

Shri Frank Anthony: I wanted to make the request when the Leader of the House is here.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow out of turn requests to be made interrupting the proceedings of the House. There is an item on the Order Paper. When it is taken up, the hon. Member can make his request, and if the House is not willing to accede to his request, all his efforts will be fruitless.

Shri Frank Anthony: You can allow it.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot do anything. Let me see then. There is no good interrupting the proceedings. If he wants to go away somewhere, I cannot accommodate him.

Shri Frank Anthony: If the Leader of the House accepts my request?

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow him.

Shri Frank Anthony: Though the matter may not be before the House now according to the Order Paper, I feel the rest of the House would be with me and allow me to make any submission.

Mr. Speaker: Certainly I would insist upon every hon. Member keeping to the items on the agenda. Only adjournment motions I allow sometimes; I do not allow others. Whatever agenda is there ought not to be interrupted in any manner. The hon. Member will have the opportunity when the item comes up. There is no hurry. We are not going to do anything in a hurry.

12.23 hrs.

VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF SALARIES (EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION) BILL*

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for exempting from taxes on income a portion of the salary or allowances

payable to any person who has in the public interest volunteered to forego it.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for exempting from taxes on income a portion of the salary or allowances payable to any person who has in the public interest volunteered to forego it."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Morarji Desai: I introduce the Bill.

12.24 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the following motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister on the 16th August, namely:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

The amendments tabled are also before the House.

The hon. Prime Minister.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): He has spoken yesterday also. I may be given an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: He is the person who moved the motion. He has got the right of reply.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, my task in replying to this debate has been considerably lightened by the many speeches delivered by hon. Members yesterday who, even though differing in some emphasis

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II. Section 2, dated the 17-8-61.

or in some minor matter, demonstrated a very large agreement with the basic policies that we have been pursuing. There was only one exception to this of a lone Member belonging to a rather lone party which disagrees with everything that we do, domestic or foreign. For the moment I do not suppose it is necessary for me to meet the points he raised in this House which were one of disapproval of what we do. But, if I may say so with respect, I found a certain appreciation in the speeches delivered here of the fact that we have to consider these matters not in an isolated manner, but in the larger context of world affairs today. Foreign affairs, after all, deal with world affairs. Some of them may be of greater importance to us than to the rest of the world, but anything that is important for the world must necessarily be important to us. A subject like war and peace, for instance, is obviously of the greatest importance to every country and to us. It is well to remember that because it is in that context that we have to consider our own problems and to adopt our policy. I should only, therefore, refer to two or three matters in regard to which, perhaps, I can give some information to the House.

Hon. Member Shri Vajpayee said that our relations with the newly independent countries of Africa were not good, and that we should develop them. I do not think he is correct in making that assumption. Our relations with these various countries in Africa are good, they were good, but it is obvious that you cannot treat, one should not try to treat, these independent countries of Africa as, if I may say so, just countries which take the lead from this country or that country whether it is a great Power or whether it is India or any other country. They are full of a feeling of awakening, of growth, of strength, of trying to make themselves heard and to do something. Africa is full of a

new life, which, sometimes, may lead to some action which may not be approved by others, by Members of this House or by me, but the main thing is that Africa is a continent which is full of vitality and vigour today. That is the main thing we must welcome, not some minor thing that they may do which we may not like. It is quite wrong to imagine that friendship with other countries means directions which we may give them or presume to give them. We presume to give no directions to any country in that sense. There is certainly friendly consultation, sometimes friendly advice if it is needed, and an attempt to co-operate without anything binding us.

In regard to specific African countries, it is true that our representation there has been very limited in the past. There were very few independent countries. I am not talking about the United Arab Republic and North Africa which might be called Arab Africa, where we have had some representation, fairly good representation. Coming to the rest of Africa, we have had representation in Ghana and Nigeria. Now we propose, and we are taking steps, to have an Ambassador in Senegal, and his domain of activity will extend to the countries of Ivory Coast, Upper Volta and Niger. Our Ambassador in the Congo will presently represent us in Chad, Central African Republic, and Gabon. Our High Commissioner in Ghana will, in future, represent us at Sierra Leone, Mali, Guinea and Liberia. Our High Commissioner in Nigeria will represent us in the Cameroons, Togoland, and Dahomey, and our representative in Mauritius will represent us in Somalia. Thus, in a sense, we shall cover nearly all the new States of Africa. We are quite alive to the very great importance of Africa, and these new countries, and so far as we are concerned, we shall develop close contacts with them, we shall try to. Where necessary, where desired, and so far as we are capable, we shall give them help. We are even

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

asked for help, chiefly technical help. We are, in fact, even now giving it to a number of these countries.

Then again, I think Shri Nath Pai said something about a vacuum developing in Southeast Asia. It has become rather customary to talk of such vacuums. I confess I do not understand the use of this word but great powers sometimes talk of vacuum of course because they have been pushed out and therefore there is vacuum and they speak of filling a vacuum because they are not there and they think that somebody else may fill it up. I do not understand the business of vacuum. Each country functions and it may get into difficulties or not but there is no vacuum. There may be trouble if you like and there may be conflict in the country but there is no question of a vacuum to be filled by another country. It is a wrong approach. Anyhow, we are not out to fill any vacuums in other countries. Naturally, we want to have the closest friendly relations and therefore, our relations in Southeast Asia are good and friendly. Sometimes, in some matters we may not agree. Burma was specially mentioned by the hon. Member. I think in regard to Burma our relations have been extra-ordinarily good throughout these many years and they are good. Nothing has happened. I think the inference drawn is that they cannot be very good because Burma has concluded some kind of a frontier treaty with China and therefore its relation must be bad with us. That is not a justifiable impression. If Burma, taking everything into consideration, comes to a treaty with China about her borders, it is upto Burma to do it. We cannot go and tell Burma that because we are in conflict in regard to our borders with China, they must not have a treaty. That would not be a proper attitude for us nor is it justifiable. The meaning is that in a developing situation there are all kinds of new problems arising and it is not

right for us to expect that every country or many countries will keep in step with us or fall in line with us in regard to every problem that arises. There have been some petty things in regard to Burma, money being sent from India to Burma or from Burma to India—some minor matters which have arisen purely through misunderstanding. But, there is no major issue between Burma and us.

About the US aid to Pakistan and to us, President Ayub Khan has made some statements which were not, I think, correct. First of all, he made some statements about our getting military aid from the United States. He mentioned hundreds of tanks and missiles and what not. I was really surprised and I was wholly unaware of this fact. So, I enquired into it and I found that in the course of the last ten years, sometime in 1952 or 1953, we purchased something from the United States. I think we purchased some tanks in 1954-55, as we purchase such equipment from other countries; we purchase them from where we can get them at the best price. There has been of course no element of aid in the military equipment that we have got from other countries at any time and in fact in recent years we have purchased less from the United States, the major reason being that their prices are much more than those in other countries and naturally we prefer a market where we get things somewhat cheaper.

Then there is a statement made by President Ayub Khan and it has often been repeated on behalf of Pakistan: you do not get military aid but you get aid for civil purposes thereby releasing your resources for military purposes. That too is a very wrong argument because what aid that we get from any country abroad, normally speaking, is for particular purpose and if not one purpose, a group of purposes according to our planning; it is all tied up. Now, if

we get some money, let us say, from the United States or from UK or USSR, wherever it may be, we get it mostly for the foreign exchange element or for the capital goods that come in. In fact that aid does not release any of our domestic resources and in fact we have to spend domestic resources to make good that aid for a project. I think I have made it clear. If we do not get that foreign aid, we may not have that project; that is a different matter and unfortunately for us we will have to go without that project. But foreign aid does not lead to any release of our domestic resources for military or like purposes because any project that we undertake means expenditure of domestic money and foreign exchange. Therefore, every project that we take up is a drain on our domestic resources; it does not release the domestic resources. In case that foreign aid did not come, it may be that we may have to give up one or two or three or five projects. That is a different matter. But by its coming we do not get release for military purposes. The military purposes remain naturally a burden on us which we have to shoulder completely with such capacity as we have.

In this connection, may I draw the attention of the House to a news item? In this morning's newspaper there is a statement reported to have been made by Mr. Chester Bowles, Under Secretary of State, who was recently in India. He is reported to have said that the United States was committed to the defence of both India and Pakistan if attacked by the other. He was asked about his statement during his Indian tour that the United States would help India if India was attacked by Pakistan. He said, the report goes on, he had only repeated "the offer made by Shri Eisenhower in 1954 then President, made in a letter to Mr. Nehru in 1954. Of course we do the same for Pakistan; we are committed bothways....". Now, whatever commitments the US Government has with Pakistan is a different matter.

The alliances and treaties, the SEATO and the CENTO, etc. have separate agreements with Pakistan. There is no reference to the word 'committed'. They may be committed in their own minds. But there is no question of any commitment by any country to us in regard to aid of this type because, as the House will know, immediately we were committed in this way or anybody else was committed, it means our becoming not wholly unaligned. We begin to be aligned in one way; it must have that effect. As a matter of fact, this matter was not discussed at all—what Mr. Chester Bowles has said. They may feel probably some kind of a moral issue, because they are helping Pakistan and because possibly they feel that doing this has not been wholly right on the moral plane or on the practical plane and therefore, for themselves, they want to balance that by saying that 'we are committed to India if India is attacked by Pakistan.' There has been no mention, no talk and no commitment so far as we are concerned...

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): He said that US was committed to help India and to balance it he has said in Washington that US would help both India and Pakistan.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite understood what the hon. Member is saying but it does not matter. I wanted, both in the interest of the United States as well as of India, to make this matter perfectly clear. But, as a matter of fact, he refers to what President Eisenhower had said in 1954. President Eisenhower had not quite said this. What he had said was this; when we protested to him about the military aid being given to Pakistan, his reply to me was, then, that he would offer military aid to India. He said, "we are prepared to do the same to you," to which I had ventured to point out that if the military aid to Pakistan was or might be injurious to India,—about which we had protested—offering something to us would not be very much in keeping with our

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
dignity or theirs, our accepting it or their offering it. I had pointed out this to him.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Have they not assured you that the equipment supplied to Pakistan shall not be used against India?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes; of course they have always said it; they have said it again. That is a different matter. That is a matter between Pakistan and the United States, under what condition they give it. That is true. But what I am at present interested in saying is—lest there be a misapprehension of what Mr. Chester Bowles has said, no doubt meaning quite well to India, but not perhaps realising that it might be interpreted in a way which is not basically true—there is no question of any commitment to us about that. As for some countries in South-East Asia, the House may remember that they were at no time referred to as under the protection of SEATO. SEATO is not only protecting its own countries but is spreading its umbrella to some other countries which are not members of the SEATO. We are not under anybody's protection or anybody's clients in this respect. That should be made perfectly clear.

In this connection, I might also refer to another piece of news that occurs in this morning's newspapers and that is, that the Government of Portugal has sent a note to the Government of India protesting against the Bill recently passed in respect of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. I have not read their protest note which has just come in. But I need not at present read it. Anyhow, they express in this note, as I understand, their intention to exercise their right to passage through Indian Union territory to Dadra and Nagar Haveli. We shall of course deal with that note in the normal course. But I want to make it perfectly clear that no one is going to be allowed to pass through Indian territory sent by the Portuguese Government or any other Government. That should be made per-

fectly clear. If anybody seeks to do that, that person or group will be ejected with great speed from the Indian territory.

I had made this clear previously but I should like to do so again. Shri Braj Raj Singh again asked, "Why does not the Government agree to our nationals going to Goa to liberate it?" Well, how do our nationals go there? Either they go there in a Satyagraha fashion, unarmed, and offer themselves to be shot or imprisoned, or they go with some kind of arms such as they may possess. It is clear that if they go in an unarmed way, as we have seen, they will be shot down ruthlessly by the Portuguese, because however feeble their army, may be it is easy enough to shot down an unarmed people. And then that creates a certain situation for this House to consider, for the Government of India and our army to consider. We should be prepared for the consequences of that. Are we then prepared to send immediately the army,—those people are to be followed by the army—and if so, why not send the army previously, and why allow the people to be shot down and then go there? Or else, the other thing is that people should go there, either in small groups or individuals, with arms, to do petty acts of violence or violent struggle there. I am not going into the moral plane. A person or a group may be justified in doing that, but again, I do not think that is a practical proposition for odd individuals or small groups to do that. It will entangle us without producing results otherwise. We have to be clear on this. The Question of Goa, as far as I can see, can only be dealt with either on a completely peaceful basis or on a full armed basis. A time may come when you decide to deal with it on the armed basis. We will do so then. But this kind of petty violence by groups and imagining that the people going there without arms, the citizens going there to liberate it, is not a practical proposition if you like it, apart from anything else that is involved in it.

But, as I said yesterday, I think it was in the other House, if I am asked at the present moment to give any kind of assurance that we shall not use armed forces in regard to Goa, I am not in a position to give it. I do not know what we may do at any time, but we cannot at present in regard to the development of events everywhere, rule out the question of using armed forces in regard to Goa.

I am sorry I am rather going from subject to subject. As the House knows, in Tunisia, there has recently been a very deplorable and distressing incident, the bombing and other action taken by the French Government at Bizerta. Peculiarly painful this has been, and this shows how sometimes even Governments which have broadly acted in a way to get rid of their colonies, how they hold on to that mentality. That brutal mentality comes back, the mentality of treating other countries as if they are a subject race, to be set upon, to be shot down and bombed. Here is the French base in Tunisia. Obviously, from any point of view, even from the military point of view, a base in a foreign country can only be useful with the goodwill of the people of that country. It cannot be otherwise. For a little while it may be used against them, but broadly speaking, no base is of any use if the people of that country want to create trouble against that base. To imagine that by shooting and bombing Tunisians they can preserve the base at Bizerta seems to me really quite an extraordinary way of considering such problems. As a matter of fact, even the French have recognised that the base of Bizerta will have to go. So, it was only a question really of facing it,—whatever it may be—going quickly or a little slowly and in spreading it out. Anyhow, it was a matter for decision with the Tunisian Government, and as everyone knows the Tunisian Government, the head of that Government, has gone out of his way to be friendly with the western countries. In spite of that, he was

given this treatment presumably to to teach him a lesson. And yet, these countries do not realise that the lesson is certainly understood particularly in a way they did not expect.

Then we see the Secretary-General of the United Nations comes to Tunisia and wants to go to France to discuss this matter with the French Government and President De Gaulle, and he is told that nobody is going to see him, if he goes there! It is a very extraordinary treatment given to the representative of the United Nations. It is one thing to agree or not agree to the proposition. But it is a discourteous treatment given to the representative of after all the only one world organisation of this kind which we have got. It does seem very extraordinary, almost a deliberate attempt to break up that organisation, to weaken it and to make it count for nothing. Therefore, this Bizerta incident has become a very serious matter. It is obvious that so far as we are concerned, anyhow we would be supporting the complete freedom of Tunisia and the removal of foreign basis. That has been our policy throughout. It continues to be that, but in the particular event as it has occurred, we feel it even more strongly that these bases should go.

Talking about the United Nations, I may refer to the South African Government, which has prevented a Commission of the United Nations from entering South West Africa. This kind of not merely discourteous treatment, but aggressively hostile treatment to the United Nations Commission—they were carrying out a resolution passed, I forget, by the Security Council, I think, is regrettable. And, Still more regrettable has been the fact that in this refusal of the South African Government to allow it to pass, the Government of the United Kingdom have passively acquiesced, almost actively I would say. It is very extraordinary—the way great powers are beginning to treat the United Nations.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Several hon. Members said that in connection with Pakistan, we should not continue appeasing Pakistan; we should not go in for appeasement, as we did in the Canal Waters Treaty or in regard to Berubari. I do not understand what appeasement means; in this context the word is thrown about. If we entered into the Canal Waters Treaty, it was because it was to our advantage. We were not throwing away anything; it was to our advantage. I would like hon. Members who want to study this matter regarding the Canal Waters Treaty to take some trouble to go into it and see whether it was to our advantage or not. We are not distributing largesse to other countries.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): On a previous occasion, you said you made a generous gesture in that regard. How is it to be reconciled with this?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know surely; a generous gesture might also be to our advantage.

Shri Hem Barua: It was pointed out that it was for the benefit of Pakistan also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Of course; when two parties have a deal, there must be an element of benefit to both, unless it is an enforced or compulsory deal. Take Berubari. I think we have done few things which are more advantageous to India than the Berubari matter. (*Interruptions*). It is no good looking at Berubari by itself. Even looking at it by itself, there was a chance of our losing the whole of Berubari, instead of certainly having half. But it is not a question of looking at it by itself. This was the part of a large deal, with territories being exchanged both in East Bengal, East Pakistan, West Bengal and on the western side here and we gained much more.

Suppose even if Berubari was not justified by itself, as it was I think, one must consider the large territories

that we got in other places. One must balance it and look at the whole picture. Any body who looks at it realises that. Of course, it is easy enough to start an agitation saying we are giving up this without exactly knowing what our rights were and what possibilities were there for our claiming it. But if one considers how far this was balanced by other things that we gained, I have no doubt that it is definitely an advantageous settlement. So, I do not know what exactly appeasement means.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Appeasement can be big, can be small or can be anything.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not quite know whether it is small or big, but when one uses the word 'appeasement', it presumably means some action taken by fear or whatever it may be. But, of course, any action taken under some coercion or fear is bad, whatever it is. But if you want to have peace instead of trouble and settle something, that is normally a good thing beneficial to a country. If you do it under pressure, under the coercion of another State or fear, well, of course, it is a bad thing. Undoubtedly it is bad.

But this kind of mentality that we must always take up a rigid attitude and try not to compromise, not to come to terms about these matters is, I submit, an exceedingly wrong attitude, which no country, however big it may be, ought to take at any time. It is an attitude really of a small country afraid of others and showing its strength by the strong language one uses. It is not the attitude of strength, but it is the attitude of weakness, which weakness is translated into strong language and strong gestures. Strong language and strong gestures may or may not have any effect on the internal situation, but externally they have no effect, because externally the other party adopts the same brave gestures and uses the same strong language as we see, let

us say, in these big issues today like the German issue or the Berlin issue—the kind of language that is gradually being used the language of cold war, etc. It does not depict that they are strong nations. Nevertheless, that language is used not because of strength, but the fear of the other. We must be strong and we must not give in on any wrong issue; that is a different matter.

Some hon. Members still object to the Secretary General of the External Affairs Ministry stopping at Peking and meeting—I do not think he met the President—the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister there. It passes my comprehension how that can be objected to unless behind that is some intention of giving up something that is vital to us or subordinating our interests through fear or otherwise. That is a different matter. But it is the normal thing and the proper thing, in fact, something that was necessary and that has justified itself. It was on the way and he had to go to Peking. There was no way. He could, of course come back *via* Moscow by a long distance.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Just because Karachi is on the way to London, you do not stop there. We are not convinced about this shortness; you have more powerful reasons for it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member is not correct. One does not have to stop at Karachi on his way to London.

Shri Nath Pai: Geographically it is nearer.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But coming back from Mongolia to India, one has to stop at Peking. There is no way unless you take a private chartered plane. Even then, you have to stop at Peking and you will have to spend at least a minimum of a day or two days to catch the next plane.

Shri Hem Barua: On a previous occasion, the hon. Prime Minister was pleased to say that there can be no friendly relations unless the territory is vacated. Still, why should there be gestures like our Secretary General stopping at Peking?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is perfectly correct statement, which I repeat now. (*Interruptions*). So long as two countries have any kind of diplomatic relations, so long as they are not either at war, when they have no relations except fighting each other or on the verge of war when they break off relations, let us say like South Africa and us—we have no relations, although we are not at war; we have no friendly relations; we have no relations—so long as a country has diplomatic relations, it is carrying on relations. It has to talk, it has to send notes, etc. All these are relations. They may not be of a very friendly character. They are relations and diplomatically speaking, they have to be courteous relations. At least that is the whole training in democracy, but in these days of cold war, it is forgotten.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): We have our ambassador in Peking. May I know why his services were not utilised and why our Secretary General was specially sent to Peking?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not because our ambassador's services are not utilised. Our ambassador's services are utilised. It is not a question of sending strong notes or sending a copy of Shri Vajpayee's speech here for them to read. The Ambassador can do that.

13 hrs.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, I seek your protection. I do not want that my speeches should be sent, it is the Prime Minister's speeches which are sent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order Let there be no more interruptions.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What I mean is this. I want this matter to be carefully considered. It is one thing to have an opinion, a strong opinion, to hold it and even if necessary fight for it, it is completely another thing to cut off talking with another country. We have to talk, always talk, till we give up talking and fight; there is no middle course left in it.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I would like to have some enlightenment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Sufficient enlightenment has already been made.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think it is because these are not developed, mature countries, functioning and developed in a mature way. It is one thing to hold to a policy, to hold on to something, but to shut all doors of talks means that you can never deal with the problem except on the field of war. It is obvious, if you rule out every other possible approach. There are, of course, in the ordinary course, pressures exercised in various ways. The Chinese attitude did exercise pressures on us because they sit on our territory. Our attitude in response to that, if I may say so, has exercised a very great deal of pressure on the Chinese because it has affected their prestige all over Asia, in Africa and every where. It is not a small pressure that we have exercised in this way.

So we have to take all these things into consideration. As I found that our Secretary-General had to go via Peking and had to spend necessarily a day at least there, deliberately—it was not by chance—I told him to go there. He has been the previous ambassador there. He knows these people. In the ordinary course he had to call on them, just a formal courtesy call. If he goes for a formal courtesy call, it depends upon how

his talk with them proceeded. He could talk about other matters. When he was going he asked me whether he could talk about other matters. I said: "It depends on circumstances. If they talk, of course, you can talk." We cannot say, no, we won't talk. And, he had to talk, and obviously the talk was more of exploration of mines and things like that than anything else. That type of exploration always goes on between representatives of States or heads of States and others.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Sir, I rise to a point of order.

It is a small matter.

Shri Raghunath Singh: No interference.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Our hon. Prime Minister said something about a lone man, a lone party. I hope he did not mean me.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall be perfectly frank. I referred to the representative of the Swatantra Party. I think Mr. Imam spoke at some length yesterday. I am not going to deal with all that he said. It seems to me not necessary to deal with anything so outside the range of logic or current politics.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: My visit to Formosa is not mentioned.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Then again Shri Braj Raj Singh asked the reason why Mongolia should be seated in the U.N.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): I did not say that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That does not matter. That is what I understood. He asked for reasons why Mongolia should be seated in the U.N.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It is far from what I said.

में ने तो यह कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार मंगोलिया को यू०एन०ओ० में बिठाने के लिये कौन से कदम उठा रही है। यह तो बिल्कुल उल्टी बात है।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : तो हब मेरी गलती है।

The fact is that, as I am pointing out yesterday, there is next to unanimity in getting Mongolia in. We want every country to be in. There are 99 nations in the United Nations. There are, I believe, just a very few left out. It see no reason why Mongolia should be left out, and we have tried for that. We can only try by talking about it, there is no other way. Now, at the present moment, every country I think with one exception, wants Mongolia there. The one exception is the Formosa Government, the Komintang Government in Formosa. It is quite astonishing. Even the United States agreed and wanted to bring in Mongolia, when the Formosian Government wanted to use its veto. I was trying to point out an extra-ordinary situation that was created.

Again, I think Shri Mahanty said that we should have no piecemeal treaty with Pakistan like canal waters and Berubari. We are always to have piecemeal treaty, not with Pakistan but with any country. We cannot wait for the settlement of every possible dispute. If a settlement in one matter is useful to us, we have it. We settled, let us say, our border issues with Pakistan. It is good. The border is not completely settled yet; some trouble occurs. But it is not that daily there is trouble which necessitated our reference to it almost every day in this House. Broadly speaking, the Indo-Pakistan border is a peaceful border now. That is an advantage to us and to them. Beru-

bari is also part of the border; so also canal waters. That can settle everything. As I said yesterday, now they are raising and making much of the eastern rivers in East Pakistan and West Bengal.

Shri Hem Barua: The Farraka Barrage also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, that is part of that. Suppose a matter can be easily settled, we will settle it. We would not wait here till every trace of conflict or bitterness between India and Pakistan is over and then settle the whole thing together. That is not really dealing with the facts of life.

One thing more, Sir. Shri Dange laid stress on his desire that we should recognise the East German Government. Now, I admit that there is a good deal of logic in that argument. The fact of the matter is, as I said on the previous day, that we have been continuing to recognise the West German Government even before it became the West German Government. It is a war-time continuation. So it has continued. Of course, otherwise too we might have to recognise it, but it is a continuing thing. Now, since the East German Government came in there has been talk of conflict, talk of two Germanies uniting or something else happening, and we have felt, therefore, that if we took that step it may rather come in the way of this developing situation rather than help it. We have trade relations with East German Government. Defacto we recognise it. They have got a Trade Representative here and we are dealing with them in many ways; it is not that we boycott them.

Shri Dange also criticised our role in the Congo and said that it was not consistent. He referred to our army people looking on when Mr. Lumumba was murdered. Well, that is not quite correct. They were not looking on. They were not there when he was murdered.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): They were there when he was arrested. He was arrested under the very nose of Shri Rajaeshwar Dayal.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes. How can our army start petty actions of its own when things happen which they do not like? It is a disciplined army. They function as they are told to function. The whole policy of the U.N. Army in the Congo had been fixed in another way. It is a different matter, but it had to function under the orders, under the board directions of the United Nations authorities. I may make it clear previously that many things were done, specially in the early days, on behalf of the United Nations in the Congo which I think were wrong and which led to a worsening of the situation. It may even be said that that step, by step, not directly but indirectly, to this unfortunate killing of Mr. Lumumba. One may say that. But to accuse us of being inconsistent in our policy there is not correct. So long as we are there, we must function as a disciplined group under the United Nations. If we do not approve of that, we would withdraw our troops. We cannot function as an independent group there. Fortunately, after all this trouble in the Congo, there is some hope now of a measure of unity, solidarity and some kind of democratic progress there.

Shri Nath Pai said something, with which I agree, and that is our right to buy arms in any country. We pay for them and get them from wherever we can, if that suits us and if the prices are favourable. If they are suitable, we will buy there. Of course, there is no inhibition about that in our minds.

I do not wish to take any more time of the House. I am grateful to the hon. Members for their approach to this question, and I could beg of them again to look at this picture of international affairs in the broadest sense. We cannot get lost in our petty likes

and dislikes when these big things are happening which may make a vast difference to the whole world.

There are some amendments. I do not accept all the amendments. The one which I accept is by Shri Naldurgkar which, I need hardly say, is one of approval of the policy of the Government of India.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the substitute motion to the vote of the House.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I object to it. I admire the hon. Prime Minister, but he has not said a word.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He cannot say anything more now. The question is:

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

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

The motion was adopted.

13.12 hrs.

THE DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI BILL

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the consideration of the Dadra and Nagar Haveli Bill. The hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Tangamani: (Madurai) On a point of order. The Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Bill has been passed by us and we were told this morning that a message has been received from Rajya Sabha that it has also passed this Bill without any amendments. We have not been able to understand whether the Bill has re-