

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Report just to appease some small number of industrialists in the country and in the bargain he has angered everybody. Are We to believe—whether they belong to the INTUC, AITUC UTUC or the Hind Mazdoor Sabha that this Government is going to appoint the right type of people to preside over these things or undertake the responsibility of adjudication and of judging labour problems? I do not think so. Therefore, what we want today is a statutory provision, if possible, in our Constitution, and if not possible in our Constitution, in the body of an enactment such as this which binds the hands of the Government in a manner which would be in the interests of the working people. I think the time has come for Parliament to take a new lesson from the recent experience of the Bonus Commission and not to trust this Government, not to trust the Labour Minister in all such labour legislations. I think we are duty bound to ensure that all these things should be so settled as would give priority to the interests of the working people. I do not wish to say very much on this subject. I have little faith in this Labour Ministry and less hope, if I may say so. Yet I would ask this Government, when they appoint such people, to consult the trade union organisations in the country, INTUC, AITUC and other organisations and see that the proper type of persons are appointed to such bodies till we have succeeded in compelling this Government to accept our suggestion for reorientation in all such matters relating to industrial relations and for appointment of such people to such bodies who will stand by social justice and at least remember that there is a Preamble to the Constitution and remember that Parliament has adopted the ideal of socialism, whatever it means, as far as the Congress Party is concerned. Sentiments are good. Even good sentiments should be respected, as far as hon. Members are concerned. Therefore, I would ask the Government and Parliament to give their thought to

this matter anew, in the light of the bitter, disappointing and melancholy experience that we have had in recent days at the hands of the present Labour Minister and, if I may say so, the Government headed by Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER RE THE COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would now call upon the Prime Minister, Lai Bahadurji, to make a statement.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI LAL BAHADUR) : Sir, I must apologise to you and to the House for not having been able to make the statement in the morning. I was held up in the other House and, therefore, I have to make the statement now.

Sir, hon. Members are aware that owing to my indisposition, I requested Shri T. T. Krishnamachari and Shrimati Indira Gandhi to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference on behalf of the Government of India. On return they reported to me fully about the proceedings of the Conference.

At the opening session of the Conference on July 8, glowing tributes were paid to the memory of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. It was stated that, in a sense, the current meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers was a memorial to Jawaharlal Nehru since it was his policy which had done so much to transform the Commonwealth relationship and make possible membership by countries with different forms of Government. All continents, creeds, races and societies were now represented in the Commonwealth which transcended the lines that normally divided mankind and this gave special significance to the deliberations of the Conference.

The results of discussions are reflected in the communique issued after the Conference. As can be seen from this communique, the deliberations of the Conference covered a review of

the world situation, the racial discriminatory policy of South Africa the colonial policy of Portugal and the pending problems of British colonial territories. Other matters related to co-operation between the Commonwealth countries in programmes of economic and social development and measures to increase co-operation between the Commonwealth countries in matters of Commonwealth aid and trade.

Our delegation at the Conference participated in this discussion on various items and made its contributions in accordance with the policies and programmes of the Government of India.

I shall not go into further details about the proceedings of the Conference but would now like to say a few words about the reference to Indo-Pak problems in the communique issued at the end of the Conference. Various views have been expressed in the Indian Press and by the public on the following reference in this communique: I am quoting:

"The Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the friendly public statements by the President of Pakistan and Prime Minister of India and expressed their hopes that the problems between their countries will be solved in the same friendly spirit".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Can you read out the next paragraph?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I am reading the relevant paragraph. I can well understand the anxiety of the hon. Members that the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference should not be used as a forum for the discussion of problems involving differences between Commonwealth Members. I would, however, like to urge that so far as this particular instance is concerned, it was, I am convinced, a general expression of goodwill and that it did not constitute a departure from

the convention that inter-Commonwealth differences should not be discussed at such meetings. I have noted in this connection that representatives of some other Governments who attended the Conference have publicly affirmed that the convention that inter-Commonwealth differences should not be discussed has been fully maintained and that this is a matter for the countries concerned to deal with between themselves. We have ourselves stated publicly that we want to settle our differences with Pakistan peacefully but consistent with our national honour and dignity. Unfortunately this general expression of well-intentioned goodwill at the London meeting has been misunderstood by some in India and has been misinterpreted or misrepresented in certain quarters abroad. We firmly and categorically repudiate the suggestion contained in such misinterpretation or misrepresentation. At the same time we reaffirm our resolve to continue to function with a sense of dignity and responsibility, as a nation dedicated to peace and to the settlement of differences by peaceful methods.

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
सभापति जी, मैं दो प्रश्न करना चाहूंगा ।
अभी तक राष्ट्र मंडल की यह परम्परा रही है
कि सदस्य देशों के पारस्परिक विवादों का
उसकी बैठकों में उल्लेख नहीं किया जाता ।
पहली बार इस परम्परा का उल्लंघन किया
गया इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि
इस प्रकार का कोई भी उल्लेख भारत की
स्थिति को दुर्बल करेगा हमारे प्रतिनिधियों
ने उस उल्लेख को समावेश करने का विरोध
क्यों नहीं किया ? उन्होंने यह क्यों नहीं कहा
कि अगर इस प्रकार का कोई उल्लेख किया
गया तो हम इस विवाद से अपने को सम्बद्ध
नहीं करेंगे ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; I would also like to say something. Let the Prime Minister answer later. First of all we would like to have a discussion on the statement and the conduct of

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] the Ministers, specially Mr. T. T. Krishnamaehari. We have given notice for raising the discussion and I hope, Sir, y'ou will kindly arrange an early discussion. Therefore, we reserve our right to speak on the subject at a later stage. But the hon. Prime Minister has just said that there is nothing wrong in the reference in the statement to Indo-Pakistan question. Yet this matter has been there ever since 1948. The late Prime Minister to the best of our knowledge never allowed this to be brought in, not even to be mentioned in any communique. When in international conferences certain things are mentioned in a joint communique of this type, there are certain objective implications of it. The objective implication in the present case is this. The Commonwealth was seized of what they call a dispute. It is not a dispute again. We went to the United Nations with a complaint in which we accused Pakistan of aggression. We never accepted the theory of a dispute. Dispute on what? Kashmir is an integral part of India. The only thing that remains to be settled is vacation of the aggression. Nothing else. Pakistan does not do it. It is not a dispute. That again is wrong. It is a violation of the Charter.

Secondly, take the manner in which reference has been made to it or they put us in the same category. Since when was it decided that in our view or in the view of Parliament India and Pakistan are in the same category? Well, are they disputants of an equal category assuming that the word "dispute" is applicable here? The Commonwealth Conference was asked to take an equidistant position on the problem that arose between India and Pakistan and put India and Pakistan on a par. That again is most objectionable. If at all in the Commonwealth we should try to mobilise opinion in order that we get the aggression vacated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought you wanted a clarification.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to the next point, I asked him to read the second paragraph. That should have been read out. Immediately after that paragraph which refers to India-Pakistan question there is another paragraph which brings in the question of mediation. And then look at the paragraphs that follow it. Anyone who takes a normal view of things would be led to conclude that this mediation relates to the India-Pakistan question; it relates to a number of questions, but certainly that was uppermost in the mind of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference. That happened at a time when Mr. Chagla had been saying in the United Nations that we are opposed to mediation of any kind. How mediation comes in there I do not know. It is not in the same paragraph, I concede that, but the Prime Minister should explain what was the need for bringing in mediation. In regard to what dispute? The only concrete reference we get there is India-Pakistan question. As far as other things are concerned. Mr. Krishnamaehari said many things including something against the Communist Party, Communism, and all kinds of things, a language the late Prime Minister never indulged in when he went to the Commonwealth Conference. When Mr. Krishnamaehari was there, I met the hon. Prime Minister at his residence despite his illness. I pointed out that Mr. Krishnamaehari should not have made all kinds of cold war statements in order to placate the British and American investors by saying how great an anti-Communist he was, how anti-Communist the Government was. He made a similar statement in the Press luncheon that was given. I would like to know whether these had his sanction.

Then again comes the Secretariat of the Commonwealth. The late Prime Minister resisted the setting up of a Secretariat of the Commonwealth, that is to say, the attempt to consolidate the particular system which we do not like and many people do not like. But

today we find that the Indian Government have made a commitment in favour of the Secretariat. May I know from the Prime Minister whether he was consulted over the telephone or by trunk call, whatever you call it, before this commitment was made? Mr. Krishnamachari's record at the Commonwealth Conference is one of shame and dishonour, and we would like it to be discussed in this House.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, may I ask the Prime Minister why in the long communique which was issued after the termination of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference there was no specific reference to the Chinese threat in Asia? I am sure our representatives in the Conference must have raised the issue of the Chinese threat on our border. Am I to understand that the response from the other members of the Commonwealth was quite good? Am I to understand that whatever impression we might have made on the subject Great Britain herself was not anxious to pursue the matter of the Chinese threat?

The second point that I would like to mention is this. Whatever might have happened with regard to Kashmir or Indo-Pakistan differences being mentioned in a very oblique way in the communique would, the Government give an assurance that in view of the dissatisfaction that exists in the country over that reference the Government would see to it that this matter is not raised, the internal differences between India and Pakistan are not raised, in any future meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, and that if any attempt is made to include it apart from the decisions of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference, the Government of India will instruct its delegates to abstain from the meeting?

SHRI P. L. KUREEL (Uttar Pradesh): May I know from the Prime Minister whether it is a fact that this reference to Indo-Pakistan problems was made with the con-

sent of the Indian Delegation? There was a news item in the Press about this that this reference was made with the consent of the Indian Delegation. I would also like to know whether this would not weaken the position of India in the Commonwealth countries.

It was also in the Press that one of the members of the Delegation, Shri Krishnamachari, gave certain assurances and suggestions with regard to the solution of the Kashmir problem, which were definitely against the declared policy of our Government. I would like to know whether it is a fact that no efforts had been made to make the Commonwealth countries understand our viewpoint. Is it due to lack of adequate publicity?

There is one more question that I would like to ask. There were two members of the Delegation. I would like to know whether any specific role was assigned to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Is it because of the fact that she happened to be the Minister of Information and Broadcasting that she went there to speed up publicity in this connection and to explain our viewpoint to the Commonwealth countries?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras): An impression is going round the country that our role at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference with regard to the African question that came up, particularly regarding Southern Rhodesia, was not in tune with the opinions of the African countries that were represented. I would like to know what was the actual line that was adopted by our Government; was it in line with that of the British Government or was it in line with that of the other African Governments that were there?

AN HON. MEMBER: Southern Rhodesia.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : घीरे घीरे
देश के भीतर और बाहर भी यह धारणा
बल पकड़ती जा रही है कि काश्मीर के सवाल

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

पर सरकार पाकिस्तान की घमकियों और पश्चिमी देशों के दबाव में झुकने की तैयारी कर रही है। क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी इस अवसर पर इस धारणा के खंडन के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना पसन्द करेंगे ?

श्री लाल बहादुर : जहां तक काश्मीर की बात है इसका जिक्र ही नहीं है, कामनवेल्थ कान्फेंस में काश्मीर की कोई बात आई ही नहीं, इसलिये काश्मीर का कोई सवाल उठता नहीं।

I think perhaps Shri Bhupesh Gupta also said something—he made a reference to Kashmir. I might make it absolutely clear that in the discussions at the Commonwealth Conference there was no reference to Kashmir. But, of course, there was a reference to Indo-Pakistan good relationship. It was there in the . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Problem.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Good relationship, friendly relationship. And Kashmir not brought into the picture at all. Therefore, the fears of Vajpayee^ if I might use that word, are unfounded.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In this connection the British spokesman of the Commonwealth Conference there told the Press while briefing that Kashmir would be included in the communique. He said it, and there was no contradiction given by the Indian representatives there at that time or even afterwards, you see. And I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether he has examined the stenographic records of the proceedings.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : Go by the communique, not by Press comments.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I do not know about any British officer saying anything on that but I did get some report that one of the Press Relations

Officers—he was of Pakistan—did try to distort the facts, and while this reference was under consideration, he went out and almost gave a distorted picture to the Press people who were present there.

Sir, in so far as other various matters are concerned, I am sorry that Bhupesh Guptaji has made such harsh remarks about our Finance Minister, Shri Krishnamachari. I mean, unless we have faith and trust in the man on the spot, it would be impossible for him to carry on and speak on behalf of the country. It was not possible for him to consult the Central Government or the Government of India at each and every stage.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is a very bad choice.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): He did his job of work.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: And I can say that both the delegates functioned collectively and indeed, did a good piece of job. I do not want to mention . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is mutual admiration society.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: It might be so but it is not between me and him. I would not like to quote the other Prime Ministers who have written to me and have said in high terms about the way in which these two delegates functioned in that Conference. *Interruptions*) I would like to mention that, as I have myself said, there may be some anxiety on the part of the people of our country or on the part of the Members of Parliament. But really I have felt sorry that some country, not some, only it is Pakistan which has tried to misrepresent the contents of the communique. I have made it clear in my statement that the communique does not contain anything in regard to the discussions held in the Conference or any talks held in the Conference on this issue. Reference is merely made

to the two statements, or some statements, made by President Ayub Khan and the Prime Minister of India. And both of us have said that we do want that our relations should improve and that Pakistan and India should live in amity and peace. The reference was to these two speeches in the communique. In the Commonwealth Conference they have merely said or in the communique it was said that these sentiments have been expressed. They wish us well. They said, "We wish both Pakistan and India well and we think that they will be able to achieve their objective". Therefore, I do not think we should try to read more than what was actually meant in the communique, about what the reference meant in the communique I might make it clear that the convention was not broken—the convention that no decision will be taken in regard to the differences between two Commonwealth countries in the Conference—and even discussion could be banned if any particular Commonwealth country does not want it.

About the reference to the second paragraph in which there is some talk of mediation and use of good offices, well, it is a general proposition. It has nothing to do with India and Pakistan; it is a general proposition. I would not like to name the countries but at least the new members of the Commonwealth were very keen and particular that there should be some kind of a recommendation on the lines of the second paragraph to which a reference was made by Shri Bhupesh Gupta, the second para, that is the para following the one which I had just now quoted.

Therefore, it has also to be realised that things have considerably changed and the character of the Commonwealth Conference has also changed. So, it is in that background and in that context that we have to function. Further, I would like to make it clear that we will never accept the position that the Commonwealth Conference can be a forum for the discussion of differences between Commonwealth countries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There were some questions about China and Rhodesia.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We had met hon. the Minister of External Affairs to request that there should be a comprehensive statement by the Finance Minister himself. He told us that the Commonwealth proceedings were confidential that they could not be given out. I think a statement could be made very well in its own way keeping in view the controversies which have arisen. Secondly, we suggested that the Press cuttings from the leading British newspapers should also be supplied to us, the text of it, so that we could know how the Press took the notes of Mr. T. T. Krishna-machari at the Commonwealth Conference because that would enable us to understand the role the Finance Minister has played and how others have taken it in international relations. That is very, very important.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): On a point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, Sir .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has raised a point of order.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: When the Prime Minister has made a statement on the London Conference on behalf of the Government, is there any justification in asking for the Finance Minister to make another statement? This is not at all necessary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, I say these materials should be supplied. I do not see any point of order in what he says. Only it is a point of disorder he is creating.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On a point of order. The Finance Minister was acting as the representative of the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister has given his reply. That should suffice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the rule -----here it is—there is nothing which says that after the Prime Minister has spoken *re* must say "amen" and go home.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
Nothing of the kind. Therefore, this is the trouble with our lawyers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sapru seems to have had a great success with you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let us get into a little good humour for a while.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): May I suggest that the last word "amen" be left to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is wisdom of another type. I accept it. Therefore, I say that a comprehensive statement should be made in the past also, if I may recall, some comprehensive statement used to be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have made yourself quite clear. What you want is that Mr. Krishnamachari should make a statement. The House seems to think that it would be redundant when the Prime Minister has made a statement already.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is for you to decide. We met the External Affairs Minister. He also agrees. We want a text of the British notes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . We want a debate on the notes in the Commonwealth Premiers' Conference. It should not be linked up with any other thing. In the past we had it. We are concerned with the specific role of our representative. When I say "our representative" I mean in singular. Shrimati Indira Gandhi was silent. I do not know why she was silent. She would have talked better but Mr. Krishnamachari was talking all the time. We want to discuss his conduct at the Commonwealth meeting. He is answerable . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 8th September, 1964.