceeding Rs. 9,42,09,000 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, 1961, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'".

DEMAND NO. 17—NAGA HILLS—TUENSANG AREA

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,98,92,000 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, 1961, in respect of 'Naga Hills-Tuensang Area'".

DEMAND NO. 18—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,86,79,000 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, 1961, in respect of 'External Affairs'".

DEMAND NO. 19—STATE OF PONDICHERRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,14,45,000 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, 1961, in respect of 'State of Pondicherry'".

DEMAND NO. 20—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,50,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st Day of March, 1961, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'".

DEMAND NO. 110—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 78,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges

[Mr. Speaker]
which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st Day of March, 1961, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of External Affairs'".

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central): Mr. Speaker, as we proceed to examine the Demands for Grants made by the Ministry of External Affairs, I would like to begin, in the first place, by saying how very much we on this side of the House wish for a successful outcome of the meeting which is going to take place in the near future between our Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of China. We know very well that certain clouds had appeared on the horizon and a jolt had been given to the historic friendship between our two countries.

13.43 hrs.

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

But it is gratifying to recall how the Prime Minister said all the time that he was agreeable to discussion with a view to a settlement of the difficulties which have arisen and we are all very happy that the signs now are that the clouds would break and we shall have a settlement which would redound to the happiness and the advance of the peoples of our two countries.

It is a pity, however, that certain elements in our country whom the Prime Minister some time ago characterised as vested interests still operate against relaxation and elimination of tension as between India and China. Sometime ago in this House I had asked a question in regard to a projected Afro-Asian Convention on Tibet to be held on an all-India scale with representatives from different countries attending it, and I saw in the papers lately how in Bihar a State conference, preparatory to the All-India Convention, has already taken place. And when I had asked a question, the Prime Minister assured the House that he was quite unhappy about the kind of proceeding which had gone on in

regard to this Convention. But I am afraid that, while, of course, we take the Prime Minister at his word—we know he has certainly been unhappy over this kind of proceeding—the Government has given a lot of rope, so to speak, to the sponsors of this organisation. Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan—whose rather enigmatic role in Indian politics at the present time, seems to me, a rather deplorable feature—has met Ambassadors from different countries and he has sent special emissaries abroad who, I am sure, got the facilities in regard to foreign exchange, passport and that sort of thing.

Now, even apart from this Afro-Asian Convention on Tibet however, which I think, is only a spoke in the wheel of the kind of friendship which our two countries wish to achieve, we have been very unhappy—as far as we are concerned—in regard to certain activities which have been pursued by a guest of our country, the Dalai Lama. I do not wish to say anything harsh in regard to an individual who is respected and who is considered to be a man of God, but I have the expectation that his behaviour would be in conformity with the reputation. I have discovered that sometimes he has been carrying on activities to which the Government of this country ought to have taken very serious objection, and ought to have stopped them. I feel that as far as the Dalai Lama is concerned, perhaps our Government, is, so to speak, on the hours of a dilemma. But there is no doubt that the Dalai Lama has been operating as a sort of a focus of resistance to a friendly country.

Only the other day, I saw the report of a statement which had been given by the Dalai Lama on the anniversary day of the Tibetan uprising against the People's Republic of China. The statement which is headed 'Dalai Lama's appeal to world conscience' with the sub-heading 'Do not forget fight of Tibet' appeared in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of the 10th

of March this year. Only the other day, Government appeared before this House asking for supplementary grants to the extent of about Rs. 40 lakhs in order to offer some amenities to Tibetan refugees, and at that time this point was raised. The Prime Minister, from the reply he gave, appeared to be somewhat unhappy about the position. Now the unhappiness of the Prime Minister, I expect, has been accentuated by the recent news of the appearance in India of the Dalai Lama's treasure from Sikkim or from somewhere else. I do not quite understand the proceeding in this matter. The Government of this country, from the reports which have appeared, surely gave escorts and special flying and precautionary facilities; all kinds of arrangements for transport were made, and a treasure which has been estimated to be of the value of between Rs. 50 lakhs and Rs. 13 crores has been deposited in Calcutta. As far as the Prime Minister is concerned, he told us in this House—and I have got the proceedings here—that he did not know what was the amount of the treasure, what kind of thing it is, whether it is gold or silver or all kinds of spiritual heirlooms or any other kind of valuable commodity. He was very vague about it.

This seems to me extremely paradoxical. I do not understand it. Is it a variety of legalised smuggling permitted to a very distinguished visitor, and if that is so, what is the purpose of it? The Prime Minister did not seem to know what the purpose was. He was only hoping that the money would be invested and spent in the interests of Tibetan refugees. In the meantime, we find newspaper reports about a lot of this money—part of it anyhow—having already been spent for financing certain advocates in the United Nations who were supposed to have championed the cause which the Dalai Lama has at heart. Meanwhile, there are reports in papers like the *Calcutta Statesman* in regard to the sale in Cal-

cutta of gold ingots out of the so-called treasure which belongs to the Dalai Lama.

I do not want to rub it in, so to speak. This is a very sordid and unsavoury proceeding. I do not mind the Dalai Lama remaining here. Perhaps he is out of harm's way, comparatively speaking; if he cannot be in China let him be in India. But if this treasure which he has brought through his own agency for which all kinds of facilities had been given by our Government, if this treasure is utilised for personal or private political purposes which militate against the interests of our country, then, surely, that is a scandal. I request the Prime Minister to consider this matter very carefully and I think if he does he will realise that very much more than a gentle hint is needed and the Dalai Lama should be told that the kind of behaviour to which he has taken recourse according to the reports available is not the kind of behaviour which is friendly to the interests of this country.

I wish next to refer to certain matters in relation to Naga land because this House and the country is very keen to know the policy of Government in regard to this particular matter. Recently, a conference had been held at Mokakchung where the demand for a Naga State within India but on a more or less autonomous basis has been put forward. Now, I do not wish to say anything very much about it except this that very rightly the Government has been pursuing the policy—and particularly the Prime Minister in his pronouncement has stressed it—that India does not want to absorb these people into itself and crush out their individuality. On the contrary we want the Nagas, as any other similarly situated people, to continue in their own particular way as far as it is possible, that is, in conformity with the development of the rest of India. We want real integration consistently with the maintenance of the autonomy of the people concerned.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Some time ago, there used to be a very regular demand regarding the amendment of the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution in a manner which would be satisfactory, basically speaking the legitimate aspects of the demand of the Nagas. After the Mokachung conference and after the meeting which some of the Naga representatives, according to reports, have had with the Governor of Assam, I do hope that the Prime Minister takes Parliament into confidence, to a certain extent as far as he can, in regard to this matter. We know that purely pacificatory measures will not solve this problem; and that is why it is important that we know what exactly is being done in order to solve this continuing problem.

I wish next to refer to another matter about which we are unhappy and that is the case before the World Court in regard to Portugal's alleged right of way, to Nagar Haveli. This matter has been mentioned in this House before many times, but I do wish to repeat that we made an original mistake for which we may have to pay a cost which, perhaps, might be a little too much. As a matter of fact, only the other day, a Member belonging to the Congress Party, Shri Achar, made an allegation which was not contradicted, namely, that even in regard to the representation of our case at the Hague before the World Court Government's behaviour was very objectionable. He said that Government had appointed not a proper international lawyer to conduct its case because the lawyer appointed by India who was to argue that the International Court had no jurisdiction had earlier written an article in the British publication *Year Book of International Law* upholding Portugal's contention that the International Court had jurisdiction. At that point of time you were in the Chair and you had asked a question. I am reading out the report of the pro-

ceedings in the *Statesman*. You had asked a question:

"Do lawyers give their opinions in the courts?"

Shri Achar had replied that it was possible for lawyers in municipal cases to hold one view and argue another; but that on international matters the views of international lawyers did count. I do not know the exact position. Maybe Shri Achar was not correctly informed. But the entire proceeding which we conducted before the World Court is going to recoil on our heads. The other day we were told that very soon the Court is going to give judgment. I cannot anticipate that judgment. I do not wish to express anything which would be in disrespect of the World Court. But it is a very probable hypothesis which we can make, that the finding may go against us, in which case the position as far as our giving Portugal the right of way to Nagar Haveli would be an extremely complicated matter. It would be a slap in the face, so to speak, of India's demands and it would be something which we could have avoided, if earlier, as we have urged over and over again in this House we had told the World Court that in regard to this matter we have nothing to do and we are not going to answer Portugal's claim because we consider it much too frivolous to attract any notice.

I wish also to say that I cannot quite understand why even though our relations with the German Democratic Republic are very friendly and are advancing, which I welcome, I cannot quite understand why we with the German Democratic Republic. I am not suggesting that we should break off our relations with Bonn, the Government of the German Federal Republic. But I am not happy about certain goings on in Bonn, their "revanchist" policy of claims on Poland and Czechoslova-

kian territory, of reports about rocket bases in Spain and that kind of thing. My point is, why must we appear to be truckling down, so to speak, to the Bonn people and not have full diplomatic relations with the G.D.R. Of course, I know that Government is having really friendly relations with the G.D.R. but I do wish the rightful step is taken of having full democratic relations established.

In regard to the work of our High Commission in London, I fear I have to say a few words. I have discovered from people who have been to England, particularly, the students, that nobody seems to have a good word to say in regard to the working of the High Commission. Students are not helped. I know of instances where students who applied through the High Commission's Education Department or something like that were told that they could not get admission in British Universities, while the same students writing direct to the British Universities got admission straightaway. It seems to indicate that the High Commission's Education Department is not particularly active.

I cannot also understand why for years now, the High Commission in London and also our Embassy in Washington continue to make payments abroad through foreign banks of large amounts. I asked questions in this House and I have been told that we do not have Indian bankers operating in that region. I cannot quite accept that because I know, as things stand at present, Indian banking houses are becoming so efficient and powerful that I am sure that if we want to we can get our payments through the instrumentality of the Indian banks.

I have heard also how the Indian High Commission Office in London has a week-end which is rather very long. The higher officers seem to go into a sort of hibernation. If some-

thing urgent comes up nothing can be done because the doors of the Indian High Commission Office are closed, and during the week-end nothing should be done to disturb the sanctity of the British week-end or something like that.

This reminds me also of what is known in this country as the passport racket about which we have been told in this House by Government that Government is trying to do something to punish the wrongdoers who take advantage of people in the Punjab in particular to get passports for themselves and sending them abroad and dangling before them hopes of making lots of money abroad. Then they discover that the passports are forged, they cannot make even a landing and they cannot make money in England, let alone being prosperous. Punish the wrongdoers by all means. But I say take a more humane attitude towards the credulous victims of the racketeers.

I have seen press reports which I have tried to pass on to Government where it was stated that in Italy where there was a camp where these stranded Indian nationals were living, the Italian officials and the people of Italy who stayed roundabout that area were very much kinder than Indian officials who were more scarce. Indeed they hardly make an appearance because all kinds of questions would be asked. Obviously, the people there are suffering; some of them may be rogues. But, at the same time, that attitude of sympathy that an Indian national, whether a rogue or not, an Indian national stranded abroad has a right to expect from an Indian official representing our country abroad, that sympathetic attitude is very conspicuously absent.

14 hrs.

Sir, I wish to refer also to another matter which is, to my mind, very important, and that is the continued refusal of the Government of France to complete the *de jure*

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

transfer of the Franch territories in India. I have heard the rumour—how far true I do not know—that in the French Constitution there is perhaps some difficulty which stands in the way of the French completing this *de jure* transfer of these territories in India to ourselves. But how long do we have to wait on the good pleasure of these people? We know how these people really treat the aspirations for freedom. Recently in a document issued by the French Government they have said that the Algerian independence, for which our country surely is trying to do whatever it can, an “atrocious” concept. Surely, people to whom the idea of Algerian independence is an atrocious concept would delay as long as ever that is possible such a very simple matter as the *de jure* transfer of French territories to India. In the meanwhile humiliating anomalies continue. Appeals have to be made to Paris. I was recently told of a particular case where it so happened that the Central Excise Department of our own country had confiscated certain smuggled goods in Pondicherry. It had confiscated all those goods under the Indian Customs Act. The party which felt aggrieved against the Government filed a case before the Pondicherry court against the Indian Customs. The court gave a verdict against the Central Excise. It was upheld by the Tribunal in Pondicherry which was the appellate tribunal—Tribunal Superieure or something like that. Then, the Government advocate according to the procedure had to prefer an appeal to the Cour de Cassation in France. I tried to get this matter clarified in one of my supplementary questions recently. The Prime Minister, perhaps, was not in possession of the facts. Besides,—I do not quite know whether this report that has come to me is absolutely correct—I am told that our Government is placed in the ugly predicament of having to appoint an advocate in Paris to plead before the

Cour de Cassation. In case that court decides against us a very peculiar position would arise.

Now, all this arises because we have not thought fit so far to extend the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to Pondicherry. Whether the French Government completes the *de jure* transfer or not, surely we ought to be in a position to do something about it. We have not even extended some of the salutary provisions of our legislations. The land reforms or labour Acts have not been extended yet in regard to the former French territories in our country.

Then, there is the extra-ordinary position of the Public Prosecutor who is both the accuser and the judge at the same time. Many public men have been penalised, and when they are penalised they are punished by imprisonment. If they have to pay a money fine they have to pay it in francs. That is the judgment, that is the way the French used to operate. This is a very queer phenomenon. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction, I feel, should be extended as soon as ever that can be and our salutary laws should be applicable to these old territories, and something should be done to make France see reason and realise that they cannot dilly dally over this matter of *de jure* transfer for ever and ever.

There is another matter which, I feel, also is rather important, and I do wish the Prime Minister applies his mind to it. I know that there are so many things that bother him; even so, it is important that our representatives abroad, specially in those countries who expect us to remember that they are our benefactors and we receive benefits from them, behave in a manner which is in conformity with our dignity. I do not wish to say anything against such people as our Ambassador in the United States. But sometime ago, last year, a speech by our Ambassador in the United States was reported in a paper which was founded by

my hon. friend, Acharya Kripalani, Vigil, and there the Ambassador was reported to have said at a meeting in America:

"We deeply appreciate what you have done...."

—you meaning the Americans—

"...and are doing, but it is not enough. Time is fast running out and the cause of democracy is in imminent danger."

This kind of speech is, to my mind, fantastic. It constitutes an offence against the country's declared policy of non-alignment with any power bloc. It suggests an involvement in the cold war as far as India is concerned, and it bemoans that democracy is near collapse in India and it could be salvaged only if there is more assistance from America. This kind of speech was made.

Then, the other day, in the other House, the Prime Minister's attention was drawn to certain statements reported to have been made by the Charge d'affaires in Washington. Even that shows that something is wrong, that everything is not in a very happy posture. I say this because only the other day we got—all Members of Parliament have got this—a News Letter from the American Embassy dated 9th March, 1960, where this matter of assistance to us has been rubbed in. It gives quotations from statements being made by authoritative American spokesmen who, it seems, are rather friendly disposed towards us at the moment and they want to give us even more than perhaps what we want to receive from them. The Counsellor of the Embassy for Public Affairs, American Embassy, writes to us quoting what was said by the Director of the U.S. International Co-operation Administration (U.S.T.C.M. in India), and he said:

"It is our contention that the simple concept of increased concentration of major U.S. financial resources in selected countries

will net more value for Free World economic strength than spreading our aid and assistance on a less catalytic scale among all countries benefiting from our economic programs."

This was a recommendation, very good as far as it goes, that America gives us greater assistance. But, then, there is the quotation from the current issue of the *U.S. Foreign Commerce Weekly* which, according to the Counsellor of the Embassy, reported to the American business community that—I am quoting.

"The outlook for increased U.S. trade and investment in India during 1960 is favourable because of various new policies adopted recently by the Indian Government and the quickening pace of India's economic development."

This is a link, so to speak, between certain economic policies recently taken in this country and the greater involvement of us with the financial set-up which is controlled by America and also others show how the Americans hope to benefit because of this position having grown.

Then the Counsellor quotes again from what he calls the "internationally respected *New York Times*", which refers to Indus water proposals. The *New York Times* writes:

"a billion dollar enterprise that would improve the lot of 50,000,000 people and help India and Pakistan to fortify their growing sense of common destiny in the face of the Communist menace has come a long step nearer realization with the announcement by the World Bank that six nations stand ready to join in financing the Indus River Project."

Yesterday, Sir, our Minister of Irrigation told us that the billion dollar was mainly for Pakistan. Well, in any case, we are told in the *New York Times* that this billion dollar

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

enterprise is to help India and Pakistan so that they can ward off the Communist menace and they can secure assistance from the six nations, including West Germany, who have joined in this kind of adventure.

All this, Sir, adds up to something which I do not like at all. Our position has often been stated in this House. We are not objecting to assistance coming in if it comes without strings, but we do object to foreign private investment particularly on the scale at which we have welcomed it in recent months. This kind of identification of foreign assistance and a sort of expectation from us in regard to foreign policy is a very dangerous thing. I do not say we on our part are going to walk into the trap straightaway. I do not say that the Prime Minister himself is only too ready and willing to walk into the trap. On the contrary, the Prime Minister may very well tell us, "I do not intend to walk into their trap." But the trap is being laid all the time, and the trap is being laid all the time particularly because of the economic and financial policies which of late have been pursued by the Government of this country of which the Prime Minister is the head. There can be no bifurcation between the economic policy of our country and the foreign policy of our country. We do want a policy of friendship, economic co-operation, with all countries in the world—socialist or non-socialist. We certainly do not want to be pushed into a position by these very powerful international forces into a kind of situation where our independence would be challenged.

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

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I say our independence, our non-alignment policy, would be challenged because there are straws in the air, so to speak. Only this morning, I read in the newspapers

about a press conference held in Calcutta by Shri Rajagopalachariar and there he asked for a shift from our non-alignment policy and he openly asked that India should join the anti-Communist bloc. If India wants to join the anti-Communist bloc, nobody can stop her. But all this has been happening at one and the same time: from the Tibet convention to Rajagopalachariar's press conference and the American confabulations in regard to the greater assistance with a view to ensuring that India and Pakistan join together in order to ward off a Communist menace. Most of these words are quotations which I am using. All these hang together and I do not like it at all.

I must say that as far as we are concerned there is no need for this kind of thing. We hold our head aloft in the world. It is not to the liking of some people abroad; at least in one major commonwealth country of which I have some little experience, I can see that people who matter there do not like our holding our head aloft, and if they see us in a difficulty, they gloat and rejoice over it. I have seen that kind of thing. But I know very well that it is because of the kind of non-alignment, independent, and really independent policy, that we try to pursue, we hold our head aloft and that is why when the summit conference is going to be held, India's voice is also being heard there even though India, militarily speaking, is not at all a powerful country. It is because of the moral balance which we hold, so to speak, in the world today that we have this kind of position and that is why it is only when we fight for moral objectives, for objectives which appeal to everybody in the world and particularly to the genius of our country,—it is only then—that our position is so resplendent. It is only in causes like the fight for disarmament and world peace that the position of India becomes such a very powerful factor for bringing about a better life for all the world. That is why I say that the

dangerous straws in the air which are there have got to be taken notice of.

The Prime Minister may consider that they are not dangerous at all. The Prime Minister may think that I am merely conjuring out of my imagination certain dangers which do not exist but I do say that these are facts of life, which are patent to whoever cares to see, in the structure of things at the present moment. It is very necessary that our foreign policy,—about which by and large we have had so much appreciation and which we have never hesitated to express,—it is about time that our foreign policy is linked also with certain other aspects of our internal policy to which perhaps we are not giving as much attention as we should.

There are certain other matters also to which I would refer, but I think that I have referred to certain matters of major importance, certain matters where our Government should behave a little differently from what it does, certain matters which can be rectified without any kind of a basic break-away from the policy which we have been pursuing. When the Prime Minister replies, I do hope that the Government will give some indication of its trying to behave in the only way in which we can secure the fruition of the hopes aroused by India's foreign policy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as usual, along with the budget papers we have been supplied the copies of the annual reports of the Ministries. If one compares this report of the External Affairs Ministry with the one that was presented to us last year one would hardly find any improvement in the situation. All outstanding problems in which we are vitally interested—such as Goa, Pondicherry, Kashmir, and the position of Indians in other countries—remain as they were. The only remarkable difference that we find is, while in the previous report, they gave three paragraphs for China and started by saying "Relations between the two countries continued to

be cordial", the Ministry this time has taken the pains to write as many as seven long paragraphs to explain at length that our relations with China suffered a serious setback. Yet, I feel that the whole truth has not been said. It would have been graceful to admit that our estimate on Chinese communist regime was wrong and therefore the actions that followed on that basis failed.

Our policy of non-alignment, so far as the Communist countries are concerned, is considered as wailings of a weak country. It would be wrong not to keep this in mind while deciding our attitude towards the aggressive Communist countries like China.

Much is being made in recent months to show that our policy of non-alignment is now being appreciated by both the west and the east and an effort is being made to side-track the issue by describing that there is an influx of dignitaries to Delhi in support of this contention. So far as the P.S.P. is concerned, we would like the Government to follow an effective and dynamic policy of non-alignment. But let us not forget one thing: let us not be blind to the support, real or otherwise, which the Prime Minister is receiving from abroad after the dispute with China. The west sympathises with us because the Chinese aggression fits into the pattern of Communist expansion with which they are familiar. The so-called Soviet neutrality is to drag us to the cold war as it would be evident from the speech which was delivered by Mr. Khrushchev in Parliament, attacking western aid and attacking the very system of parliamentary democracy. Never before was it more true than now that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. The finest flower of our youth has been sacrificed in Ladakh. 12,000 sq. miles of our country are under the illegal occupation of an aggressor. We have been forced to divert our resources and attention from the development projects. We cannot afford to repeat the same dangerous drama.

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

While the Government do not take any concrete steps to recover our territory from the illegal occupation of the Chinese, an extraordinary step was taken and the Prime Minister of China was invited to Delhi for a meeting at a time when the President accused the Prime Minister of China for breach of faith. The Chinese Premier has accepted the invitation and he is prepared to come to Delhi, which he considered unsuitable only in December last. Only, we have to know on which date he is coming, whether the date suggested by our Prime Minister is accepted by him or not. But the fact remains that the meeting is going to take place.

I have very carefully gone through what the Prime Minister has stated in justification of his latest stand. We disapprove the fine distinction made between meeting and negotiation. Only the other day, the Finance Minister refused to meet the representatives of the State Bank employees saying that there was no basis for negotiation and that the demands, according to him, were fantastic. But here, the Chinese Premier does not accept the basis nor is he even prepared to admit that the treatment meted out to our valiant fighters was not fair.

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah): It is not a correct analogy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is most unusual. However much the Prime Minister has tried to conceal or explain away, it is now clear from the letter that Premier Chou En-lai has written on the 26th February, that he is coming with a positive attitude and that the entire border question could be the subject of negotiation. So, it no longer remains a mere meeting of the Prime Ministers of two neighbouring countries. It is much more than that. I am sure the whole House will agree with me—of course I cannot say about my Communist friends—when I request the Prime Minister to take the Parliament into confidence

and tell us about the scope of the forthcoming talks with Mr. Chou En-lai. We want an assurance that there will be no surrender of our territory, administered or non-administered. We want to be reassured that the vacation of the territory by the aggressor will precede formal negotiations on minor rectification of borders. We want to be told in clear terms that the Government will not fall in for the propaganda about relaxation of tensions. We have not caused the tensions, and if China genuinely desires relaxation of tensions, she should quit our land.

Having said this much about it, let me also say a word about the forthcoming meeting. Let it be very clearly understood that the people of this country have no interest in this meeting. They hate those responsible for the invasion of our country. Mr. Chou En-lai, therefore, will be a guest of the State, not of the Indian people. (*Interruption*). We may not demonstrate against him, as he is coming as the guest of the Government. But we have the right to dissociate from any public function in his honour. In their anxiety to show the Chinese Premier our cordiality, as has been exhibited now, which I am sure the Indian people are not willing to do, let not the Government make any attempt to build up receptions of the people etc. It may have a very unwholesome effect which all of us want to avoid. Let the Chinese Premier know that he is disliked by the people, as the head of an aggressor nation which he controls and directs. I would, therefore, urge very earnestly upon the Government to make it a formal visit and to discuss this matter in a calm and quiet atmosphere.

In view of the situation and the action of the Chinese, our relations with border countries such as Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim have become important. We welcome the recent visit of Nepalese Premier to our country and the economic aid that has been agreed upon. I have gone through these reports and I feel that probably

we have not done all that was necessary to bring Bhutan nearer to us. Although it is independent, it is linked up with us in defence. I go so far as to say that the fate of Sikkim and the fate of our border district of Darjeeling is more or less linked up with the fate of Bhutan. This has become vulnerable in view of the concentration of Chinese troops on the other side of the frontier, as I learnt from very responsible people during my recent visit to these areas in January last. Very little information is available in these areas regarding Bhutan and all sorts of gossips are brought in by the interested parties. I was told that even our intelligence officials were not in a position to counteract any such propaganda as there is no source to get correct information. It is essential that a direct road connection should be established from Kalimpong to Bhutan so that it may open up trade channels and other sources.

As regards Sikkim, the people of Sikkim are really grateful for the economic aid of India, with which various development works have been carried out during the last so many years. But they have a grievance that no responsible government has been established there. They naturally expect that the same political and democratic rights be made available to them, as is being enjoyed by people in other parts of India. We are running too much of a risk. I would say, by depending on the ruling family. I feel the Government of India has a duty to the people of this area and it should use its influence without any delay to see that the political aspirations of the people of Sikkim are satisfied. So far as I know, all political parties in Sikkim want full responsible government.

Shri Tyagi: Does the hon. Member expect our Government to interfere in their internal matters?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I do not want our Government to interfere,

but let them use their influence through their Political Adviser there. If only my hon. friend had listened carefully, I used the word "influence". We have so many sources there and, as my friend is very much acquainted with the administration of the country, he would be familiar with them. I do not want to go into the details of it.

I would again urge in this connection, as I did on a previous occasion, on the Government to see that the camp of the Tibetan refugees is shifted to some other place in Punjab or NEFA, which are not nearer to the Tibetan border but whose climate would be suitable to the Tibetans. I would also urge on the Government to seriously consider the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees. There is no question of their going back, it seems now.

Another question that arises out of this is: what is our attitude towards the Tibetan nationals? How are we treating them in our country? Are they to be treated as nationals of Tibet or are they being treated as Chinese nationals? I also heard a complaint in Kalimpong that Tibetans who had lived in India for a number of years, who had been enrolled in the electoral list and who had voted in the last general elections are now being made to register afresh and asked to leave Kalimpong. I would request Government to enquire into this matter. When the Chinese trade agency which is practically working as a centre of conspiracy in this country and no limits have been put on its officers who are going round all over Bengal and other parts, to put restrictions on Tibetans, who had lived here for years. I do not think, is proper.

I have heard what my friend, Shri Mukerjee, has said about the treasure of Dalai Lama. It is a matter between the Dalai Lama and the Government;

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

it is all their concern and I do not want to say anything about it. I have a feeling that it is not proper for us to put restrictions on Dalai Lama, since we have made it a condition, and which he accepts, that we would not permit him to function as a Government of Tibet, or to organise any movement against Tibet. He may be perfectly within his right to do so, but since we have put these restrictions, I think we should not put any restriction and permit him to express his opinion fully so that he can educate the world opinion against the atrocities committed by the Chinese in Tibet. At the same time, I am rather unhappy that when the Government, for some reason or other, is not able to do anything when non-official efforts are being made by organising Tibetan Convention, this or that, to focus the attention of the world to this Tibetan problem, our Government is rather making statements which damage such attempts rather than encourage them.

Having said this much, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to another problem, and that is the problem of Algeria, which has assumed great importance in view of the recent trend of events. It seems that an attempt is being made to divide the country. I wish our Government take a positive stand and adopt a positive policy. I think the Indian people as well would like the provisional Government of Algeria to fight the present French Regime there and achieve independence for Algeria.

The question of Africa also comes in along with this question. We all know how important that problem is. I only want to draw the attention of the Government to the regrettable role that some of the Indians are playing in Africa. They are aligning themselves with the European vested interests and thereby siding with the enemies of African people. I think the Government through its propaganda machinery must do something to make

it clear that we have nothing to do with such Indians who are behaving as enemies of the people who are fighting for freedom. I read in the papers that the Prime Minister might undertake a visit to Russia again. I would suggest—I hope he will excuse me for suggesting this—that it is better for him first to give priority to paying a visit to Ghana whose invitation, I am told, is lying with him.

The next point I want to refer to is about diplomatic relationships. It seems that the Government is following a very strange policy. We have diplomatic relations with the Fascist regime of Spain. I am told presently a Press Delegation is also touring our country at our own expense. The status of the Mission in the puppet regime of Hungary has been raised to Embassy level. These are dictatorial countries. It is really ununderstandable as to why we still hesitate to have diplomatic relationship with Israel. It is a socialist country and there is so much in common between us. The fear of estranging Arab opinion, according to me, has no validity. Even small countries like Ghana, Burma and Yugoslavia, which have the best of relations with Colonel Nasser, have diplomatic relations with Israel.

Shri Kasiwal: Not Yugoslavia.

An Hon. Member: It has.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Yes, Although we have no diplomatic relations with East Germany—I hope there will be none at present—it seems that even trade and other common facilities that are extended in the case of East Germany are not being given to Israel. I hope the hon. Prime Minister would consider this very seriously.

I would now refer to the administration of this Ministry. I have very

carefully gone through the Budget and the reports. I venture to say that there are more officers at the top level than necessary. I doubt whether any attempt has been made for rational distribution of work in this Ministry. I would think that the two officers, the Secretary General and the Foreign Secretary, are overlapping each other. If the Foreign Secretary and the Commonwealth Secretary, according to the Report, are dividing functions among themselves one fails to see the necessity of a Special Secretary again to look to the administrative side. This Ministry seems to have more administrative staff than those engaged in the work of policy-making which should be the actual job of this Ministry. On account of these factors I feel that most of the officers in the Foreign Service suffer from lack of directive. It seems no talking points or hints are given to our young officers in regard to public relations in the countries to which they are attached.

I do not also find any economic section functioning in this Ministry as it is in other countries. As you know, we are developing trade relations with different countries in an increasing number. A list of those countries would be found in this Report. I doubt very much whether the Foreign Ministry is in a position to advise the Commerce Ministry as to the political aspect of the trade agreements that they are going to follow or they are going to make. Therefore it is necessary that something should be done in this respect.

Then I would draw your attention to another aspect, that is, the information services. Our diplomatic personnel seem to be handicapped by the paucity of information from home. A recent visitor to Warsaw was telling me that during the Kerala crisis last year the Embassy had no other means of having information except the British newspapers which reached there two or three days late. The local press was not suitable because of the language and also because of their slant towards the Communists. Even

with regard to the China issue, I was told, the same difficulties were experienced. It would be better if the Government economised on supplying our Missions with all types of journals and diverted that expenditure to the expeditious despatch of news from home. For instance, I was told that in the Visitors' Room in Indian Missions all over Europe one finds a very recently published Weekly of Delhi. I do not know whether any hon. Minister is connected with it or not. It is very widely displayed. This paper has made it a special job to vilify democratic socialist movement in this country.

Some Hon. Members: Can we know the name of that magazine?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Link.

To the passport policy my hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee, has already referred. I endorse what he has said. But at the same time I am surprised that after 13 years of independence a citizen of our country has not got this right of travelling abroad without let or hindrance. It is left to the whimsical policy of the officers. For genuine cases it takes months to get a passport. But if one has influence or if one knows how to pull wires, he can go abroad even for joy rides. To eliminate corruption the Government should lay down a policy that every Indian national eligible for a passport should get it for five years as a matter of course and that the procedure should not take more than three weeks.

Connected with this, of course, is the question of foreign exchange. It is not a direct responsibility of this Ministry, I know. But I would think that much of the trouble would be removed if the Government fixed an amount, which will be automatically available to every traveller, in foreign exchange and that very few people get more.

The last point I would refer to is about Goa and Pondicherry. My hon. friend has already referred to it.

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

Really it is a question of how long you can wait. The French Government, at least the present Government, is known for its quick action. In the last Report it was said that it is hoped that the ratification would be made by the new Government of France without delay. Now a year has passed. We do not understand why this delay is occurring. Let the hon. Prime Minister take this matter a little more seriously.

About Goa I want to say this much that the Government is responsible for the present state of affairs in Goa because the Government practically prevented the Indian people from taking action, non-violent and peaceful of course. A Government inhibited by its so-called policy of non-alignment was not able to liberate our land from this foreign possession.

An Hon. Member: Liberation.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: They prevented the people from going there. During the whole year it seems they have slept over the matter. We do not know actually when the Goan people would really be free and will be within the administrative boundaries of India as a whole.

Shri Kasliwal: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demands for Grants of this Ministry. The Report that had been circulated to all Members of Parliament contains two items about which I want to speak. One relates to disarmament. I particularly want to speak about disarmament because I believe that Government have made a great contribution towards trying to achieve disarmament.

This House will recall that at the 12th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, when the Soviet Union had put forward a resolution about the composition of the Disarmament Commission of all members of the U.N. that resolution was defeated. At the 13th Session, however, India and

Yugoslavia put forward a resolution. That resolution was successful. Under that resolution the Disarmament Commission came into being consisting of all the 82 nations which are members of the United Nations. But this Disarmament Commission did not make much progress. Therefore again India took the lead and in the 14th Session a resolution was again unanimously adopted. That resolution was sponsored again by India and Yugoslavia saying that a Disarmament Committee should be formed and should go into the entire question of disarmament. The Disarmament Committee has met yesterday, and I wish godspeed to its deliberations. I am sure that India which has all along made a contribution towards disarmament will continue to do so under the able leadership of our Prime Minister.

With regard to the cessation of nuclear tests, we have all along been putting forward resolutions in the U.N. and they are continuously being passed. It is to our credit that we raised this question in the U.N., but there is one thing which is very painful, and that is that, although France has agreed to these resolutions, it has now exploded a nuclear bomb in the Sahara. I want to record my emphatic protest against the French action in this connection. It is reported in the papers that only yesterday M. Jules Moch made a statement about the cessation of nuclear tests, and they have all along agreed with our resolutions on the cessation of nuclear tests, and so it surprises me that they exploded this bomb.

In the matter of outer space again, India has played a leading role. The House will recall that in the thirteenth session an Outer Space Committee was formed but it was not acceptable to the Soviet Union. India refused to join the committee as a member, and for a very right reason, namely that the Soviet Union, who were the leaders in the matter of outer space, were not taking part in that committee. But this year, again with

our efforts, the difficulty has been resolved, and a committee consisting of ten members has been formed. I believe this committee will now function effectively and deal with matters of outer space.

During the twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the U.N. General Assembly we had the item of Antarctica inscribed in the agenda of the U.N. General Assembly, but every time it came up for discussion, it was withdrawn. I find that in the fourteenth session the question came up and a committee has been formed in which India is not a member. It is rather surprising that India is not a member. India is vitally interested in this question. The existence of India depends upon Antarctica, the monsoon breezes that blow from that side are the ones which give rain to India, and all the time India has taken a leading part in this question. So, it surprises me that India was not taken as a member of this committee on Antarctica. Probably the Prime Minister, in his reply, will be able to throw some light on this.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee raised the question of our lawyers' delegation to the Hague Court of International Justice. In 1957 when this matter came up at the Hague Court, I was present. I was present for a whole week from the very beginning, and I want to tell this House the very great impression that our delegation made at the Hague Court. Everybody was surprised that Indian lawyers were so capable. The delegation was led by our Attorney-General, and some of the most able lawyers in the world were with us, such as Sir Frank Soskice, the former Attorney-General of the U.K., as also three or four other able lawyers from Switzerland and other countries. The same delegation went in 1959. I am rather surprised to find it stated that some lawyers were changed since they held different views etc. I can assure the House that as far as my knowledge goes, we have put forward our case to the very best of our ability. Of course, the

judgement ultimately depends on the Court, but I have no hesitation in saying that our case has been presented very well.

As the House is aware, a meeting between the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of China is going to take place very soon, and I wish godspeed to their talks. I hope those who have all the time been saying that there should be no talks will stand corrected. Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, who preceded me, trotted out the same ceaseless arguments that the P.S.P. has been giving in this House, saying that there should be no negotiations.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want to correct him. I never said there should be no negotiation. I wanted that the scope of the negotiation should be stated here.

Shri Kasliwal: Acharya Kripalani has said here every time that there should be no negotiation, and asked why we have invited the Chinese Prime Minister. That is what you have, in effect, said. I do not want to go into the background of the letters which has resulted in this invitation. The letters are there, and already they have been a subject of discussion. But it is very clear that there is no alternative to this invitation, unless we decide to go to war.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You have also repeated the same argument.

Shri Kasliwal: Shri Surendranath Dwivedy said that the people would not take kindly to such an invitation. I am really surprised at the way he has spoken, as if he is the only representative of the people in this House of more than 500 Members.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: As if you are the only representative. We are all representatives. We have got our own views and we express them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member should address the Chair.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): He will be our honoured guest.

Shri Kasliwal: All formal respect has got to be given to the Prime Minister of any country who visits us.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): He is, in fact, an aggressor.

Shri Kasliwal: It is not a question of aggressor, nothing of the sort. You have seen the letter of the Prime Minister of 5th February which makes it very clear that there is no basis for negotiation, that there is no meeting ground and all that, and yet he has accepted the invitation. Do you mean to say that we will reverse our position? That is not possible. (*Interruption*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There should be no aggression here.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Since you are there, there can be no aggression.

Shri Kasliwal: Shri Dwivedy also raised the question of Algeria. I think there is no country in the world which has had greater sympathy with Algeria, with Algerian suffering than India. There have been questions in this House, there have been resolutions, the Government have all along expressed their sympathy for Algeria.

I do not want to take more time of the House except to say, as Shri Dwivedy himself said, that on the whole our policy of non-alignment has been greatly successful. I only remind the House of the last few months when the two greatest leaders of the two most powerful countries that the world has ever seen stepped on Indian soil within two months of each other. I am sure when the history of our times is recorded, India's foreign policy will be written in letters of gold. Posterity will remember our foreign policy.

With these remarks, I support the Demands of the Ministry.

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): I have great pleasure in supporting the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs. The debate on the Demands of this Ministry gives scope and opportunity to the House to discuss the foreign policy of the Government.

At the outset, I wish to express the sense of the House, and I am sure the entire House will agree with me except perhaps a few Members, the hope that the talks between the two Prime Ministers may be successful. The Government has taken a firm stand and expressed itself in unequivocal terms. The Chinese Prime Minister has accepted the invitation knowing our stand, and let us hope that the meeting would bring about a settlement.

The Chinese Prime Minister will be an honoured guest of the country. It is not correct that some parties should say that they would not like to associate themselves with his visit. Let them not. The entire country is behind our Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister of China will be received like any other foreign dignitary with all the respect that is due to him. It is not proper for the House to discuss at the present moment any further regarding the Chinese aggression. Let us leave it to the two Prime Ministers, and let us create a congenial atmosphere and a climate to enable them to come to a peaceful settlement. It was said some time ago, and even now, my hon. friend Shri Surendranath Dwivedy has hinted that there is no point in meeting the Chinese Prime Minister because China is the aggressor. Supposing this meeting would fructify and some settlement could be arrived at, then will not the country be deprived of the settlement, if this meeting did not take place? Therefore, at this juncture, it is not correct for the House to express any such opinion regarding the forthcoming visit of the Chinese Prime Minister.

My hon. friend Shri Surendranath Dwivedy also referred to the reported statement of Shri C. Rajagopalachari that India should join the anti-communist bloc. When such a statement is made, we cannot but remember and realise the basic principles of our foreign policy. Our foreign policy is that we do not join any bloc. The whole world is divided into military blocs. We want to avoid one bloc or the other, and, therefore, we are in an advantageous position, and we are in an intervening position, so that our country is not dragged into one bloc or the other. Even the joint pact with Pakistan, which has been suggested by some persons is not in our interest, because it goes against the basic principles and the basic philosophy of our foreign policy.

My hon. friend also referred to Goa, Pondicherry and Kashmir and said that these questions had not been settled, and they are where they were. But he has not been able to suggest any solution to the problem. How are we going to solve this Goa problem? Has he any solution to offer? And yet, he is again and again raising these questions.

Some time ago, I read a news item in *The Hindustan Times* published in January, 1960, to the following effect. With your permission, I would read out just a few portions from that report. It says:

"Dr. Salazar, Portuguese Premier, had great regard for Mr. Nehru, although the Portuguese political set-up and present policy towards India did not permit him to express his feelings, according to one of the topmost leaders of Portugal quoted by Mr. M. D'Souza, President of the Goan National Union, here today."

Further on, it says:

"Dr. Salazar belonged to the group which favours an early and amicable settlement on Goa. The other group is opposed to such a

settlement. Dr. Salazar felt that Portugal must relinquish its hold on the possessions in India and consolidate its hold in Africa for various political and economic reasons."

Again, it says:

"The Portuguese Premier and some of his colleagues highly appreciated the atmosphere prevailing in India, particularly in relation to the Goa dispute, and thought the conditions were still favourable for an amicable settlement on the British and French analogy."

So, there is bound to be a change in the Portuguese attitude. We have seen the British and French Governments giving up their hold over colonial possessions, and I am sure Portugal also will follow suit. The forthcoming visit of the President of U.S.A. to Portugal may yield some favourable results. Therefore, let us not get agitated over this issue, as it is bound to be settled, and the method for arriving at a solution is through peaceful negotiation. Portugal is a member of the United Nations, as we are. Therefore, we have to explore all those avenues of peaceful settlement. It is no good raising this question over and over again.

Regarding Kashmir, the matter is before the Security Council. So, nothing more can be done at the present moment.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, referred to the reported speech of the Indian Ambassador at Washington and said that he demanded more aid, on the ground that democracy in India is in danger, and he added that a trap has been laid, and we are going slowly to enter the trap. It is not correct to say so. We are not begging any country for aid, because every advanced country in the world has come to realise that prosperity like peace is indivisible, and there cannot be prosperity in one part of the world and poverty

[Shri Jaganatha Rao]

in the other. They realise that under-developed countries have to be given the economic aid that is necessary, so that they come up to a state of economic stability. It is because of this growing realisation on their part, that these countries are coming up to render economic aid to all the undeveloped countries. We are not accepting it as recipients or as donees; we say we have a right, because a prosperous country is bound to assist and come to the aid of undeveloped countries. It is not correct to say that our economic policies in India are linked with the capitalistic policies of America thereby. We have got our own economic basis, and we are not going to follow the American economic policy or the centralised economy of Russia. We have our own economic basis, and we are now trying to build up our country in order to bring about a rise in the standard of living of our people, particularly in the villages.

Further, I would say that every country in the world has developed its economy only by external assistance; America has done it by assistance from European capital, and Russia by assistance from America to build up its economy. Therefore, it is not correct to say that we are entering the trap that has been laid for us.

My hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, also referred to the counsel that have been engaged by us at the International Court at the Hague. I would say that it is the privilege of a lawyer to hold different views on any subject. At one time, he may have one view, while at another time, he may have another. It does not mean that he would be quoted; it does not mean that the case would be lost simply because at one time earlier he had a particular view. Perhaps, he might not have had sufficient material before him to hold a particular view, and in the light of the material now available, he may take a different view. I may say that our side has been assisted by a galaxy of lawyers, and all the material has been placed before them, and, therefore,

there can be no fear that our case at the International Court of Justice at the Hague would suffer.

Our policy of non-alignment and non-intervention in others' affairs has won appreciation all over the world. It has been endorsed by my hon. friends Shri Surendranath Dwivedy and Shri H. N. Mukerjee also in this House. It is this policy that has won for us a unique place in the international world. At the United Nations, our voice is heard with respect. Every other delegation wishes to know what stand India would take. Even the big countries like the U.K. and the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia consult our delegation and then only formulate their views.

This year, in the Fourteenth Session of the General Assembly, we sponsored an item regarding the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee and also approved by the General Assembly, and we can take credit for that. We have been responsible to bring the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. together and a 82-nation resolution on total disarmament was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly.

We have been championing the cause of the colonial peoples, and we have been responsible to a great extent in seeing that the administering Powers give up their hold on the territories under their administration now and enable them to attain independence. On the 1st of January this year, the French Cameroons became independent, and French Togoland is going to become independent from 27th April this year, and so also Nigeria on the 1st October, and Italian Somaliland on the 1st of July, 1960. A little later, the British Cameroons would also become independent, and also Tanganyika in the latter part of this year or early next year. We have been responsible for the freedom or independence of these colonial people. We have been responsible also to a great degree in seeing that the administering Powers fix a time-table and target dates for the self-govern-

ment or independence of these colonies. And I speak with justifiable pride that the foreign policy which we have been pursuing and the foreign policy which is being interpreted in the United Nations, has won the appreciation and respect of the entire world. From this year, the South African Government agreed to co-operate with the United Nations and agreed to submit annual reports about the progress that is being achieved in South Africa and also in South-West Africa. South-West Africa was formerly a trust territory under the administration of the South African Government. Till this year, South African Government refused to co-operate with the United Nations and did not recognise the supervisory powers of the United Nations on the ground that the United Nations is not a successor to the League of Nations and that Article 7 of the mandate agreement would not apply to the United Nations. But this year, I may state that the South African Government agreed and the South African delegate took part in the discussions in the Fourth Committee and agreed to co-operate with the United Nations and the Commissions that would be appointed from time to time to go into the question of the progress of the people in the fields of education, economy and the political life of the country.

15 hrs.

In conclusion, I would say that the foreign policy of our country has won for us the appreciation and the position in the international world which no other country, however militarily strong it may be, could win and, therefore, we should be proud of the policies we have been following with success. Sir, I support the Demands for Grants of the Ministry.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to suggest that full diplomatic support should be accorded to Pakistan on the question of Pakhtoonistan. Both India and Pakistan would be weakened and dictatorship would triumph throughout

the Afro-Asian land mass if the process....

Shri Dinesh Singh (Banda): Pakistan is already a dictatorship.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: May I ask him to repeat what he said?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should not listen to the interruptions.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Both India and Pakistan would be weakened and dictatorship would triumph throughout the Afro-Asian land mass if the process of Balkanisation is not checked in time. It would be a suicidal folly on our part to sacrifice long-term interests at the altar of short-term interests. Our conflict with Pakistan over Kashmir should not blur our vision.

Pakhtoonistan is no solution of the problems of conflict between Pakistan and Afghanistan. The vivi-section of India has in no way solved the problems of conflict between India and Pakistan. There is no reason to suppose that with the establishment of Pakhtoonistan good relations will be established between Pakistan and Afghanistan. The only solution of all the problems of conflict in international politics is the integration of Russia with the Afro-Asian land mass. It would take time to achieve this goal but till then all the problems of conflict will remain in tact.

I am opposed to Pakhtoonistan because it can never be a viable unit in any sense of the term. And to talk of Pakhtoonistan and self-determination in the thermo-nuclear age is sheer obscurantism. No Nation State is a viable unit now; neither India, nor China, nor Russia, nor America. The right of self-determination runs counter to the dominant tendencies of the age. The world is moving fast towards political integration for Nation States have become obsolete. President Wilson's ideas of self-determination led to the vivi-section of Europe. The result was the out-break of the Second

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

World War. The Second World War broke out on the issue of Polish independence. Hitler stood for self-determination for all Germans living in non-German lands. The demand for Pakhtoonistan smacks of Hitlerism.

I am opposed to Pakhtoonistan because I stand for all centripetal forces. I can never align myself with any centrifugal tendencies. I am opposed to self-determination for Naga lands, Kashmir, Pakhtoonistan, Hungary and Tibet. We know to our cost what self-determination means. Only reactionaries who are opposed to the political integration of the world uphold the banner of self-determination. Was President Wilson's advocacy of self-determination merely a cover for the American policy of preventing the political integration of Europe? The right of self-determination of Nation States is a negation of the concept of individual self-determination. The right of the individual to rise to the full height of his being can be guaranteed only within the framework of a World Government. Man cannot be free in the full sense of the term as long as Nation States exist. If Pakistan withdraws from the CENTO and the SEATO, both Afghanistan and Russia would become friendly to her. All talk of Pakhtoonistan will become a thing of the past and the Kashmir problem will be solved the day Pakistan withdraws from the CENTO and the SEATO. What disturbs Pakistan is the growing realisation that as a result of a political settlement between Russia and America, the CENTO and the SEATO will be liquidated. If such a political settlement is arrived at and if Russia is not confronted with the offer of a federal union by each and every country of the Afro-Asian land mass, Russian hegemony would be established over North Africa and West Asia. All the nations of the Afro-Asian land mass will rally round India if our Government makes an offer of a federal union to Russia and China. An offer of a federal union to the smaller countries of Asia will be interpreted by them as an offer of a dominion status. It lies

within the power of both China and Russia....

Shri C. D. Pande: May I know what India's status would be in that federation?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: India's status will be enhanced because all the nations of the Middle East and the South-East Asia will rally round India within the confederation in which both Russia and China are partners. It is an elementary truth which does not require much intelligence to understand it. It lies within the power of both China and Russia to torpedo any scheme of a federal union from which they are excluded. If the offer of a federal union is rejected by China and Russia, we should transform the United Nations Organisation into a World Government by surrendering to it the task of conducting and controlling our foreign policy and defence forces. This is the only way of averting the threat of white and Communist hegemonies. The days of foreign policy and diplomacy are over. One by one, all the nations of the Afro-Asian land mass will surrender their national sovereignty at the altar of the United Nations Organisation if India takes a lead in this matter. The constitutional and primary responsibility of defending India must be foisted upon the whole world, for singly India cannot withstand the onslaught of either the Sino-Soviet or the Russo-American Powers. The advent of the nuclear age has strengthened the position of the weaker nations *vis-a-vis* the big States. Big nation-states cannot establish hegemony over the weaker states by subversion if the United Nations Organisation is transformed into a World Government. Big Nation-States used to establish hegemony over the weaker nations by conquest. But now war is out of the question. Only the U.N.O. can become the third force between Russia and America. No third force can be evolved outside the U.N.O.

The danger of China becoming an autonomous centre of power can be

averted only by transforming the U.N.O. into a sovereign body. Sovereign nation states cannot be bundled into a third force, for all nation states are enemies of one another by virtue of the imperatives of power politics in a world of anarchy. Outside the U.N.O., there is no cementing force to bind the sovereign nation states into a third force. The NATO has failed to bring any harmony in the foreign policies of England, America, France and Germany.

It is ridiculous to talk of an anti-Communist front of the countries of South-East Asia. An Indo-Soviet *entente* alone can avert the growth of Chinese expansionism in South-East Asia. It is not possible for America to bless any plan of an anti-Communist front in South-East Asia because America and Russia, as a result of the impending summit meeting, may become one for all practical purposes in the sphere of international politics. If the summit meeting fails, the result may be the establishment of a Sino-American *entente*. How can any anti-Communist front be formed if China and America agree to pursue any common policy in South-East Asia?

Both England and America are keen to establish good relationship with China and Russia. Will America make a public declaration that if within a specified period of time China does not walk out of the Aksai Chin area, she will come down on China with all her bombs and rockets? The truth of the matter is that China has become more important to America than India. The American Government is not supporting India on the border dispute with China. My estimate of the situation, based partly on Mr. Herter's statement on our border dispute with China, has turned out to be true. America is not interested in halting Chinese expansionism in S.E. Asia. The only Power that is interested in halting Chinese expansionism in S.E. Asia is Russia and Russia alone.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): At the outset, one may be permitted to express one's gratification on behalf

of this House and of the country for the bold invitation the Prime Minister has extended to Mr. Chou En-lai to come to India and have a conference. It would be equally proper and sincere not to conceal one's pleasure that Mr. Chou En-lai has accepted the invitation, and that his reply has been couched in exceedingly cordial and friendly terms.

It is true China has occupied our territory. It is true she has been unjust to us. It is also true that China has stabbed us in the back, particularly in the famous Ladakh incident where a number of our young men died. But if this tension were to continue unabated and if the proposed talks next month are not going to be the beginning of the end of this tension, what is going to happen between us? A havoc would be wrought on both our countries. This is the danger which we have to avoid, and avoid in a wise manner. The Prime Minister has taken courage in both hands and after a long period, during which my hon. friends opposite condemned the actions and attitude of Government, after that process was halted, he sent out an invitation, and next month the two Prime Ministers will meet to discuss these issues in a calm atmosphere. It must be said to the credit of the Opposition Parties that they want to sit in dignified silence, that they do not want to create any trouble, that they shall throw open the doors of India to an honoured guest, as India has thrown open her doors all these thousands of years to all types of people—even invaders—and we hope and pray that these talks at the conference will be a success and thereafter negotiations will go on between officials on both sides until we succeed.

Friends, we should understand and recognise....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. This is not a public meeting where we say 'Friends'.

Shri Joachim Alva: Hon. Members,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should address the Chair.

Shri Joachim Alva: I bow down to you.

Sir, unfortunately, platform speakers like me suffer from the disadvantage of interruptions from you. You know that most of us are platform or public speakers. Anyway, I bow down to you. Acharya Kripalani suffered from the same thing yesterday. I am a smaller fry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Acharya Kripalani had no complaint about my interruption. He welcomed it.

Shri Joachim Alva: I felt like complaining when he was interrupted. But I bow down to you. I am a smaller fry. But I want to mention that when a speaker is on his legs and is interrupted, the trend of his arguments is gone.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This cannot be helped.

Shri Joachim Alva: The Prime Minister was faced with a very difficult situation. He is the formulator, designer and originator of our foreign policy. History does not give many chances for reconciliation. Mr. Chou En-lai threw out many hints for a round table conference. He had suggested a meeting in Rangoon, with which some of my hon. friends found fault. The atmosphere in India was very hot for him in the sense that there were attacks in Parliament, and outside Chairman Mao's picture was dishonoured.

I had been in China last year and I saw with my own eyes how Chairman Mao is hailed there as the Liberator of China. He is a hero worshipped by the Chinese millions. If you want to know the history of China, you must know about the March to Yenan; what that has meant to them is of much greater significance than even the Dandi March is to us. Thousands of people perished on the way through the snowy mountains and

grassy lands and the rest reached their goal. The foreigners who treated the Chinese like dogs were hurled out.

In that situation, we have to understand the background to this problem. Our differences have to be settled in the generation of Chairman Mao and Premier Chou En-lai and Prime Minister Nehru. The President and the Prime Minister of India are the last leaves on that fading tree—the tree being the last instalment of our freedom fighters. And when that instalment shall have vanished from the face of this land, we shall be ready with the next generation in India as well as in China which may not tolerate any such situation. Chairman Mao and Premier Chou En-lai are great statesmen in their own country, and when the next layer of the Chinese comes, that layer may be fanatic, strong and intenable. Today we are led by our Prime Minister who has been the expression of our great freedom movement. History will not give us another chance to make up. History has very few chances for people to make up, and we may never get this chance again.

Three years ago we did not hear of a single incident on the border or questions about it; today, there are so many questions. It is in order to resolve this conflict in the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi that the Prime Minister has invited Mr. Chou En-lai, and whatever may come out of it, it is better that we have a conference and we also set a time-table for the conference. Unfortunately, the Chinese are an inscrutable people and they can get themselves mixed up in interminable negotiations. What happened about the five American prisoners? Negotiations were carried on between the brilliant U.S.A. Ambassador to Czechoslovakia (1957), Alexis Johnson, who is now their Ambassador in Thailand, and the Chinese. They met a hundred times in Europe to decide about the five American prisoners and till today they have not come to a settlement.

So India may be warned by this example, so that our Government may enter into negotiations with a regular time-table. After the Prime Ministers' meeting, the officials will carry on negotiations in such a way that the negotiations will end within a certain period of time and they arrive at a certain solution.

After all is said and done it is better to redraw the MacMahon boundary line once and for all if there is a doubt on the one side or the other. It is better to redraw the line once and for all so that we may not leave a heritage of trouble for the future generations. It is all right for you and me and for the Chinese to engage in a deadly battle. But we have got the next generation to look after and we are not going to allow all the things which we have built up with the sweat of our brow and blood to be destroyed in a single act of war.

If the Prime Minister's policy has been justified on the Pakistan front—you know the amount of passion that was excited in this House and the amount of bitterness that swept over this country—if that passed away recently overnight—and if tomorrow also we feel similarly bitter and strongly antagonistic towards the Chinese—that will calm down some time or other. History will not give us another chance and we are not going to leave a legacy of bitterness for the next generation to hang on between China and India.

As I said this opportunity of negotiations, between Chairman Mao and Chou En-lai and ourselves will not come again. They are great people in their own country. We have no right to consider in what way the people of China worship their masters just as they have no right to see in what way we worship our masters. So, this meeting between the heads of these two States must lead towards the settlement of this dispute for a'l time. This must be settled in the lifetime of President Rajendra Prasad and Prime Minister Nehru because they have been the custodians and

guardians of the great freedom movement which was carried on from the time of the Dandi march and long before. Let us not fritter away the fruits of that movement by a deadly combat and destroy all the great advantages we have derived therefrom.

Indians have been noted for their hospitality. This land of the Hindus and Buddhists has been noted for its hospitality. We have entertained even our worst enemies. Even the Arabs welcomed their worst enemies if they go inside their homes and ask protection. The Arabs give protection to them, and only when the enemy goes out, do they draw their swords. (Interruption). We are noted for our hospitality. Let us in the proper spirit of the Prime Minister's instructions carry on. Remember, we have not many friends in the West. Sir Olaf Caroe's letter to the *London Times* on the MacMahon line was not published by the *London Times*. Sir Olaf Caroe was the Governor of the N.W.W.P. and he helped to keep the province for the British. He threw the great Khan Brothers into the dust of prison-life. Sir Olaf Caroe's article appeared in the Indian Press. But the *London Times* would not publish it in all its greatness.

My friend just now said very cogently that America is not with us in our dispute with the Chinese. Have the Americans expressed any opinion about our borders? Millions of pounds and millions of dollars would have been spent to bring about a situation like this. But due to the thoughtlessness of the Chinese, perhaps, due to their expansionist mood, they have brought about the situation for which even one dol'ar need not have been spent! So, as wise statesmen, let us welcome Mr. Chou En-lai as a State guest. We may not welcome him in ecstasy; but let us give due honour and see that the Prime Ministers of the two great countries sit together for 4 or 5 days and then, thereafter, they cha'k out a programme, which the officials on both sides will carry it on. We have trusted our officials to look after it from our Foreign Secre-

[Shri Joachim Alva]

tary upwards, our Ambassador there and other officials.

I have seen in China how the members of our Embassy, their wives and children live in a state of tension. The Chinese may thus become the prisoners of the Indian State or tensions here and the Indians there the prisoners of the Chinese State or tensions there. If there is no cordiality, this will become the state of affairs. It is right for you to say, Oh! But you must see under what tensions the wives and children of our Embassy people live there. Do you want that tension to be there and also here?

An Hon. Member: Did you draw the attention of Chou En-lai to this when you were there?

Shri Joachim Alva: I did draw his attention. I had drawn his attention to the question of Americans there. I did plead with him for the release of the American prisoners and what more do you want. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Joachim Alva: But that is the tension there. We do not want to make our Embassy people in China the prisoners of the Chinese Government; nor do we want the Chinese to become the prisoners of our Government.

An Hon. Member: That is not the case here.

Shri Joachim Alva: We do not want that position to arise. I am mentioning this only as a barometer of our national relations so that these things may be put right.

Now, I want to come to the continent of Africa. The Prime Minister rightly focussed our attention on Africa, a growing State. Africa is growing in importance. Within two years, Africa will have about nearly 30 or more independent States. They will become the Members of the UNO. It is a matter of importance

Our countrymen in Africa must realise that they advance their interests and aspirations only if they do not put their heads against them. Unless we Indians put ourselves alongside the Africans, we have no future in Africa. The Africans have also been treated badly by foreigners that today they are asserting their once down-trodden rights. The Government of India should draw up a comprehensive plan by which India will have a place in Africa, in the sentiments and the aspirations of the people of Africa. Africa is going to be an explosive continent. If today, we who have gone there and worked with our sweat and blood are not wanted, let us then come out. We shall have to come out unless we identify ourselves with the people of Africa and not the way we have gone on in Burma, where some of our moneylenders have brought such a bad name for us Indians. In Burma, the Indians are in a tight position. Let the Government of India draw up a comprehensive plan for our citizens and our ideals overseas. I would like hon. Members and the public to visit Africa and not waste their visits on the West only but also concentrate our attention on the continent of Africa. *(Interruption)*

The External Affairs Report is making a rather alarming note about Goa. The Portuguese have had a number of violations of our air space around Daman and Diu. This is rather a very unhappy situation. Can we allow the Portuguese planes to go over our territory? Can we tolerate it? In Berlin the Russians and the East Germans have protested that the western planes should fly even over 35,000 ft. above their territory. Though the British did not want to fly such planes, the westerners have now obeyed or respected the protests of the Russians and East Germans and today in Berlin the planes are not even flying over 35,000 ft. How is it that we allow the Portuguese planes to fly over our territory and tolerate these air violations around Diu and Daman?

That brings me to another point, and it is about External Affairs publicity. The External Affairs publicity is very weak and not dynamic—not vigorous. We have a first class case on Goa from the religious, national, minorities and cultural point of view; but we cannot put it across the world. So also on Kashmir.

The External Affairs publicity cannot be managed by a Deputy Secretary who has never been a first-class journalist. The External Affairs publicity and information should be headed by a first-class journalist. We have first-class journalists who have got ten years of experience but they are wasting their talents here in the galleries of Parliament. They should be brought into the foreign service; and thereafter, in their own time they may become the heads of Missions. We have no such policy here. We have got able and patriotic journalists who are for years rotting in the Press Gallery here. They must be given responsible jobs as Consul-Generals and eventually made Heads of our Missions. Our policy is very weak on this front.

How many people know that Sir Olaf Caroe's letter has been discarded by the *London Times*? The world should know the American policy towards China. The world should know how the British are silent about China. Now our External Affairs publicity is very weak, not dynamic, not strong. How long are we going to live on the capital of Nehru's foreign policy? (*Interruption*).

An. Hon. Member: I think we stand upon our own strength and not on the strength of publicity.

Shri Joachim Alva: We have a strong case; we know our foreign policy is sound; we are truthful and just. But we cannot for ever live on this kind of aid. The foreign policy has to be put out by vigorous people, by patriotic young men so that our foreign policy may be respected and we may be honoured. Even a small

country like Portugal gets away against us in regard to publicity. It is shame for us that we are not able to hold against Portugal. Portugal holds the largest territory in Africa and in Colonial Africa we have not seen any human deencies. When we say something about Goa, we should be more aggressive and we should be more rigorous about our policy.

These are the points that I have been wanting to say. I shall not take more time of the House. I am grateful to you. But, as I said—and I again reiterate it—history gives very few chances for a reconciliation between nations; and, if we spurn that, I think (*Interruptions*). I think my friend heard me saying that China has been the aggressor. Even allowing that, if we go in the spirit of Mahatmaji—I think this is the only country which is still being guided by the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi—if we throw that down in the dust, we can never have a chance of rising in the manner that we have risen so far.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Rani Manjula Devi.

An Hon. Member: None from this side?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I anticipated that observation from the Opposition and I was prepared with my reply. Two hon. Members from the Opposition have taken one hour. Still there are ten minutes to complete that one hour for the Congress. How can I call another hon. Member from the Opposition. I have to divide the time. We have decided to allot more time to them; we have decided to allot 60 per cent to that side and 40 per cent to this side. Two Members of the Opposition took full one hour. I must give at least one hour to the Congress.

Shri Joachim Alva: Sir, I may be permitted to say, because the hon. Member there drew my attention....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No second speech is allowed.

Shri Joachim Alva: I just want to correct.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Manjula Devi (Gopalpara): My Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I know that the impending visit of the Prime Minister of China would cause a lot of criticism. It is but natural that certain apprehensions should be felt by the country. But I congratulate the Prime Minister on the stand he has taken on this issue.

When the two Prime Ministers meet, I am sure the discussion would be based on the strong and clear-cut lines laid down in the note that was sent to China. Moreover, I am quite sure that the Prime Minister would not stake the country or the nation in such a light-hearted manner.

It is surprising, Sir, to hear from our friends across that we should not take part in the functions that would be arranged when the Prime Minister of China would visit our country. The Prime Minister of India as the leader of the nation has invited the Prime Minister of the other country and as such we should abide by the action of the leader of the nation. I do not see any reason for apprehension, because the Constitution of India would always protect the territorial integrity of India, as is shown in the Berubari case. I hope the hon. Members when they criticise on this issue would remember that fact. 42,000 square miles of territory are claimed by the Chinese, but I am sure that India would stand firm, and our Prime Minister would abide by the wishes of our country and see that not an inch of Indian soil would go to foreign hands.

Shri Amjad Ali (Dhubri): Let us hope so.

Shrimati Manjula Devi: Well, it is for us to see. The meeting of the two Prime Ministers is a very important factor. The national integrity depends on the success of these talks; not only national integrity but international

security also depends on the success of these talks. We as a nation should stand by our Prime Minister to see that these talks successfully end and, at the same time, see that the prestige of India does not suffer.

There has been recently a census of Chinese nationals of KMT Government. They are stated as stateless persons and are given residential permits for three months. I would like to know what would happen to them after the expiration of these three months, whether residential permits would be issued again and again or there would be some sort of rehabilitation or they would be sent back. I would like to have clarification on these points about the Chinese nationals.

Regarding the Tibetans in India, there had been a recent criticism about our Communist friends. They never hesitate in the denunciation of anything that is Tibetan or in the confirmation of anything Chinese. Now, there has been a strong criticism about Dalai Lama's treasures. It surprises me how a foreign dignitary's personal possessions could be interfered with when he is our honoured guest. It is indeed surprising that a noted politician of that category should suggest that we should interfere with the personal belongings of a foreign dignitary when he is our guest. The only thing we can do is to request Dalai Lama to help us in the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees, to help us with some of his great treasures for this. More than that, I am afraid, we cannot do—we cannot impose anything on him.

Now, regarding the Tibetan Camps, the Government are going to spend about Rs. 12 lakhs in the rehabilitation in NEFA area. The near proximity of the Tibetan refugees to border areas is a source of danger to India. I would request the Government to reconsider this policy and see that the Tibetan refugees are settled somewhere in the south.

I am glad that the relationship with Pakistan is much better than what it was before. The friendly settlements are indeed a proof of that. I fail to understand how we can have a defence pact with Pakistan or have a grouping with South-East-Asian countries. Any grouping is always in conflict with the ideas of other groupings, and as such our policy of non-alignment would always suffer. I can't understand the stand taken by the Swatantra Party in suggesting the defence pact with Pakistan and the grouping of India with other countries.

Now I want to say something about external publicity activities. I want the Government to take more notice of the recent inefficiency noticed in its activities. External Affairs Relations has Rs. 683.23 lakhs in the Budget, out of which 85 Missions have Rs. 526.97 lakhs provided in the Budget. That means about Rs. 5.28 lakhs per Mission. When such an enormous amount is spent on such Missions, I wish that they do their duty and they come forward in establishing greater understanding and friendship with other nations and other countries. I wish that they explain India's stand on many of her internal and international activities and undertakings. There should be more initiative and concentrated effort on this matter and the foreign missions, I hope, will see that they should not be so weak in their existence. Had the efforts and undertakings been stronger than they are now and had the propaganda been better, I am sure that our Goa question and the Kashmir question would have fared better.

Recently, when the commonwealth parliamentarians met in India, I met some of them and I asked them the reason why that Pakistan had been gaining so much support from different quarters and more especially from the major nations. They gave me some pointers and it is this: that we have not quite succeeded in establishing our position and explaining to the other nations the justice of our stand with regard to Kashmir and Goa. I hope

that our foreign missions would take greater lead in this matter and have better contacts with other nations. When delegations go from here, I wish they would also contact other nations. Our concentration now is more on the bigger nations. But we should also see that other smaller nations and other uncommitted nations also give us their support, so that when questions of this nature arise, we get a greater support than what we have now. I do hope that the External Affairs Ministry would take note of it and see that our delegations work in this field well, and endeavour to have good contacts with all the other nations in the world.

I am glad that the recent delegation to the United Nations have established better relations than what they had done before. There is now better appreciation and I hope that even though some truths, though deserving, should not always be told, we should be more diplomatic in our dealings with them and gain their friendship and goodwill rather than be critical of other nations in the international field. It is this point that has been brought to my notice when I had discussions with the commonwealth parliamentarians. In a friendly talk, they told me that if we go forward with friendship and understanding and sympathy and not with a platform approach, we would achieve better results. It is very essential for us to win the good opinion of not only the big nations but also the smaller nations, and I hope that the delegations and the missions would see that this purpose is achieved.

Regarding NEFA, Darjeeling and the Naga Hills, I feel that we should take strong steps to curb all antinational risings. Whatever it may be, I am afraid we have been rather slow with regard to the Nagas. I hope it would not create another Kashmir trouble for us in the Nagaland.

The scheme for the reorganisation and integration of the information service with the External Affairs Ministry is being put into effect. I am glad,

[Shrimati Manjula Devi]

and I hope that the information service will accelerate its activities. India's role in the international field indeed deserves great appreciation. I am glad that the summit conference is meeting and I hope that the world tension will become less and world peace will be established. The Algerian self-government, I hope, would soon be established. I do wish that the Government of France would see to it that the atom tests which they are trying to demonstrate would cease very soon.

The denunciation of race conflict in Africa by our Government is of course upheld by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and I hope that all this racial discrimination would come to an end and that all the nations of the world would see that no nation can have any kind of this discrimination on any ground whatsoever.

I compliment the Prime Minister on the stand that he has taken on international affairs, and I am glad that India has stood the test of world opinion in her recent actions.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, before I come to some of the relatively important aspects of External Affairs, I would first like to dwell on some of the routine aspects of the Ministry. Almost every year references had been made to the mounting administrative costs incurred by the Ministry in its missions and posts abroad. It has been reassuring to note that Government are also committed to the principle and objective of lowering down the administrative costs incurred in our foreign missions and posts. The expenditure on our missions and posts amounts to Rs. 526.97 lakhs and is spread over 85 missions abroad. According to the annual report, it has been estimated that the average expenditure per mission, excluding the High Commission in the United Kingdom, is Rs. 5.28 lakhs. While the expenditure in these missions may leave some scope for curtailment, I have no doubt in my mind that the expenditure in the United Kingdom High Commission

needs immediate correction. This House knows—I do not know for what reason—that the High Commission in the United Kingdom functions more or less on the lines of a miniature Government of India. There is any amount of over departmentalisation and duplication of work there. For instance, we have a commerce department in the High Commission which is at present engaged in buying machinery and stores for some of the public sector projects. Even though we have an India Stores Department, with a full fledged shipping directorate attached to it, the shipping of foodgrains has been entrusted to the commerce department. These are mere instances to show how over-departmentalisation and duplication of work has been going on in the High Commission in the United Kingdom.

In this context, the Finance Ministry had appointed a special reorganisation unit under the leadership of Shri Inderjit Singh, the Joint Secretary of the Finance Ministry. That gentleman had been entrusted with the work of scrutinising the workload in the United Kingdom High Commission and make his recommendations to the Government. I do not know why Shri Inderjit Singh found the climate in London so uncongenial and left soon after. I do not know whether he left out of his own volition or he was recalled, perhaps somebody owes us an answer why Shri Inderjit Singh, for whom travelling and other expenses were incurred and who had been sent specifically to the United Kingdom to scrutinise the work, had come back.

Shri C. D. Pande: He has effected a saving of Rs. 35 lakhs.

Shri Mahanty: I am coming to that question of savings. But my question remains; why he was called back. Then, the work was entrusted to whom? The S.R. unit functioned under the Deputy High Commissioner of the High Commission. In other words, the Deputy High Commissioner of the United Kingdom High Commission was entrusted with the task of scrutinising his own department for

economy purposes. Of course, I do not wish to attribute any motive to anybody and I have no doubt that the Deputy Commissioner of the High Commission was competent enough to recommend economies in his Mission. But the question remains,—it is begging the question,—what was the need for sending the S.R. Unit to London and spending for the Unit to the extent of about Rs. 70,000, a major part of which is foreign exchange? Be that as it may, the Unit under the leadership, not of Inderjit Singh of the Finance Ministry but of the Deputy Commissioner of U.K. High Commission in London, went into the workload and various aspects of the activities of our U.K. High Commission. They worked within the framework of securing agreed conclusions, agreed by the High Commission and agreed by the team, and recommended the reduction of 237 posts, even though according to the report of the S.R. Unit they could still have reduced 65 posts. I do not know why the S.R. Unit did not recommend the reduction of these 65 posts, even though the Unit was convinced that these posts could have been reduced. Even then, they recommended the reduction of 237 posts. But what do we find? We find from the annual report that the Government have still left some of the posts untouched. It is somewhat regrettable that when in the name of economy the Ministry has been reducing under the heads Class IV and Class III employees in the foreign mission abroad, the high executive officers without much work to do remain untouched. The Unit have further referred in para 21 of the Report that some senior executive officers and higher executive officers were engaged on jobs which not only intrinsically merited attention of lower grade personnel but were of a character as were actually performed by lower grade personnel. Furthermore, the Unit also referred to the fact that the utilisation of the Higher Executive officers was not fully effective.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What is the hon. Member reading from?

Shri Mahanty: I am reading from the Report of the S.R. Unit on U.K. High Commission.

Therefore, I venture to think that there is much scope for the re-thinking on this subject. Before I leave this subject I wish to make a reference to the fact that the Government of India are now contemplating to appoint a gentleman as the Director of India Stores Department, whose commercial knowledge is co-terminus with his failure to obtain a seat in the last elections.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No appointment has yet been made. The hon. Member says that they have in contemplation the appointment of a member whose qualifications are co-terminus with this and this. That is not justified. The hon. Member...

An hon. Member: He should be more specific.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not want things to be referred to when the member has no justification for saying that. No appointment has yet been made, we do not know who that gentleman is, and before his appointment he is being criticised here. That is not fair.

Shri Mahanty: I am sorry. I am prepared to withdraw it, if that is in bad taste. I simply wanted to point out....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I wish he withdraw that.

Shri Mahanty: O.K. I withdraw it, if that is your direction.

I now come to the relatively more important aspect namely the Indo-Chinese relations. A sigh of relief will be heaved on account of the fact that the Indo-Chinese conflict over the northern border has not deteriorated of late. For that one should remain thankful more to the Himalayan winter than to Chinese intentions of peace. With the summer coming and the snow melting, one has really to wait

[Shri Mahanty]

and see whether there is not going to be further deterioration.

It is gratifying to note that the Chinese Prime Minister has agreed to the Indian Prime Minister's request to come to Delhi, though the actual date of his arrival has not yet been communicated. Rightly, the Government of India have decided to extend to him all the courtesies due to a distinguished visitor of Mr. Chou En-lai's eminence. But the question remains, and the fact remains, that we are going to welcome an aggressor on the soil of India. That fact cannot be obliterated that we are going to welcome an aggressor on this soil. But, even then, the more important thing is, what is the background of proposed meeting? I am not the type of man who would surrender my way of thinking to the Prime Minister, however eminent he may be. He owes not only to this House, but to the country at large an answer as to the circumstances which led him to trace back from the stand that he took in November, 1959 regarding the meeting.

The Indian Prime Minister, in his letter dated 16th November, 1959, mentioned about some interim understandings which were conditions precedent for any meeting between the two Prime Ministers, and then he indicated in that communication that after some interim agreements were arrived at, the date, the time and place for the meeting could be fixed. I would beg of the hon. Prime Minister to tell us whether he had arrived at any interim agreements since then and, if so, what those are.

The reply dated 17th December, from Premier Chou En-lai to the Indian Prime Minister was not only discouraging but humiliating, inasmuch as the Chinese Premier characterised a portion of the Indian Prime Minister's proposals as lacking fairness, and when I say "lacking fairness" I say within quotations.

Furthermore, it was mentioned in that communication that not only a few outposts in the north-eastern sector of India, but the western sector the Ladakh sector, the entire 2,000 mile long border was never delimited. The little point that I am trying to bring out is that since the communication dated 16th November, the situation has deteriorated, the differences have widened, there have been violent disagreements about facts and so where is the basis for any meeting and what is after all going to be discussed in that meeting? In his letter dated 17th December, the Chinese Prime Minister indicated the scope of the meeting in the following words:

"Although there are differences of opinion between our two countries on the boundary question, I believe that this in no way hinders the holding of talks between the two Prime Ministers; but on the contrary it precisely requires its early realisation so as to reach some agreements on principles as a guidance to concrete discussions and settlement of the boundary question by the two sides."

From an analysis of this, I come to this conclusion, that this meeting is taking place for determining the guidance which will lead to a settlement of the boundary disputes. I would ask of the Prime Minister to tell the country: where was the boundary dispute till the Chinese by their military aggression occupied 12,000 square miles of Indian territory, which was Indian territory in law, in custom and in agreements? The Chinese occupied 12,000 sq. miles of our territory. Then they said "here is a dispute" and told us "let us come to a settlement on this dispute" and dictated, not from any position of reasonableness but from a position of brazen military strength. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what is going to be discussed, what is going to be negotiated about. If there is going to be negotiation about the cessation of Indian territories. Well, so far as I am concerned, so far

as my party is concerned and that portion of the Indian population to which we belong is concerned, we are not at one with him. We are not at one with him when he thinks of the cessation of Indian territories, when he is talking about the settlement of boundary disputes.

According to us there were no boundary disputes. There was cold-blooded military occupation by China of Indian territories. There can be no discussion. There can be no negotiation, there can be no guidance except vacation of the military occupation. Therefore it is time now that the hon. Prime Minister says categorically as to what the scope of the meeting is, whether he is going to negotiate about the 12,000 square miles of Indian territory which has been occupied by the Chinese. He may do it. He is eminent enough to do that. He has also got the ruling party behind him. But that will not reflect the national opinion as a whole.

16 hrs.

Now I come to Tibet. In this Budget we are making some provision for the relief and maintenance of Tibetan refugees who have crossed over to India on account of political disturbance in Tibet. I for one do not grudge any expenditure that we might have to incur for giving succour and consolation to the Tibetans in their agony. We fully share their sufferings struggles and tribulations. But I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister the perspective about Tibet. It is being suggested that this expenditure will now be an annual feature of our Budget and that these refugees will be a part of our Indian population. In that case, this should be a matter of deep concern to us. I submit that there should be some perspective and some realistic and bold thinking as to what we are going to do about Tibet.

In this connection memories flash back to the year 1950 when the 422 (Ai) LS.—7.

Chinese were making their preparations for occupying Tibet. I am constrained to say that had the Government of India been awakened to their responsibilities in 1950 there would have been no Tibetan problem today. There would have been no Indo-Chinese problem either that is there today, had the Indian Embassy in Peking, acted in a manner that was expected of it. The betrayal of Tibet could not have taken place in this manner. I have got there a book entitled *In Two Chinas* written by an eminent diplomat, Sardar K. M. Panikkar, who was our Ambassador in Peking. I am speaking not out of any personal capricious motive or in any spirit of carping criticism but I am speaking with the objectivity of a historian. After ten years when we search for what happened in 1950 what do we find on page 105 of this book? The eminent diplomat writes:

"I expressed the hope that they would follow the policy of peace in regard to Tibet. Chou En-lai replied that while the 'liberation of Tibet was a sacred duty his Government were anxious to secure their ends by negotiations and not by military action'."

But the eminent diplomat never conveyed these intentions of the Chinese to the Government of India and New Delhi was kept in complete darkness. Again, we find on his own admission at page 112 of this work that while the American and Hongkong press were full of stories of Chinese invasion of Tibet, the Indian Embassy situated in Peking feigned ignorance about all that had been happening in that unfortunate country and the Government of India was kept in total darkness. This is on his own admission. The Government of India had always discounted whenever the Opposition brings certain matters to their notice, for instance, the violation of air space of India. I know questions were asked by Shri Barua in this connection to which the hon. Prime Minister had re-

[Shri Mahanty]

plied that those were mere bazaar gossips. Similarly, when the American and Hongkong press were full of bloodcurdling stories about the Chinese operations in Tibet, the Government of India had discounted those because the Indian Embassy in Peking had kept the Government of India in total darkness.

Then you come the most important and interesting part of the diplomat's memoirs. At page 113 he says:

"The Indian Press, egged on by the sensational reports of the American correspondents and the blood-curdling stories issued from Hong Kong by Taipeh agents, kept on talking about Chinese aggression. Even Sardar Patel, the Deputy Prime Minister, felt called upon to make an unfriendly speech. There was also some support in the External Affairs Ministry for the view that India should act vigorously to protect Tibet. In the meantime Ecuador which was then a member of the Security Council, threatened to bring up the Tibetan question before the United Nations. Knowing the temper of the Indian public and the attitude of some of the officials I was nervous that the Government might take some hasty step. My own prestige with the Government was at a low ebb and I was being attacked for having misled the Prime Minister about Chinese intervention in Korea. But the Prime Minister was not so easily moved. He kept calm and allowed the public feeling to die down."

My only complaint about the hon. Prime Minister is that he is always unmoved. He was unmoved when this gentleman betrayed the best interests of India in Tibet. He is also unmoved to-day when the best interests of India are assailed on the northern border. I would only like him to be more dynamic.

From this it will be evident how at every step the Indian Embassy in Peking had betrayed the best interests of India in Tibet by keeping New Delhi in dark. It is a pity and a shame that today that gentleman has been nominated by the President as the representative of the Indian people. Somebody must speak out. This means that this administration has been putting a premium on betrayal. We think the time has come when this kind of putting a premium on betrayal should stop and those people who have betrayed our interests in our Missions abroad must be brought to book before public opinion. I am sorry to have said so, but I thought....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Really I am also sorry for that. The difficulty is that though he has read from his own book certain admission that he has made, the conclusions that the hon. Member draws may not be so justified. Therefore he should use a milder language that what he has been doing.

Shri Mahanty: I am sorry. What I said perhaps was not in good taste nor is it my habit to speak in such language.

An Hon. Member: That is a fact.

Shri Mahanty: But when I find that such men are being nominated by the President as representatives of the Indian people certainly it is time enough for someone to point out this kind of approach.

I do not wish to take more time of the House. Of course while concluding I will not hesitate to pay my open-hearted compliment to the hon. Prime Minister for the way in which he has been handling most of our foreign affairs. We know the time is difficult, the context is difficult and the people with whom he is dealing are difficult. But having said so before concluding I would once again urge that foreign policies are not

matters of national controversies. These are national policies. The hon. Prime Minister is not a partisan when he pursues those policies. To us he is a symbol of the nation as a whole. But if he has to claim and deserve this right he can do so by taking into account the feelings of all parts of this House.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have listened with rapt attention to the speech of the hon. Member who preceded me. I fail to understand whether it does anyone good to rake up those controversies which have been laid to rest. Today people have been talking in terms of history. Some have been talking in terms of history which exists and some have been talking in terms of history which will never come into being. The hon. gentleman built up his whole case on some book which he has read and which has been written by one of our eminent diplomats. I have not read that book, but I think it is very unfair to any writer to take some extracts from his book and tear them out of their context. I think the gentlemen who represent our country abroad in different missions and embassies have done very well by their country, and it does not become an Indian national to say that they have betrayed the interests of the country anywhere. I feel that our Ambassador in China, to whom the hon. Member referred, is a very eminent scholar, an eminent historian and an eminent public man, and I have no doubt about the fact that whatever he did, he did in the interests of the country. I think he served the interests of the country.

What happened in 1950 is being carried over to 1960. The question is whether our policy towards Tibet at that time has much to do with our policy towards China today. I think history does not move in a straight line, and you cannot say that one thing follows from the other. History is never logical, history is a negation of logic, and it is only the cheap

writers of history that try to introduce any sense of logic into history. Moreover, all the diplomats of the world, all the statesmen of the world, work within a particular framework at a particular time, and, without being prophets, without knowing what is going to happen after ten or twenty years, they take their decisions in the best interests of the country at a particular moment. I think what happened in 1950, so far as Tibet is concerned, happened because we then thought that it was in the best interests of the country. What happened afterwards happened because we thought that it was also conducive to the welfare of the country.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Was that in the interests of democracy also?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I must say here is a gentleman....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Every hon. Member, when he is referred to, should be referred to as an Hon. Member, not as a gentleman.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am sorry. Here is an hon. Member who is a member of a party which consists of 25 or 26 hon. Members, and he feels that he represents India much more than we do who sit on this side of the House. There cannot be a greater travesty of facts than this.

Shri Rajendra Singh: May I ask whether membership is the measure of intelligence and patriotism?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Our policy towards Tibet was conditioned by our thinking on international affairs, by our thinking on foreign policy matters at that time. What has happened now between my country and China I believe does not stem from our policy towards Tibet. After all, Tibet was recognised even by the British people as a region of China and we did not do anything more extraordinary than that. We only accepted the fact which was recognised by the British Government for such a long time. Therefore, that is not the point.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

Our policy about China has been put under fire again by one hon. Member, and he has said that it is a betrayal of this thing and that thing. You were very right, Sir, when you said that these were very hard words and that he should not use such words. But the fact of the matter is that, whatever the relations between China and India be at this time, whatever the relations may have been in the past, when our Prime Minister has asked Mr. Chou En-lai to come to India....

Shri Rajendra Singh: He has requested, he has not asked.

Shri D. C. Sharma:... and discuss matters with him, he has not thought of Mr. Chou En-lai as an aggressor, and he has not thought of himself as an aggrieved party. After all, there are certain diplomatic conventions, certain things which govern the relations between countries, and I believe that according to international usage, according to diplomatic convention, according to what history says, our Prime Minister has done the best possible thing by asking Mr. Chou En-lai to come to India so that discussions can be held.

After all, what do these people want, I ask. What is the alternative to this? Do they want that there should be an armed conflict between India and China? Our Prime Minister has, at one time, said that if need be India will be a nation in arms. He is not afraid of that. But the fact of the matter is that in international affairs these days, whatever the reasons may be, people are pursuing the path of negotiation. If there are negotiations between Russia and America, the two big giants, between France and Algerians, I do not think that our Prime Minister has betrayed the country by inviting Mr. Chou En-lai to hold discussions. I think he has served the interests of the nation in the best possible manner. I believe he has done something on account of which

history will give him a very high place.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Provided it is written by you.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Therefore, I believe these are not things to be thought of like that.

India and China had good relations, and they were good neighbours. Even Prime Minister Chou En-lai has said that the relations of India and China are of eternal friendship. Of course, you may say that perhaps he does not mean what he says. I do not think like that. I think that some countries can be the victims of misunderstanding, victims of a wrong reading of geography, a wrong reading of history. I believe that China for which I have great respect, and Mr. Chou En-lai for whom I have great respect, have been victims of a wrong reading of the geography of India and China, a wrong reading of the history of India and China. Hence this trouble. But I believe there are two ways of solving the problem.

You can cut the Gordian knot by a sword, or you can unite the knot in a very gentle and statesmanlike manner. I believe that this meeting between the Prime Ministers of the two great countries, of two great neighbours, is going to do the latter. The knot will not be slashed with a knife. Therefore, I welcome this meeting and I hope the whole of India will welcome it. The whole of India will be watching this meeting with interest because Indians know that our Prime Minister is committed to the policy of getting the aggression vacated. He is also committed to the policy of insisting upon the Himalayas as the natural boundary line of India, to the policy of having those areas which form part of India as our own. I have no doubt about it. So, the misgivings of some of these persons who represent some parties, I think, are utterly unfounded, and I would request them to suspend their judgment for some time and wait for the meeting. I hope some good will come

out of the meeting to hearten the people and set at rest the doubts of the waverers. I am sure about it.

There is another point to which I want to refer, and that is about the structure of the administration of our External Affairs Ministry. Somebody said that the structure should be rationalised. I am not a very keen student of all the administrative structures, but I see some of these Ministries in action, and I can say without fear of contradiction that the External Affairs Ministry has one good point about it, if there is no other good point, and it is this; though the External Affairs Ministry can always be in the limelight, yet I have found that the officers of this Ministry avoid the limelight. Whenever I see any newspaper in the morning, I find that the Joint Secretary of this Ministry or the Deputy Secretary of that Ministry or the Secretary of a third Ministry is doing something, and sometimes, I feel that they are very wonderful people, and they are getting into news. But so far as this Ministry is concerned, I find that their officers do not get into news, which has become one of the obsessive defects of the officers of the other Ministries, who are always out to get their names published in the newspapers and to have their names advertised,—or I would not use the term 'advertised', but I would say,—to have their names splashed like that.

I would also say that so far as the Organisation and Methods Division is concerned, the axe has fallen with a keener edge on this Ministry than on any other Ministry. For instance, take the economies effected in the High Commission in London. I think this Ministry is a kind of a guinea-pig, if I can use that word, for experiments on economy. And I am very glad that our Prime Minister is carrying on those experiments in economy, so far as his Ministry is concerned.

I want to say a word about the information services. I think that the information services of the Ministry

should be such as would compare favourably with those of other countries. But I would say one thing that our foreign Missions abroad do try to project India in other countries. For instance, I was in Washington recently, and I could not get any news about India, and I had to depend upon the news-letter which was published by the Washington Embassy once a week or twice a week for getting news about India. Therefore, I believe that the information services of this Ministry are doing very good work though they do require a new look.

I want to say one or two sentences about the other things. I want to congratulate the Ministry on the way in which they have tackled the Tibetan refugees. Whatever people may say, I think India has done something very great by having accommodated the Tibetan refugees, and I do not mind if we are going to give some money for their rehabilitation. I think this is one of the things for which we shall be remembered not only in this country but in other countries, not only today but in days to come.

I also find that there has been some lessening of tension in the Naga State, and I hope that the Naga People's Convention's ideas will be looked into and something will be done in order to give those Nagas a proper share in the administration of the country.

Then, I want to say a word about Cyprus. I have been talking about Cyprus every time on the floor of the House. I am sorry that the independence of Cyprus has been postponed, and there is some trouble about the bases there. They want 120 miles, and they can give only 36 miles or something like that. I wish that the negotiations between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots and the British Government would come to a happy conclusion, and they should see to it that the people of Cyprus are not kept in suspense very long. I think there is a great deal to be said for the point of view of the Greek Cypriots.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the hon. Member should conclude. There ought to be nothing beyond Cyprus

Shri D. C. Sharma: There is South Africa beyond Cyprus. I would submit very respectfully that South Africa, in the world of today, represents a system of government, a system of economy and a system of administration which are, I believe, outmoded. I think the system in South Africa is something for which nobody can congratulate that country. I am glad that Mr. Harold Macmillan, the Prime Minister of Great Britain said that this racial policy of South Africa was very bad and was not desirable. He said that in very forthright terms, and I would say that the sooner the racial policy of South Africa comes to an end, the better it will be, and all the countries of the world should join in order to put an end to these outmoded policies of South Africa.

Members may now move their cut motions relating to the Demands under the Ministry of External Affairs subject to their being otherwise admissible.

Policy towards the tribals

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced to Re. 1." (123).

Failure to eradicate Rat Menace in Mijo Hills area

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced to Rs. 100." (265).

Failure to supply food in due time in Mijo Hills area

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced to Rs. 100." (266).

Need to improve Road Links in Tribal areas

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced by Rs. 100." (267).

Problems of integrating the tribal areas with the rest of India

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced by Rs. 100." (316).

Desirability of transferring the N.E.F.A. administration to the Ministry of Home Affairs

Shri P. K. Deo: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Tribal Areas' be reduced by Rs. 100." (347).

Policy towards the Nagas

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area' be reduced to Re. 1." (124).

Policy towards Naga problem

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area' be reduced to Re. 1. (292).

Failure to restore confidence of the Nagas in Government

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area' be reduced by Rs. 100." (268).

Failure to suppress the Naga rebels

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area' be reduced by Rs. 100." (269).

Desirability of transferring the administration of the Naga Hills—Tuensang Area to the Ministry of Home Affairs

Shri P. K. Deo: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Naga Hills—Tuensang Area' be reduced by Rs. 100." (348).

Policy concerning Tibet

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1." (139).

Policy concerning Chinese aggression against India

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1." (140).

Policy regarding rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees in India

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1." (293).

Policy towards China

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1." (443).

Policy towards Tibet

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced to Re. 1." (444).

Need for reduction in the expenditure on officers

Shri Ram Sevak Yadav: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 4,00,00,000." (120).

Selection of personnel for Delegations sent abroad

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (151).

Recruitment and expenditure policies of the Ministry

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (152).

Status of Tibetan refugees in India

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (270).

Need to utilise Dalai Lama's wealth for rehabilitation of Tibetan refugees

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (271).

Failure to stop further in-flow of Tibetan refugees

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (272).

Failure to enforce discipline in the Missimari Camp

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (273).

Need for all-weather roads linking India and Bhutan

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (274).

Need for more check-posts at strategic points on the Indo-Tibetan and Indo-Chinese borders

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (275).

Failure to guard borders of India against Chinese aggression

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (276)

Need to celebrate 15th August as the Independence Day in all Indian Embassies abroad

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (277)

Need to invite all Indian citizens abroad by respective Indian Embassies to the Independence Day and Republic Day celebrations

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (278)

Need to improve the publicity machinery in the Indian Embassies abroad

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (279)

Need for looking after the interest and welfare of Indian citizens and tourists better by Indian Embassies abroad

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (280)

Failure to check issue of fictitious passports

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (281)

Refusal of passport to the delegates of International Youth Festival held in Vienna in 1959

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (282)

Need for screening Kalimpong of foreign spies

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (283)

Stateless persons in India

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (284)

Demarcation of border-line with Eastern Pakistan

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (285)

Delay in the establishment of diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (304)

Implications of a reported convention on Tibet planned to be held soon in India

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (305)

Implications of the Dalai Lama's activities in India

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (306)

Failure of our diplomatic representatives abroad to deal with the problem of stranded Indian nationals

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (312)

Continued recalcitrance of the Government of France in regard to the de jure transfer of French possessions in India

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (319)

Implications of the proceedings before the World Court over Portugal's claim to right of way through Indian territory

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (320)

Undesirability of certain speeches made in the U.S.A. by some of our diplomatic representatives

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (321)

Failure of the policy in regard to China

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (329)

Policy regarding Goa

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (330)

Need for positive steps to develop closer association with Bhutan and Sikkim in view of Chinese aggression

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (331)

Failure to establish diplomatic relations with Israel

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (332)

Need for reduction of officers in the higher ranks of the Ministry

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (333)

Delay in issuing passports and the policy in this regard

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (335)

Lack of publicity machinery abroad and need for expeditious despatch of news from home

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (336)

Composition of Indian Delegations to U.N.O.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (339)

Failure to publish White Papers on India-China relations in different regional languages of India

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (340)

Failure to take any definite step in the solution of Goa problem

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (341)

Approach of the Government towards the question of border dispute with China

Shri P. K. Deo: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (349)

Urgency of liberating the Portuguese possessions in India

Shri P. K. Deo: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (350)

Failure to take effective steps to liberate Goa and other Portuguese territories in India

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (398)

Policy in regard to Chinese aggression

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (399)

Failure to establish diplomatic relations with Israel

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (400)

Failure to give proper and effective publicity of our view in other countries by our embassies

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (401)

Need for de jure transfer of Pondicherry

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (402)

Need for reduction in expenses of our Embassies abroad

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (403)

Failure of our diplomatic personnel abroad to deal with the problem of stranded Indian nationals

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (404)

Failure to check Pakistani raids on Indo-Pak border

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (405)

Failure to look after the interest and welfare of Indian citizens and tourists better by Indian Embassies abroad

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (406)

Failure to check the activities of foreign spies in Kalimpong

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (407)

Failure to check issue of forged passports

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (408)

Need to have full diplomatic relations with Israel

Shri Assar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (480)

Failure to rectify anomalies in the out-moded judicial system in the former French possessions

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (328).

Need for de jure transfer of Pondicherry

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (337)

Failure to finalise the agreement with the French Government regarding de jure transfer of Pondicherry

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be reduced by Rs. 100." (342).

Failure to supply water from the lake of Madras zone to Pondicherry area for cultivation

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'State of Pondicherry' be by Rs. 100." (343)

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

Shri Dinosh Singh: The matter about foreign relations, which is uppermost in our minds today is that of the China-India border problem. Much has been said in this House before and today about this matter, and I shall, therefore, deal with it very briefly.

Whenever there is a dispute of this nature where aggression has been committed by one country, what is the way in which we can solve it? There are only two ways. Either we go to war and try to take back the territory which has been occupied or conquered, or we negotiate and try to get it back that way.

As you know, Sir, our policy has always been that of peace. We have always wanted to settle all matters by peaceful negotiations, and therefore, it was only natural and logical for us to choose this method of peaceful negotiations.

There has been much discussion here today that it was wrong on the part of Government to have invited the Prime Minister of China to discuss this matter. I am afraid I fail to understand the logic behind it. If we want to settle a matter peacefully, we have to talk. The Prime Minister of China had offered to negotiate. He had invited our Prime Minister to China to talk this matter over. We did not like the implications and the conditions that were put forward, and, therefore, our Prime Minister declined that invitation. He wrote to the Prime Minister of China again, and he said that we were not willing to negotiate our

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

border, but we would certainly be willing to discuss a friendly solution out of it. The Prime Minister of China is likely to come, and I do not see any harm in discussing the matter with him.

Some fear was voiced by a Member from the Opposition, saying that we shall give away territory here and there. I do not think there is any question of giving away territory, at least without reference to this House. Hon. Members should know that the Supreme Court has already ruled that no territory which is Indian territory can be given away without an amendment of the Constitution. So, whatever negotiations there may be, whatever discussions there may be, if there is any question of surrendering of any Indian territory, no one can do it alone; it will come to this House, and I hope such an occasion will not arise.

It is always rather difficult to restrict a person when he is negotiating. It limits him and it puts him at a certain disadvantage. If we want to say something in a general way, that is a different matter altogether. To try to limit the Prime Minister to do this or not to do this or that will make the negotiations absolutely meaningless. It will then be better to send our terms in the form of an ultimatum in a letter and leave it at that, but negotiation means discussing a situation and trying to understand each other's point of view. With this thing in mind, I feel that it would be a good thing if the Chinese Prime Minister comes here and we are able to discuss this matter. Of course, they are border problems. The Prime Minister has himself said that we are not going to negotiate the border and I am sure he will bear it in mind that before we negotiate these Chinese incursions into our territory, we shall also insist that the Chinese respect our territorial integrity elsewhere along the border.

There is one point which I would like to emphasize here that when we

discuss this border issue with the Chinese Prime Minister, we must also bear in mind the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan. The Chinese Prime Minister has carefully tried to avoid this point. In his letter he has made it clear that the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan are not to be negotiated with India and I hope the Prime Minister will bear this in mind.

Another problem that arises out of this is the 1954 Treaty between India and China. This Treaty was the famous Treaty of Panchsheel. By this Treaty we established consulates in Tibet and China, established consulates here. If I may refer to that Treaty, it says that these consulates and the staff of these consulates will be on a reciprocal basis. These are the exact words:

"The trade agencies of both parties shall be accorded the same status and the same treatment. The Trade Agents of both parties shall enjoy freedom from arrest while exercising their functions and shall enjoy in respect of themselves, their wives and children, who are dependent on them for livelihood, freedom from search."

I feel that the Chinese have already violated this Treaty. They have searched family members of our diplomats; they have restricted members of our consulates from movement in China and I feel that this matter should also be taken up with the Chinese Government and if they are not willing to agree to it, then we should bring in operation the reciprocal clause and limit the Chinese movements according to that.

Now, I should like to refer to certain points which appear in the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs. Last year, I had occasion to refer in this House, the matter of reorganisation that was being carried out in the Ministry of External Affairs. I mentioned to this House that the reorganisation was a very good thing and that we should

try to expand it within this Ministry and also other Ministries of the Government of India should also try to incorporate it. I am sorry to say that there has been no increase of this reorganised system and I can only hope that the Ministry of External Affairs, which already has some experience of this reorganisation, will try to have the whole Ministry under this reorganised system and also recommend this reorganisation to other Ministries of the Government of India. It is rather curious there is a chart—Annexure VI—which is appended to the Annual Report of the Ministry. It shows that there are three Secretaries of the Government of India attached to this Ministry: the Foreign Secretary, the Special Secretary and the Commonwealth Secretary. The Foreign Secretary and the Special Secretary deal directly with the Prime Minister in certain matters, while the Commonwealth Secretary deals only through the Parliamentary Secretary. I do not know what the implication is. It is not properly explained. I hope the Ministry will take the trouble of explaining it.

Now, coming to the question of Foreign Service (B)—it has been rather an interesting experiment carried out by the Ministry—I understand there is much dissatisfaction regarding the seniority in this service and the Deputy Minister is aware of it. This is an important matter and I hope it will be looked into.

The other thing that has come out in this Report is the reorganisation of the Information Service of the Ministry of External Affairs. It is rather curious that they are trying now to bring this Information Service also under the Foreign Service. It is a rather curious state of affairs because this is a more specialised service. We need here journalists who are very good in public relations work. Everyone who comes into the Foreign Service may not be good at public relations and, therefore, this service should really be open to journalists

and others who can be brought in at every level, who are really the experts in this business.

I also notice that there is no provision in this Report for a Central Translation Bureau. I believe that there is a Translation Bureau under the Home Ministry or some other Ministry. But it is the External Affairs Ministry which comes in contact with this more than any other Ministry and I feel that there should be a Translation Bureau attached to this Ministry which is able to translate from the languages of all the countries where we have representatives. I mention this specially because during the time our border problems with China came up we were at a terrible disadvantage because the Ministry circulated the points of view of the Government of India in English to all the Missions. There was no translation in French and other languages of Europe, Africa and Asia with the result that there was considerable delay in passing that information on to the people of those countries. They had to get them translated and all sorts of complications came in.

There is also the question of passports which is rather interesting. As you know, this matter of passport racket has been talked about for a long time. The whole difficulty seems to be that these passports are taken out by people who go to Europe or rather to the United Kingdom to seek employment there and we want to discourage it. I do not see why we should take it upon ourselves to do something for the United Kingdom in this way. If the United Kingdom people do not want Indian nationals to go there, they should have a visa system. But why should we restrict passports for these people and do the job here. As it is, in most of the Commonwealth countries, we require visas. It is only in U.K. we do not require visa. If they want to restrict people going there, they can also have visa system. We should not create all these complications here.

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

Now, I should like to turn to Africa. In this Report that has been brought out by the Ministry there is much that has been written about the activities of the Ministry of External Affairs, in independent States of Africa and, also about the training of students in other countries; but there is no mention here of the large number of African students to whom we provide scholarships and facilities for study in this country. It is amazing how little attention we all pay to Africa which is now really the coming continent. Europe has been tied up with all sorts of treaty relations with one another, with America, with U.S.S.R. and they have, more or less, lost the freedom of action. It is this continent which is coming up and I feel that we should try to have a better representation there so that they understand our point of view and also we extend this area of non-involvement. The Africans, as you know, are very much interested in India. They have the highest regard for our Prime Minister and whatever the differences may be between them and the people of Indian origin in Africa, they have great respect for the views of the Government of India and, I think, we should certainly pay a little more attention to Africa, to the independent countries and also to the non-independent countries. It is our duty to help them to achieve independence.

Similar is the case of Algeria. It is our duty to see that the Algerian people are helped in their fight for achieving their independence. France has taken an extremely rigid line, and it is not a new thing with France. It has lost the initiative everywhere, even in India, in Africa, everywhere. They do not seem to be able to move with public opinion.

Therefore, I feel that it should be our responsibility to help these people by recognising the National Government of Algeria which is in exile. This should not be a new thing to France because during the Spanish

revolution, France accepted both sides. It accepted the France Government as also the Republican Government. So if we give the National Government of Algeria *de facto* recognition, I do not see how we are going to make the situation any the worse.

You have already rung the bell and Shri A.M. Tariq is getting very impatient. I should not, therefore, like to take more time. But I should like to say just a few words about NEFA. The efforts of the Ministry of External Affairs in the development of NEFA are really very creditable. I hope that some Members of this House would really go and see good work that is being done there instead of criticising Government here.

Similarly, the activities in Sikkim and also in Bhutan are very creditable. I hope Government will soon have a representative in Bhutan, because now we have got a road-building programme and other activities which are going on there and it is necessary that the Government have someone there who is able to co-ordinate all these activities and be of real help.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Mohammed Imam. Shri Tariq can wait. He is the Whip. So he has to remain here.

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug): It is unfortunate that India is confronted with serious problems all round her borders which still remain unresolved or partially solved. We have the problem of the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry which has not yet been completed. There is the problem of Goa and there is the problem of Kashmir. But these problems pale into insignificance when compared to the dangerous problem that has arisen, that is confronting us and has been causing anxiety to one and all.

I am glad that the relations between India and Pakistan have been improving. I am also glad that the new Government of General Ayub have realised their responsibility. They have realised that the destinies

of these two countries which once lived under one umbrella are linked together. I am glad he has also realised that Pakistan stands to gain more by exchanging blessings rather than curses as was the case until recently. I am happy that some of the disputes like canal waters and others have been settled and I hope the General will recognise this and play his part well and fairly and squarely regarding Kashmir also so that a solution of this knotty problem advantageous to both—because both countries have to spend a lot of money—is arrived at.

Coming to the new danger that has arisen in the northern border, till now this border of the country was considered to be impregnable. We thought no enemy would come into India through the Himalayas. But at present this area, which was once considered to be impregnable, has become very vulnerable. I agree with Shri Mahanty who remarked just now that matters relating to foreign policy should not be matters of controversy. There must be as much agreement as possible between the Government and the other parties in matters concerning foreign affairs. That is the case in other advanced countries like the U.K. and U.S.A. The leaders of the various parties meet together and chalk out what is called a bi-partisan foreign policy. The leaders of the ruling party trust the leaders of other Parties and the latter are sometimes sent as representatives of the Government to international conferences. This is really a very good move because it will strengthen the nation and also ensure the continuity of the foreign policy. I wish the Prime Minister also follows the same idea here. Before taking any major step, I wish he consults the various leaders because this is a matter which must be kept above party level—the country must be kept above parties—and I hope before he comes to a settlement with Mr. Chou En-lai he will take the leaders of other Parties into confidence and chalk out an agreed line.

It is true that some of us are very unhappy at the initiative taken by the Prime Minister in having invited the Prime Minister of China, because this was against his own declared intention and policy. He had said that unless China vacated the aggression she committed, there was no room for negotiations. During the debate on the President's Address also, he said that there would be negotiations only under appropriate conditions and he also characterised the action and attitude of China as a breach of faith. What we want to know is whether the Prime Minister is satisfied that those appropriate conditions have been created. We thought that the appropriate condition was the vacation of aggression—which has not been done. Our only apprehension is that the sudden invitation by the Prime Minister may be regarded or construed as a sign of weakness. We think that probably—I hope we are wrong—the Prime Minister is in a position to yield. There may be negotiations and they may yield some result. Supposing these negotiations fail, and the two Premiers fail to come to an agreement, then I think the results will be more complicated and more harmful to our country. I am not thinking of temporary agreements of arrangements that have to be made on the border question; I am thinking of the permanent danger that the country has to face. I have already said that India has become vulnerable on the northern front. It became vulnerable because of the obliteration of Tibet. I think India committed a grave mistake when she allowed Tibet to run over so easily by the Chinese. She committed a great mistake when she acknowledged the suzerainty of China over Tibet. She never thought what its implications or repercussions would be by allowing Tibet to be obliterated.

In Europe they are having Switzerland as a buffer state. Its neutrality is respected. All the countries around Switzerland stand to gain. It is to the advantage of those countries to have this buffer State in their midst. Similarly, India and the

[Shri Mohammed Imam]

adjoining countries should have pursued this idea of having a buffer State between China and India, between the communist countries and the non-communist countries.

When India allowed Tibet to be easily swallowed, we ourselves became responsible for all the bad happenings and for the vulnerable position we are put in now.

What is the position now? China is practically on our northern border. It is now sitting on the holy heights of the Himalayas looking greedily on the Indo-Gangetic valley. It is true that in between there are some small countries or States like Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan and in the face of or in the neighbourhood of a mighty China which occupies one sixth of the land surface we cannot predict their future.

What is more? India is wedded to protect and guard the interests of Bhutan and Sikkim. So, now there is the permanent danger which has been created by the proximity of the communist country. That is the chief point that has to be considered.

It may be said that these two countries may live side by side as friends, and that we may rely on China. But all previous facts show that we cannot rely on a communist country because they keep to the agreements as long as it suits them. We had previous agreements between the plenipotentiaries of China and India and other countries. The border line was defined. All sorts of agreements were entered into but these agreements are set aside. We must profit by what is happening in the neighbourhood of other communist countries.

For example, in Europe you take all those small countries that surrounded Russia. They have now become practically her satellites. They have now been absorbed. What is the fate of Latvia, of Estonia, of Serbia, of Bul-

garia and Albania and the Ukraine. Nearly thirteen States in Eastern Europe have become satellites of communist Russia, and thirteen ancient capitals have been absorbed. So, I submit that this communism which is Russian in origin, Chinese by adoption and world-wide in its application and ruthless in execution—so long as we remain under the influence of this communism there is no safety.

Here is a new form of imperialism, which is not only ideological but strategic and economic also. Now, a communist country becomes our immediate and close neighbour. That is the greatest danger. Can we rely on a communist country in view of our past experience; can we rely on their words?

These are the factors which the Prime Minister has to take into consideration before he commences the negotiations. It is not merely a temporary agreement which Chou En-lai may agree to—All right I will give up part of Ladakh or NEFA—but the Prime Minister must get a guarantee or must satisfy himself that there is no danger of communist aggression of this country.

We know we can fight against an external force, against an external enemy but, unfortunately, it must be understood, we cannot fight against ourselves. That is the situation.

Sir, our Prime Minister has been following a policy of non-alignment. In pursuance of this policy we have been inviting dignitaries from all over the world. Practically we have been honoured by a visit from dignitaries from every country, dignitaries who represent various views, dignitaries who represent various blocs. It is a good thing. We are friends with all these countries. But sometimes the effect created by the visit of one dignitary will be neutralised by the visit of another dignitary. It is a good thing to have friends, but it is not

always good or prudent to have too many friends, because when an emergency arises, when an occasion arises, when we are really in danger, it may so happen that we have no friends at all. In this connection, I am reminded of an incident. A friend of mine went to a place where he had a number of relatives. He went there with an empty stomach expecting that one of the relatives would invite him and he would have a hearty meal. But after he went there it so happened that each relative began to think that the other man would have invited my friend and therefore he need not invite him. Finally no relative invited him and he had to come back with an empty stomach. That is the danger of having too many relatives in a certain place. Where I have a number of relatives I always make it a point to dump myself with a particular relative so that I may be ensured of my meals. Here there is a similar case.

Then, it is true that a country must be strong. The Prime Minister has agreed that our country must be strong. In these days everybody wants the country to be strong. How to attain strength? Strength can be attained, safety can be attained or peace can be attained because we all want to be peaceful. We all want peace. Peace can be attained either through appeasement or through negotiation or through strength. Appeasement is, I think, regarded as cowardliness. That is what some of us feel. We feel that the Prime Minister's invitation is a sort of appeasement. Attainment of peace through appeasement is not at all possible because we will always be under the mercy of somebody else. Through negotiation, we must rely on the party with whom we negotiate. He must be a man of character and of integrity. But the third way, Sir, is attainment of peace through strength. Unless there is strength we cannot attain peace. In fact, Sir, it is said that peace reigns in Europe and America because of the existence

422 (A) LS-8.

of atom bombs and hydrogen bombs. Anyhow, if we want to attain peace through strength, we must take necessary steps to attain that strength. I would strike a different note so far as our alignment or non-alignment policy is concerned. I know our Prime Minister is wedded to a non-alignment policy. He is wedded to Panchsheel. He wants to live peacefully with every country. The non-alignment policy will be all right when we deal with a country which also follows a non-alignment policy. But we are not sure if China has been following a non-alignment policy. You know there is understanding among all the Communist countries to help each other. They have got a world of their own. So, is it prudent for India to adopt a non-alignment policy or, it may be an all-alignment policy? My own opinion is, we want peace and in these days we must build up strength if we want peace. The suggestion made by various leaders that the time has come to revise the non-alignment policy needs serious consideration even though it may hurt our Prime Minister because the integrity and the independence of the country are at stake. We cannot stand on sentiments. We must face the facts in their proper perspective.

17 hrs.

We know that the entire world is divided into various groups. Each country, I think, except India, has been doing its best to attain strength. Perhaps India is the only country which like the old proverbial sage is sticking to her own policy. Though we need not align ourselves with other blocs, the suggestion that we in south-east Asia must come to an understanding amongst ourselves is worth serious consideration. Take, for instance, India and Pakistan. I am sure Pakistan will welcome that. Pakistan and India have similar problems. We face a common danger and a common enemy. So, India, Pakistan and Burma and other south-east Asian countries must, I think

[Shri Mahammed Imam]

come to some understanding not only to face the aggression but face Communism, to repel Communism, which we do not want. Otherwise, if the present policy is continued, I can assure you that there will be a fort-wall of Communism not only all round India but all round the south-east Asian countries. So, this is a matter which requires serious consideration.

Whatever party we may belong to, whether Communist or Socialist, we are one in upholding the independence and integrity of our country. We must do the best thing. We owe a responsibility to posterity. We must leave them safe in safe hands. So, there is a great responsibility which rests on the Prime Minister. Therefore, I commend this suggestion to the Prime Minister: when he meets the Chinese Premier, he must take into confidence the leaders of other groups also and if necessary those who have experience of China and other countries. It is not merely the question of warding off the permanent danger or a border dispute that has arisen. He must apply and devote himself to the questions as to how to safeguard the safety and integrity of India as against the Communist menace and Communist aggression and also how to ensure the safety of our northern borders which are now flanked by China.

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in my intervention I would like to touch some of the points which were raised by certain members in this House. To begin with, it was alleged by members that there has been a shift in the position adopted by the Government when the Prime Minister invited the Premier of China to come to India for negotiations. On that plea, members have been very eloquent and acutually insistent that we should not have anything to do with China, that we should not negotiate because negotiation would mean surrender of certain posi-

tion that we have taken, which would be to the disadvantage of our country. Here I would like to point out that it is like insisting on not moving at all if there has been any break-down, let us say, in a journey. Suppose a person wants to go on a journey by car. Suddenly there is a break-down of the motor car, and the only alternative available is a jeep or train or a bullock cart, and the member insists that unless there is a car he will not move. That is exactly the position adopted by some members who insist that we should not have anything to do with China until the original position, the vacation of aggression which we had stated should take place, has taken place. Sir, to them I would say that if a certain avenue of negotiation fails, a Government which is interested in peace, in the settlement of problems by peaceful negotiations should explore other avenues, and there is no question of losing face here as it is only a question of having peaceful negotiations.

Then I come to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition about the convention on Tibet. The convention on Tibet was held some time ago, in May 1959, and that convention laid down certain procedure by which to pursue its work. There was an insinuation in the hon. Member's speech in which he said that the Government and the Prime Minister gave a long rope to this Convention. Here I would like to say that from the very beginning Government had dissociated itself with the work of the convention. In fact, the Prime Minister was not at all happy that voluntary organisations should hold conferences which, in his opinion and in the opinion of the Government would not make a short cut to peace. However, we are in a democracy and our Constitution gives absolute freedom to any organisation to hold any kind of conference in this country. Under the circumstances, to think that the Government are helping, either directly or indirectly, this convention on Tibet is not right. It

is quite true that Shri Jai Prakash Narayan has sent his own emissaries to various governments. But he has perfect freedom to do so. He is arranging a conference and, naturally he will invite delegates from abroad, and they will be given the normal facilities which we give to the delegates attending other conferences, if we are satisfied that they are eligible to come to India. For the rest, I want to state on behalf of the Government that the Government of India is in no way associated either with the holding of the original convention that was held in May 1959 or the subsequent activities of the sponsors of this conference. We have also informed our emissaries abroad that this is a conference which is arranged by non-officials on the initiative of non-officials and the Government have nothing to do with it. I am sure this should satisfy the hon. Member.

Now I come to the second point, the question of Dalai Lama's treasures. This question was raised in both the Houses of Parliament and answers have been given. But I suppose it is the normal procedure that at the time of the Demands for Grants these issues should be raised again and, therefore, I would like to repeat what has been stated before, that the Government have no knowledge of the exact nature of the treasure, or the exact amount. As has been pointed out, it has been stated that it may be anything between Rs. 80 lakhs and Rs. 15 crores.

This is rather an unusual assessment of the value of any kind of property or thing which varies between Rs. 80 lakhs and Rs. 15 crores. It is true that these treasures came to Sikkim in 1951 when there was a fear perhaps that the Dalai Lama would like to leave Tibet. Anyway the treasure was admitted and was kept in safe custody in Sikkim. Recently we had given normal facilities, escort etc., as the hon. Member alleged, to bring this treasure to Calcutta. But the Govern-

ment of India have no knowledge of the exact value. It is alleged on behalf of the Dalai Lama that this is his private property. If any hon. Member has any doubt as to this assertion it is for him to prove in a court of law whether the property belonged to the Tibetan Government as such or whether it is the personal property of the Dalai Lama. Till that is done we would accept the assertion made on behalf of the Dalai Lama that it is the private property of the Dalai Lama and that he has absolute freedom to do what he likes to do with it.

It has been claimed that we, the Government of India, have waived all normal procedures in order to bring this wealth to India. The hon. Members would remember that under our existing rules there is no duty whatever for the import of gold from Tibet into India. There is a certain duty on the import of silver. This has been waived, it is true specially after the recent happenings in Tibet when refugees, who came to India, were allowed to carry whatever wealth they had in the shape of silver. The normal customs duties were waived. For the rest I have no information except the statement made by the Dalai Lama himself that if this gold etc. were converted into currency it will be properly invested and will be used for the alleviation of the sufferings of the Tibetan refugees. I do not see any reason why we should go by what Dr. Sen says in London and not believe what the Dalai Lama himself says in India. I am sure the hon. Member must be satisfied with the purpose for which the Dalai Lama's treasures will be used. After all the Dalai Lama is responsible to a large extent for the refugees and it is quite likely that in his wisdom he would use this amount for correct purposes and not for political propaganda or for other political purposes as hinted by the hon. Member.

Now I come to the allied question, that is, the question of rehabilitation and resettlement of the Tibetan refu-

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon]

gees. Some hon. Members expressed the fear that if we settled these refugees on the border it might not be altogether safe. Wherever they are settled, they are settled far away from the border, 150 to 300 miles away from the border. I was really astonished at the suggestion made that all the Tibetan refugees should be settled in southern India. I do not know whether the people in South India want to see the Tibetans or whether they have anything special to offer, let alone the climate. It is well known that these people come from very high altitudes and it will be a crime if we have to settle them in places which are absolutely uncongenial from the point of view of climate.

It is quite true that the amount that we ask for the settlement of Tibetans is not going to be an *ad hoc* grant. It is going to be a part of our regular Budget for some years, I think, till these people are settled and absorbed into some kind of permanent rehabilitation. Already, measures are being taken to educate the young people, to send people who wanted religious education to the various Lamaseries; artisans have been given opportunities to ply their art and trade, and able-bodied unskilled people have been put on construction work, either for roads or for forest areas. I have got the exact figures, but I do not think it is necessary to tire the House with these figures. But I want to say that every effort is made to make them independent, economically independent, and also settle them, because I do not see any prospect of these people going back to their homes.

Sir, you would remember that at that time the Government had no idea whatever that the number of refugees that would come to India would mount to such vast figures. It is over 16,000 now, and even now people are coming not in large numbers, but in small numbers, but they

are coming. So, the problem is going to be not a stray one, but will be part of our regular Budget for some years to come.

Something was said about the need for having closer association with Bhutan and Sikkim. I really do not know why people imagine things when they know there is nothing that has come between India on the one hand and Sikkim and Bhutan on the other. Our relations with these States have been exceedingly friendly, and I have myself answered many questions in this House putting before the House the details of the amounts spent for developmental works, and a statement was also made by the Prime Minister that we are responsible for the defence of both these States, that any aggression or anything which interfered with the boundaries of these States, would be regarded as aggression against us. Even so, there are Members who think that there should be closer association with Sikkim and Bhutan.

Shri Rajendra Singh: One point, Sir.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The hon. Member did not speak. I do not know what point he is trying to raise.

The political relations between India and Bhutan, and India and Sikkim, are based on treaties and you know, Sir, that according to the Treaty of 1949 between India and Bhutan, there shall be perpetual peace and friendship between our two countries, and India has also undertaken to exercise no interference in the internal administration of Bhutan. The hon. Members would also remember the provisions that are made for developing communications or developing industries in these areas, and I really do not think it is necessary for me to go over that all again.

Shri Rajendra Singh: The question is bringing about a democratic set-up in Sikkim and Bhutan.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: It is for them to have the kind of Government they want. The hon. Members here think that it is the duty of India to govern the whole world, they want us to solve all the problems all over the world; not only that, they also want us to dictate the kind of Governments that other States should have. That is not certainly.....

Shri Rajendra Singh: When you assume the responsibility of defending.....

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am not yielding, and I do not know why the hon. Member keeps on interrupting me before he has actually made this contribution to the debate.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is exactly the reason why he is interrupting, because he did not get a chance!

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: Will you kindly give him a chance, so that tomorrow the Prime Minister can reply?

The Government of India is responsible for the defence of the territorial integrity of Sikkim, and the external relations of Sikkim also shall be guided by the Government of India. So, there is no point in saying that there should be closer relations between Sikkim and India.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee raises one issue almost every year. Some of the topics come up again and again, they might be called real hardy annuals. Only this year, he has mentioned not only London, but has also added Washington, which makes my task very easy. This is a question about remittances and the continued utilisation of foreign banks for making payments abroad, in London and Washington. I would like to point out at this stage that it is the general policy of the Government of India to utilise Indian banks for remittances abroad as far as possible. The High Commission in London does not make any remittances direct. It is done through the Reserve Bank of India, but as far as other places are

concerned, especially remittances in Washington, we do not have branches of Indian Banks there. The hon. Member did say that this is the usual excuse given by the Government of India that we do not have branches there, but I would like to point out that we have always insisted that wherever possible, the remittances should be made through the Indian banks, and I would like to state the progress that we have already made.

In 1956, during the period January to December, the remittances through the non-Indian banks were £18,521,476, and through Indian banks £5,503,833. In 1957 through Indian banks, the remittances were £10,768,776, and in 1958 they were £11,073,071. During the corresponding periods, the remittances through the non-Indian banks were as follows. In 1957, the remittances through non-Indian banks were £67 million odd, and in 1958, they had come down to £37,361,686, and in 1959, they came to only £12,625,223.

The difficulty is that the volume of export trade for which the Indian banks function as bankers is far less than the volume of Government imports; also, the Indian banks have got very limited foreign currencies or foreign exchange, and, therefore, it is difficult for them to have the same amount of business as the foreign banks.

Now, I come to some very important things. One is about administrative economies. It is quite true that expenditure with regard to administration is increasing, and it will go on increasing. Hon. Members know that in a country which has a developing economy, and in a Ministry which is constantly opening up Missions abroad, because new countries are becoming independent, and these new countries are demanding that we open Missions there, it is very difficult to enforce economies without affecting efficiency.

The question has been raised as to the poor external publicity that we

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon]

have. The assumption is that, if we do enough propaganda, then the whole world will be converted to our way of thinking. Our Members here are exposed to a terrible amount of propaganda from other countries. People claim that Soviet propaganda is so good, that Chinese propaganda is so good, and that American propaganda is so good, but I would like to know how many of our people have been converted to the policies or the way of thinking of the Americans or the Chinese or the Russians. The very fact that all of us, I mean all of us on this side of the House, and the majority in the country, still abide by our policies and still have faith in the country is not because we are not exposed to foreign influences or foreign propaganda, but because people very seldom change their attitudes and well-considered opinions just because they are exposed to foreign propaganda. Even so, we are doing everything possible not to convert other people by putting out untruths and half-truths and exaggerated accounts of our progress, but to tell the plain truth about what is happening in the country. When we have only to tell the truth, it is not necessary to display the truth in glowing colours and try to capture the imagination of other people. People come to us. It is not necessary for us to tell them what is happening in the country. Foreigners come, technicians come, engineers come, tourists come, not in their tens, not in their hundreds, but in their thousands, and the whole country is an open book to them; they can go round, they can see, and they can ask people what is happening in the country. There is no restriction as in the case of countries where people have to be told what is happening, because they are not allowed to see what is happening. So, in such a country as ours, the amount spent on propaganda or publicity is strictly limited. Even otherwise, even if we want to spend more money, we are entirely dependent on the Parliament to give us more and more grants, so that we can expand our publicity arrangements.

As it is, to say that we have no publicity machinery abroad is also wrong. One hon. Member said that the Director of the External Publicity Division should be a distinguished journalist. I really do not know; it looks as if the director's duty is to write articles and propaganda material; the director does not do all those things; the director has to see, and has to understand, the policy of Government with regard to external publicity, the policy of Government with regard to their international relations, and all that he does is to manage a group of journalists or a group of writers and see that the material that they put out is presentable and is understandable. For that, a senior officer in the Ministry who has had some experience of work in Missions abroad is more important than a journalist, however eminent he may be, who is picked up from the journalistic world. I do not agree with the suggestion made by the hon. Member.

And what is the amount that we have for publicity work? It is all very well to say that our publicity is weak, that the information centre is not functioning properly. I am very glad to hear from Shri D. C. Sharma that in foreign countries, it is very difficult to get any news about India or about our activities, and the only source of information is through the information centres and our publications.

For instance, in 1956 or in 1958-59 or in 1959-60 what is the total allotment for publicity? It is only Rs. 93 lakhs. Imagine that Rs. 93 lakhs is that is available for the information department of the Ministry; out of that Rs. 71 lakhs is spent on salaries, and Rs. 22 lakhs is represented as expenditure in headquarters. It is the headquarters that has to publish all the material; it is the headquarters that has to publish whatever has to be published.

We are told that during these recent months, when we have had

difficulties in China, our publicity has been very poor. Although we have put out enough material for those who wish to read and understand, even so we are blamed that we have not put out enough material, and also that we have not made any effort to translate this material in all the languages. It is quite true, as one of the Members pointed out, that we do not have a translation cadre or a well organised cadre in our Ministry who can translate all the stuff that is being put out in the various languages and distributed to the various countries. That also means enormous expenditure because interpreters and translators are not easily available for one thing in our country, and the other thing is that we shall have to employ foreigners who are able to translate into foreign languages, to which also hon. Members would object; and it is not really advantageous for us to have foreign personnel engaged in these things. It will take some time till our people are themselves educated in foreign languages so that they could take up this responsibility and do the needful. One hon. Member said that the delegations that we send abroad should do more propaganda. In all humility, I must say that a delegation is chosen for a definite purpose. If you send a delegation to the United Nations, and that delegation instead of attending the meetings of the General Assembly goes round doing propaganda, as some others do, then it is no advantage to Government, nor would they be fulfilling their responsibility properly. A delegation is sent for a particular purpose, and during their period of delegation, they should do, or attend to, the work that is entrusted to them.

It is also pointed out that we should try to cultivate people with gentleness etc. etc. Nobody who is responsible in this country will go out and try to make enemies. Naturally, our desire when we go abroad is to see that our country's problems are properly presented, that we try to create good-will among the people that we meet and so on, but the presumption

that we go round throwing bricks or trying to create hostility towards our country is really unwarranted.

These are some of the things that I would like to tackle now. Tomorrow, when the Prime Minister replies to the debate, I am sure he will deal with the other points.

I shall take just one minute more, because I want to deal with the passport business.

An. Hon. Member: Passport racket.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I am sorry I have to take a little time in regard to this, because it is an important thing. There is a feeling that there are two kinds of passport rackets. One presumably is the Ministry itself, because we are asked why we take such a long time in the issuing of passports. It is alleged that we are not functioning properly and, therefore, passports are not issued in time. I want to give certain figures to show the rapidity with which we do our job. The figures from the month of January, 1960 show that out of 2909 applications received during the month, 2639 applications, that is, 90.7 per cent, were disposed of in the same month in addition to 140 pending cases. In many cases we do not get police reports. Sometimes the Regional Passport Officer may have to refer the matter to the External Affairs Ministry and sometimes it is found that the previous passports have been issued not in India but in some other places. Many of the people who want passports come from the Punjab. Sir, you yourself know the amount of difficulty that we face. The policy of the Government is not to give passports to illiterate and semi-illiterate people for obvious reasons because they get involved in all sorts of things and, therefore, it is the policy of the Government not to issue passports to them as far as possible. Sometimes we find that bogus financial guarantees are given. They put Rs. 10,000 in a Bank and give us a guarantee and as soon as they get the passport that money is released

Shri D. C. Sharma: It is not only in the case of Punjab. It applies to all the States.

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: May be in the case of all the States.

Sir, before I conclude I want to say something about what the hon. Member of the Opposition said, about the callousness on the part of our Embassy officials in Rome with regard to the people who were in camps in Italy. I myself have given an answer here that many times our officers visited the camp and they found nothing. The campers suffered from two things; one, lack of understanding of the Italian language and secondly, they did not like the Italian food. What can we do here? Otherwise, they were comfortable and the Italian Government gave them absolute freedom to leave Italy if they wanted to and the Government were willing to repatriate them. But they did not want to come back to India because they had sold away all their properties and given away all their possessions in order to secure bogus passports and they feared if they came back to India they would be arrested and prosecuted. Therefore, they did not want to come back to India. To blame officers for something which they never did is very unkind because our officers, specially in this case, did everything possible. The Secretary went two or three times in the beginning to find out what was wrong with them and then took up the matter with the Italian Government. To say again and again that the officers were callous and did not look after these poor people who were in camps in Italy is wrong.

Shri Khadlikar (Ahmednagar): I would not take a mechanistic view of international events, as many hon. Members who have spoken today in the debate on the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry have done. I consider that this year marks the beginning of the end of an era of our external relations. If I were to term it, I would call it the era of honeymoon diplomacy, because imme-

diately after freedom in the first years, when we tried to establish relationship with the western world, the outside world, we were looking at it with rosy eyes. Naturally because of our past experience under foreign rule, we carried a certain amount of missionary zeal in our relationship with the external world. We considered everything with a certain amount of anti-imperialist bias, without bearing in mind the fact that our relationship as an independent country with the outside world had undergone a transformation and we have got to view the world with a sense of reality.

We must, therefore, really thank China for bringing about this awakening in this country. When we view the last twelve years of our external relations, we find that there was a fireman in our Ministry who used to go with a fire brigade to every potential spot or likely spot of international conflagration—I am referring to Shri Krishna Menon—and the diplomacy was directed to one purpose, namely, that there should not be any international conflict of a major nature at least. That was one aspect of our diplomacy.

Another aspect is the hangover of the past. We had a bad experience of western imperialism. We naturally considered that as a result of the Second World War, a big socialist world emerged victorious. Those countries which had become free recently looked on this world with a certain amount of—I would not say exactly attachment but—liking because it was considered that it was a liberating force; and in case we have got to meet the machinations of the imperialists this force, as a balance of powers in the new world set-up, would come up to our aid. Therefore, all these diplomatic relations were carried on in an atmosphere of unreality but a certain amount of charm was there. Those of our diplomats who went abroad thought that they were representing a big country which had just achieved freedom and they could just impress

others without understanding what was diplomacy and what were the real national interests of our country and how we were going to serve them. That was the main question. Therefore, this aggression, for the first time, brought us face to face with the realities of the world as it existed today. We have got to give serious thought to it.

17-37 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

So far as our basic policy is concerned, we feel that we are maintaining a dynamic neutrality. We are not aligned. I have nothing to say about that. But, when we are faced with this problem—this Chinese problem—this non-alignment does not remain an academic issue. Today we have got to decide.

One party in this country feels that as a nation we should adopt a fellow-traveller's attitude. This is the pleading of one party. There is another section which feels and propagates the view that we should adopt a camp follower's attitude—of the western bloc. And, in this conflict, at this hour, the time has come when we have got to redefine in diplomatic terms—I am not suggesting that there is any need for any basic change in the policy—whatever is the policy decided upon in this Parliament. When it is to be executed, it is the duty of the External Affairs Ministry to see that that is being executed with a certain sense of realisation, keeping in mind the interests of the country at large.

As a nation we cannot behave as if we are camp followers or fellow travellers of this side or that side. This attitude must be abandoned once for all. This is the lesson that China has taught us. (*Interruption*).

There is another way of looking at it. As I said once you give up this romantic period of honeymoon diplomacy and enter a period of realism, then, as Prof. Toynbee said recently, India holds the balance in the worldwide competition between rival ideo-

logies. That aspect is very important, because when we come in direct conflict with China we had never before realised that China is on our border, so far, till we had the experience that China could militarily deal with the Tibetans and destroy their autonomy, and come to our border with all its armed might. So the very fact that China having a different social system has touched our border in an aggressive posture brings about a qualitative change in our international relationship and a re-definition is called for because of this. This is my first plea.

Then, when I said I did not take a mechanistic view of international relations, it was because international relationship is always in a state of flux and if you want to grasp the reality you cannot afford, as I said on a former occasion, to lead the diplomatic relationship with a sort of one-track mind—I call it one-track diplomacy—because the diplomatic manoeuvres of the socialist world and the imperialist world have a different content. One world feels, and very naturally, that diplomacy is part of their dialectics, the other world feels that diplomacy is part of their speaking from the position of strength.

Therefore, when the world is balanced on a power level between the two camps, as Toynbee has observed, we are balanced on an ideological level and we are holding the ideological balance of the world. Are we going to maintain it any longer? This is the main question. While judging our attitude towards China if we bear this background in mind, bear it fully and try to execute our policies as adopted by this House, I think a certain amount of realism will be reflected in our dealings with other nations.

We used to take many things for granted, but international relationship does not permit taking things for granted. I need not point it out to the Deputy Minister for External Affairs who is sitting opposite. If we are to view the coming events from

[Shri Khadilkar]

this angle, I mean the meeting of the Chinese Prime Minister in Delhi with our Prime Minister, I think we will come to a different view altogether.

Sir, views have been expressed here, that after all, China is an aggressor we have stamped that aggression—a very serious charge indeed—as committing a breach of faith with us, they have not vacated the aggression. The one question asked is, should we talk with such a person and that too in our capital? I personally feel that in international relationship you cannot just sit tight in your position. You have got to discover a new position from where you can deal with your neighbour, whether aggressive or ordinary friendly neighbour, with a certain position of vantage.

If China, in my opinion, as I have studied the northern border, had not committed any aggression and approached our country in a friendly way—from all the correspondence it is clear that now China has realised and she just wants a sort of communication for her convenience between Tibet and Sinkiang—where we so long could not establish a sort of physical possession—it is a territory notionally in our possession

An Hon. Member: No, no.

Shri Khadilkar: I am talking of facts of history and geography both. We have failed to establish a physical possession, but from traditional borders as they were defined certainly it was our territory. My view is that if they had approached us in a friendly way we would have conceded, looking to the interest of our neighbour, their requirements and accommodated China. Today, China has placed us in such a corner that we cannot just afford to accommodate China. That is the major difficulty in the way of negotiation.

Another very important factor is this. Let us realise once for all this aspect of the problem. When two big

systems, whatever be the rights or the wrongs of a system, come face to face like India and China, and when their borders align, it is very difficult to maintain a certain amount of close and friendly relationship. If I were to refer to history, I may point out that Afghanistan is the creation of the British and Russian diplomacy. That creation of the old imperialist era today survives because Russia also feels that it would be a sort of safety valve between two big nations. You have to create such safety valves by allowing small nations to survive in freedom. Therefore, in 1954, it was assumed that the autonomy of Tibet would not be violated by China. Even now, if we reach a negotiated settlement with China, without yielding or surrendering, and keeping the honour and the dignity of our country, we will have to plead with China that so long as China is sitting with her military might on the top of the Himalayas, it would be difficult to convince our people about the good neighbourly relations with China. This, we cannot forget, and ultimately we will have to persuade China to restore and respect the autonomy of Tibet.

I am not talking from any partisan angle. I am talking from the facts of history and geography and am talking from the position of reality. Then there is another question which is very significant. As I said, the recent conflict with China has brought a of realism. I would say we have become a little introvert now. So long our attitude was more concerned with the outside problems. Now, we have got to think in terms of the defence of our Himalayan frontiers. When we think about it, it is absurd to think just about about more weapons or more personnel. The defence of our border assumes a special significance now in the light of another system coming to our border. We have got to establish communications. But more than that, we will have to impart a sense of oneness with the people of the hills and the people of the plains. Today, a wide psychological gulf divides them.

The people of the hills believe that the people of the plains are something different and therefore all attempts must be made to create a sense of oneness. Whatever money has to be spent must be spent to bring up the border people and make them feel that they are coming up with the people of the plains. Ultimately, the defence of the border will depend on the morale and the loyalty of the hills. They must have a stake in our society. Unless you create that feeling and that condition of stake in our society, I do not think even military roads will keep the border safe.

Therefore, the primary duty, from the point of view of creating a bulwark of defence on the Himalayan border, is to take measures for bringing them up and creating a sense of oneness with our country and the people on the plains. Today, whether we admit or not, a sense of a certain amount of separation and aloofness prevails among the hill people. We are looked upon, or perhaps looked down, as something different, as they have their own civilization and their own culture.

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

Shri Khadilkar: In this context, I would like to mention the Naga problem. In dealing with the Naga problem, we have been inhibited, and very naturally, in our military operations. What do we find there? Even after military operations, today there is a good guerilla base, from which the fanatic Nagas are fighting. In a society where there is a social base for rebels or fighters, the guerilla warfare can be fought, that is known to all. Therefore, looking at the broader problem of defence on the northern border of India, I would plead that the time has come when we should openly invite the Naga rebel leader Phizo and others and talk things with them. I will give you an instance. In East Africa the leaders who were connected with Mau Mau today were indirectly recognised and talks have started. You cannot just

create some moderate section so long as you do not initiate talks. I know from personal experience—the military personnel are also corroborating it—that they have failed in dealing with the Naga problem, in winning them over to our side. Therefore, the best thing would be to bring the genuine Naga leaders round and establish relations with them. Today they might be rebels, but once upon a time we were also rebels. It would be possible to have an autonomous Naga State as a part of our Union. It is not too late and it would not be too difficult. Fortunately, our relationship with Pakistan.....

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: May I ask one question? Is it his suggestion that border areas should be turned into autonomous States? Is it his suggestion?

Shri Khadilkar: I am sorry, the hon. Member has misunderstood me. So far as the Naga problem is concerned, there is a section in the report. After reading the report and taking other things into consideration, it is my conclusion that it is not as we thought just a military problem. My reference was only to the Naga land, recognising their full autonomy within the Indian Union and dealing directly with the rebel leaders. I do not mean that you have to deal in the same manner with all other hill tribes. That is not my suggestion.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: But the Naga land is in the India-China-Burma border. It has got a strategic position.

Shri Khadilkar: I know that it is on India-China-Burma border, I have got a good grasp of geography.

Then I come to Pakistan. So far as Pakistan is concerned, it is a good augury that the old chapter of strife and conflict is likely to come to an end. There are signs already. Though there were acts of aggression, because Pakistan had adopted a certain attitude—Pakistan became a part of the world military alliances—though our policy and their policy differed, still

[Shri Khadilkar]

our attitude to Pakistan, with all the acts of aggression committed on our border, was very friendly and very naturally they had at last realised it. Only one problem now stands in the way. Fortunately, the other day the Pakistan Foreign Minister said regarding Kashmir,—and you know that it has become a sort of obsession with Pakistan, and the Pakistani people—he said “we consider plebiscite as the only solution” but if India could offer another solution, a better and durable solution, we are ready to consider it. I think this is the new trend. If we can seize the opportunity and try to explore the possibilities on the cease-fire border, creating a certain amount of confidence on the other side and this side that we can decide this problem where the cease-fire has been stabilised, there is a possibility and if we could do that, I think we would be in a position to strengthen our ties without entering into any defence pact with Pakistan, as some Swatantra people are advocating. Because, it is repugnant, it is inconsistent with our policy as Pakistan forms part of an international military alliance. Therefore, we cannot enter into a sort of defensive pact. But still we can have one customs union. We can have better relations with Pakistan. Our two economies are so complementary to each other that both can mutually benefit by better relations.

Then I would like to refer to Goa.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. He cannot exhaust all the things in one speech.

Shri Khadilkar: I will not take much time.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Let him be the last speaker today.

Mr. Speaker: I will call one other hon. Member before we adjourn.

Shri Khadilkar: I will take only five minutes. I want to touch the problem of Goa. As I am in touch

with the local developments I may tell you very frankly that there is a sense of bitterness and frustration all round. They feel that the Government of India has let them down. At the same time there is a certain amount of awakening because in Portugal there is a ferment. Some Church leaders have taken the lead against Salazar's dictatorship. From my knowledge I can say that people who voted for General Delgado who fought the election as the opponent of Salazar were being persecuted in Goa proper. We must take note of all these things. We just should not sit tight in our present position.

Why do I say this? It is because there are 35 Indian nationals still in Goan prisons. They have been accused of violence. One of our nationals—it is the pity of it—Shri Mohan Laxman Ranade has been sentenced for 20 years. After the sentence he has been kept in an isolation cell under Police surveillance. He has not been sent to a regular prison anywhere. When we look at all these conditions, when supporters of Delgado in Goa are being persecuted, when 35 of our nationals are still rotting in their jails and when there is a certain awakening as they are in close touch with Portugal and with the new ferment that is discernible there, it is time for us to think about Goa in some positive terms and not simply say that time alone will bring Goan liberation. This would be a counsel of despair. So far as Goa is concerned I would like to say this much.

One point more and I shall finish. My feeling is that we have taken less interest in the African awakening. It was expected of us and people expect even now that we should keep with them and try to support their struggles wherever possible. I would like in this connection to refer to Algeria. There is the Algerian Provisional Government. From my knowledge I can say that at the present moment when de Gaulle has gone back on his previous offer, NATO divisions from Germany are fighting in Algeria to sup-

press the rebels. Therefore the time has come to offer assistance. We should consider whether recognition of the Provisional Government would help them better or whether some other way of assistance could be found out. Indonesia has recognised it, and about twenty other nations, Pakistan, our neighbour, could not recognise it because it forms part of the Western alliance. But the time has come when we have got to look to this aspect.

So far as the foreign delegations are concerned, all care is taken to select the most innocent people. From what point of view, I do not know. It is innocence abroad when they go flaunting as delegates of India representing this aspect or that aspect of life not knowing the background of the country and not having any acquaintance with the social conditions that prevail. If such people are sent, it is a big waste of money. With my experience I am prepared to say this, based on a certain amount of study and knowledge, that selection of the delegations that go to UNO annually is made more from the innocents, more from the ignorants, than from those who are capable of playing the role as delegates of this big country. Therefore, I would appeal to the Ministry of External Affairs that henceforth, instead of sending innocents abroad and sometimes bringing disgrace to this country, to curtail their numbers if necessary, that does not matter; but if they want to send the proper persons, they have got to select really capable people.

18 hrs.

Our foreign broadcasts, particularly from the point of view of international relations, are almost nil.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: On a point of order, Sir. Can the hon. Member cast aspersions on Members of Parliament who are sent in delegations as ignorant, inexperienced etc.?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He has got the right.

Shri Khadilkar: I have got the right, what is the objection?

Shri Radhelal Vyas: I think it is not proper.

Shri Khadilkar: All right, then you say that.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: He has characterised them as "innocents". Perhaps he wants "offenders" to be sent!

Mr. Speaker: I thought the UN delegates consisted of both Members of Parliament and non-members. It may apply to others! I cannot prevent the hon. Member referring to the constitution of the delegations. Of course, he should not cast aspersions on Members of Parliament. We are all representatives.

Shri Khadilkar: I had no intention of casting any aspersion.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He has not even referred to Members of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: All that he means is that persons who are taken are not acquainted with the task and social conditions here.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: But that is also not correct.

Mr. Speaker: He may be wrong, there may be difference of opinion.

Shri Khadilkar: If you have a meeting in the Central Hall and ask them to speak about the country they have visited, our Speaker would be able to judge their quality.

Mr. Speaker: I said already, sitting in the Central Hall is no disqualification. Let him refer to persons other than Members of Parliament.

Shri Khadilkar: So far as publicity is concerned, we must maintain an independent international news service. But now, so far as external news service is concerned, we are depending on other news services which have

[Shri Khadilkar]

vital interests in some countries or some camp. Therefore, unless you establish, help in establishing, an independent international news service on the one side, and have a good commentary on international affairs. . .

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: He is talking about broadcasting, not about publicity.

Mr. Speaker: He says the External Affairs Ministry must have its own correspondents elsewhere, a world organisation to give them news. There is no good attaching it to the Broadcasting Ministry.

Shri Khadilkar: I am showing the drawbacks of your publicity from another angle.

I do not know why there is no commentary. I know the Minister of Broadcasting was formerly a Deputy Minister of External Affairs. But are there no people of talent in this country to give a good, lucid interpretation of our foreign policy on the radio? I am surprised. Therefore, I would like the External Affairs Ministry to look into this aspect of publicity appealing to the intelligentsia of the world in

an intelligent manner and interpreting the policies of our country in the light of our own experience.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Thanu Pillai.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): Mr. Speaker, Sir . . .

An Hon. Member: That is all. Tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Possibly he does not want to speak!

Shri Thanu Pillai: This Ministry . . .

Mr. Speaker: How long will he take?

Shri Thanu Pillai: Fifteen to 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: He may continue tomorrow.

18.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till March 17, 1960/Phalgun 27, 1881 Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, (Saka).