

REFERENCE TO DEATH OF
SCHOOL CHILDREN IN ANDHRA
PRADESH DUE TO FOOD
POISONING

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Now, may I, Sir, with your permission, draw your kind attention to the death of some school children that has occurred in Andhra Pradesh due to food poisoning consequent on the meals served in lunch hour?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you sent notice of that?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I have sent notice of that. The notice is there but the Minister has not cared to make a statement.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am raising it now with your permission, Sir, because it is an urgent matter and something has to be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has intimated to us that he is getting information and he will make a statement as soon as he gets the information.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: The Education Minister made a statement in the other House yesterday and why should he wait for a motion from somebody? Why can't they come on their own and make such statements?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He made a statement about Andhra?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Yes; about the death of children, in the other House and this House is being neglected.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: *Suo motu* they can come and make statements. (Interruptions.) Sir, if you order, we will catch the Ministers and get them here.

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION—contd.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Sir, we are debating foreign affairs for the first time after the passing away of our great leader who laid down the outlines of our foreign policy. In such a situation we have to be clear about what the policy was and what policy should be. I have no doubt that the fundamentals of the policy that was laid down by the late Prime Minister were correct and they merit continuance and the speech of the mover of the Motion gave ample proof that that policy is sought to be continued. The implementation of that policy, however, is a different matter and will come to that later on.

we are confronted with a peculiar situation on our borders. On our borders there are few States about which we can claim that they are positively friendly to us. Our relations with Pakistan have not been very happy. But then God and nature by binding this sub-continent on three sides by sea and enclosing the other side by impassable mountains ordained that this sub-continent and its interests shall be one. I hope it will be the endeavour of man to see that this dispensation of God and nature is not departed from. Geography makes us one. Our history is one. Our culture, in spite of the differences in religion, is one. We have lived as one in the past and in spite of the differences that have cropped up after freedom, it should be our endeavour to improve our relationship and live in unison and harmony, for one fact must be clear to every right-thinking person either in this country or in Pakistan that a power to the north of this sub-continent is always driving towards the warmer waters of the Indian Ocean. That power poses a common danger both to Pakistan and to India and, therefore, the earnest endeavours which are being made of late to improve the relations between the two countries are, in my opinion, welcome. But then those endeavours

must take note of the realities of the situation. This country at this stage will not tolerate, will not accept, any radical change in the status of Kashmir, which, as public opinion holds, has been settled finally and irrevocably. Therefore, while every effort should be made to improve the relationship between these two countries, this aspect of the matter should not be ignored by those who are making efforts to improve the relationship between India and Pakistan.

After Pakistan I come to China and our relationship with China. There are elements in this country which have been always at pains to assert, to emphasise that the main enemy of this country is Pakistan. That is not my approach at least. I am alert enough not to fall a prey to that sort of illusion. China is a big power, China is an expansionist power. Therefore, while we should make every endeavour to have negotiations with China, let us have those negotiations with the full knowledge of the expansionist character of China. We have accepted the Colombo proposals. It is a unilateral acceptance. It is for China now to respond by accepting the Colombo proposals. Since we are committed, if China accepts those proposals, we shall have to sit with China at the negotiating table. But then sometimes statements have been made by important people which create a suspicion at least in my mind, that our resolve in resisting China sometimes weakens. It is posed: Do you want negotiations or war, as if these are the only two alternatives in the situation with which we are faced. In my opinion, there is a third alternative; the stalemate which has been continuing now for two or three years. It is argued that any settlement is preferable to a stalemate. I agree normally it is so, but the situation with which we are faced is abnormal, for the Chinese case is not a normal one. What are the advantages that flow from a settlement? The advantages are the

nation develops a sense of security, it spends less on the armed forces, it relaxes on the threatened borders and the money that is saved thereby is spent on productive endeavours. Can a settlement with China give us that assurance so that we can relax in our defence preparations or relax in our watchfulness on the northern frontiers? China is on aggressive power and it is a very big power. China claims the whole of South-east Asia. It claims Nepal. It claims Bhutan. It claims Sikkim. It claims a million and a half square kilometres of Soviet territory and it claims millions of square miles of the State that is Mongolia. The character of China is very pithily put in an editorial in "Pravda":—

"The true schemes of the Chinese leaders are becoming obvious. These schemes have nothing in common with the interests of the struggle for the victory of the cause of peace and socialism. They are permeated through and through with great-power chauvinism and hegemonism. Mao-Tse Tung's talk with Japanese socialists is the most eloquent and graphic evidence of this."

So, this power is an expansionist power. This power believes in starting revolutions and conquering the whole world. Would it be possible and wise to have faith in any settlement with such a power? Mr. Chairman, the Chinese hand, the Chinese finger is evident from Brazil to the Congo, including the countries of South-east Asia. Wherever you find disruption, the Chinese hand is behind that disruption. The aim of China is to disrupt all legal governments and establish Chinese stooges in their place. Would it be possible for us to relax if we have a settlement with such an expansionist power? It is said that we are brought up in the Gandhian tradition and, therefore, we must rely on the promises of others. Let us see what has been China's performance in the matter of keeping its

[Shri B K P Sinha]

promises China gave us the solemn word that it recognised the MacMahon Line and the traditional and historical frontiers in the western sector, that is, the Ladakh region. The solemn word was given to our late Prime Minister. We know how China kept it. China gave us to understand, gave us the promise that she would respect the autonomy of Tibet, would not interfere in its culture and religion. We know and all the other countries know what became of that promise of China. China recognised the independence of Mongolia, a communist State, in 1948. In 1954 the issue of the independence of Mongolia was raised with Mr Khrushchev, with the view that the Soviet power agree to the inclusion of Mongolia in China as a province of China. In 1960 there was the border agreement with Mongolia. In 1964, the latest is that the Chinese forces are concentrated on the borders of Mongolia. In the circumstances, even if there is a settlement with China would it be possible to rely on that settlement and relax our military endeavours? If we cannot relax our military endeavours what advantages flow from that settlement? The northern borders of India have become alive have become hot for the foreseeable future and, therefore, we cannot relax our defence preparedness. Since we are obliged to negotiate on certain honourable terms, we shall not hesitate to negotiate on those terms. But let not the negotiations be on terms other than those contemplated in the Colombo proposals, for we cannot possibly have faith in any settlement with China. China has threatened not only our borders but China is threatening all the countries of South-east Asia. China is threatening our flanks. If our flanks are exposed if our bastions in South-east Asia fall, I am sure India will fall an easy prey to the machinations and the power lust of China. Therefore, it should be our endeavour to succour and aid those threatened States. At this stage no military accord is indi-

cated or is possible. But short of a military accord we must try to build up a firm understanding between India and the nations of South East Asia that are threatened by Chinese expansionism and even with those powers whose destiny today it is to oppose Chinese expansionism in this region. But then, Mr Chairman the question is put: if we make that endeavour what becomes of non-alignment? We know that there is a small State called Israel. Certain Arab States have a sort of military understanding against that State of Israel but those Arab States continue to be leaders of the non-aligned world. That has not affected their non-aligned character. The same may be said of the independent African States who have formed an organisation for African Unity to take out from the imperialist clutches some of those areas of Africa which are still under colonial domination, directly or indirectly under the white settlers. But even those African States, in spite of this alliance retain their non-aligned character. Therefore to say that simply because we have a firm understanding with the States of South East Asia we would be going counter to the policy of non-alignment, in my opinion is not correct.

Mr Chairman, what are the exact implications of the policy of non-alignment? Non-alignment was developed in a particular historical context, in a particular power context. That context was that the world was divided into two important power blocs. There was a bi-polar division of the world. Communism was monocentric and Communism after the breakaway of China has become polycentric. And that was a period of cold war. In such a period it was enough to be friendly with the USA and to be friendly with the USSR to maintain and retain our non-aligned character. But then when we have to deal with a breakaway and runaway power like China which is

behaving like a bull in the international China shop, non-alignment must get its precise meaning in such a situation. To deal with such a situation, the norms that are followed in dealing with the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. are not enough. As our late Prime Minister said not once but at least on two occasions, I remember, "We believe in non-alignment, but of course there can be no non-alignment in relation to an aggressor." And China is an aggressor. Therefore, we should make every endeavour to build up at this stage a firm understanding amongst those States including India which are threatened by Chinese expansionism, and that accord, that understanding, in my opinion, would not be running counter to the policy of non-alignment. But in evolving this accord, in evolving this policy, we must take care not to affect the interests of the U.S.S.R., Soviet Russia. It is a big power. It is a power with which we have almost a common border, and this power has always come to our aid and succour; even when we were threatened by a Communist State. Because of its nearness and because of its power, it should be our endeavour to continue, not only to continue but to cement and develop that friendship. And in developing that accord against China we should be careful that we do not affect adversely the interests of the U.S.S.R., that we do not tread on their corns. I do not think that in evolving this policy we shall be running counter to the policies of the late Prime Minister. What is policy after all? Policy is the response of a nation to a particular world situation. As circumstances change, as situations change, policy has to change. We can have an immutable policy only if the world situation is congealed at the stage at which the policy was evolved. Therefore, in the very nature of things policy is changeable, but more changeable is the application of the policy. And sometimes a blind and superficial adherence, an apparent adherence to what has been done in the past, in a changed situation is really to run counter to that policy.

In dissimilar situations the application of a policy must be dissimilar. A leader comes in an enveloping darkness. He says let there be light. The leader quits the scene and a blazing sun comes out. Would it be possible then in that blazing sunlight to respect that policy by lighting a lamp even though the sun is shining? It is the fundamentals that have to be respected in their application.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded in this connection of a small anecdote with which I will finish, the story of a mathematician-statesman. His master told him that in human affairs one must be guided by the law of averages. That pupil took that to heart. He had to cross a big river. He wanted to know from the boatman what was the depth at particular places in the broad river. He got the depth at the various spots and then he applied the law of averages. He tried to wade across the river and was drowned in the process. As the story clearly indicates, superficial or apparent compliance is sometimes repudiation and negation of some directives and some policies. In evolving our policies to meet the complex and everchanging world situation I hope our policy planners shall be conscious of this.

SRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Mr. Chairman, let me begin by congratulating the Government and the country on having at last a wholetime Minister of External Affairs. This whole-time Minister of External Affairs must also remember that he is not a Minister of International Affairs; he is a Minister of External Affairs of India. He has to administer policies which will promote the national interests of India in relation to foreign States.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

The Minister in his concluding remarks laid down the fundamental principles of the policy of the Government in regard to the international situation. He said it was peace, co-

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]
existence and Non-alignment. Peace, Madam, Deputy Chairman, is not achieved directly. In fact it is not in our hands. It is not wholly in human hands. Peace is the result of a number of small moves and it is the accumulated effect of these moves that promotes peace. Peace is one of those things which are not attained by a direct approach, by a direct attack. As for co-existence, I have been taught to beware of Latin equivalents for Anglo-Saxon words. Anglo-Saxon words are concrete, realistic, whereas Latin equivalents are meant to cover vague generalities. Co-existence is a modern substitute for the old principle of "Live and let live."

Why should there be pacts and declarations of co-existence? Living together of nations in peace is a natural law. It is when people are contemplating the infraction of this natural law that they invent theories of co-existence. And let us remember that some States which proclaim their adherence to the policy of co-existence do not hesitate to encourage subversive movements in those countries with which they concluded peace pacts or pacts of co-existence.

And then we come to non-alignment. When the critics of non-alignment criticise this policy, they are taunted with the argument that they want to practise alignment. Alignment is not an opposite of non-alignment. It is as if nations could be divided into two parties, absolutely different, distinct from each other, facing each other and pursuing policies against each other. It is not so definite, so distinct as all that. Nations are mixed up with each other. Friends of one moment may become the enemies at another. So, the opposite of non-alignment is the policy of independence, the policy of the free hand, the policy of promoting the national interests. And let us see how non-alignment has served the interests of our country. Non-alignment is no preventive of war. It is an ironic comment on non-alignment that many

of the countries that had declared themselves as non-aligned powers—Egypt, India, China, Indonesia, all members of the Bandung Conference of 1955—have all been engaged in war at one time or other. Nor, Madam Deputy Chairman, is non-alignment a guarantee of friendship. Not a single one of the neutral non-aligned States protested against the Chinese aggression when it took place. The declaration of the Colombo Powers was conspicuous for its complacency in regard to this aggression by China. It equated India with China. They made no declaration as to the guilt of the one or the other. And then there is a contradiction in the remarks made by the Minister of External Affairs in regard to the policy of non-alignment. Among the four principles that he enunciated one ran thus—

"We shall continue to seek friendship and develop our relations with all countries irrespective of ideology or their political systems."

Now, I may ask: Why has Israel not been given the right of exchanging diplomatic representatives with India? Why have the Government of India stopped short of according diplomatic recognition to Israel as an independent State? Why has it not gone further and established diplomatic relationship with Israel?

And then another principle enunciated by the Minister was—

"We shall continue to work for freedom of the peoples of Asia and Africa from colonial rule . . ."

Now, this colonialism and imperialism do not mean only salt water imperialism, imperialism that is established over the seas. What about land imperialism? What about the imperialism of Russia which has enslaved so many countries, the independent States of Central Asia, the Muslim States of Central Asia? Is the Government going to undertake the freeing of these countries from this imperialism of Russia?

And leaving aside all these generalities of peace, co-existence and non-alignment, let us face the problem, the real problem, that faces India today, the great problem of the continued menace and threat of China. That is the one particular, pressing problem; we must concentrate all our attention on that. It was Bismarck who said that the essence of foreign policy consists in concentrating upon one particular question at a time, in studying the issues at stake and trying to solve the problems, not in dissipating our energies or minds or our intellectual efforts on the solution of all the problems of the world. The Chinese threat is still there. We read newspaper reports on the gathering of Chinese troops on the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan and there is that very important, salient piece of territory called the Chumbi Valley lying between Sikkim and Bhutan. That is a strategic valley. Have the Defence Minister and the External Affairs Minister considered this question of the defence of Sikkim and Bhutan, especially the question of defence being concentrated upon the Chumbi Valley? The concentration of Chinese troops on the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan makes me wonder whether the next attack of the Chinese on Sikkim and Bhutan may not be timed for next October because October is the month in which two of the great countries that are on the side of freedom, namely England and the United States of America, will be engaged in electoral struggles. That may be the time when England and the United States are preoccupied with their domestic struggle, in electoral struggle. That may be the time chosen by the Chinese Government for an attack upon Sikkim and Bhutan. Are our intelligence reports up to date about the activities of the Chinese troops on the borders of Sikkim and Bhutan? And do the Government, the Defence Minister as well as the External Affairs Minister pay proper and due attention to those intelligence reports or are they treated with the same negligence with which the reports of our patrol troops between 1955 and 1960 were

treated by the then Defence Minister? May I ask a question? Is the Indian Army prepared to defend Sikkim and Bhutan? Can India defend Sikkim and Bhutan by itself? If the Indian Army is able to defend Sikkim and Bhutan, if the Indian Army is able to defend our frontiers by itself, why is it not able to recover the lost territories on the Ladakh border and in the NEFA border? Why is it that the Government are waiting for the professional opinion, the professional advice, of the Army or the Defence Ministry before it can prove its might by an attempt to recover these lost territories? It is a brutal fact that the Indian Army by itself is not able to defend the borders, it is not able to recover these lost territories. The Army knows it, the Defence Minister knows it, the External Affairs Minister knows it and the country also, I am afraid, knows it. And that is why we must rely upon alliances, military alliances, with countries that will help us to defend ourselves, military alliances with the United States, with the United Kingdom, with other countries. As has been pointed out by Mr. Sinha, there ought also to be a ring of defence created all along the South-East Asia starting from Malaysia, Formosa, the Philippines, Japan including also Australia because the future cockpit of world war will, I think, be the Pacific, and what will happen to the Pacific will affect the future interests of our country. Therefore, India is vitally interested in promoting the defence of South-East Asia, in joining in the defence of South-East Asia. Unless this is done, India, by itself, will not be able to defend itself.

The great Chinese philosopher Confucius said once, "When I meet a man for the first time, I listen and believe what he says. Now that I know him better, I watch what he is going to do". That is the advice which we must take from that distinguished Chinese philosopher. Now that we know what China is, how China will treat India, let us watch every step, every move of China on the Chinese border.

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

Lastly, Madam, I reiterate that foreign policy must be determined by facts and not by ideology, even by an ideology which has been left as a legacy by the late Prime Minister. A great French publicist, Raymond Aron said, "The situation of each country on the operational map makes its neutrality improbable or probable in advance". Let us look at the geographical position of India and determine our foreign policy accordingly. The geography and the circumstances of India, the military, the defence potential, the economic potential and even the political potential of the country should determine our foreign policy. Through their foreign policy, through the policy of non-alignment, our Ministers, our Government, think that they would be able to build up a bridge between the warring nations, between the nations involved in the cold war. But recent history shows that it is not bridgemanhip that we have achieved but brinkmanship in the negative sense. India was brought to the brink of war by this policy of non-alignment and it will continue to bring India to the brink of war if it is pursued. It is in pursuit of this policy of bridgemanhip that our late Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister have been advised to go to Summit Conferences.

Our present Prime Minister is going to the Summit Conference at Cairo. The late Prime Minister in his last days, after his experience of the consequence of the Bandung Conference, was not very enthusiastic about these summit conferences. With regard to the Belgrade Conference of 1960, he did not allow his name to be included among the signatories. And may I ask: Is Cairo going to displace New Delhi as a centre of international activity so far as Afro-Asia is concerned?

Madam, advice has been given to our diplomatic agents that they should improve their methods of publicity. One of the objectives of our external policy, as enunciated by the External Affairs Minister, is that that should

project the image of India among all these foreign countries. It is not so much the image of India that must be projected, it is the interest of India, it is the promotion of the interest of India that must be the main aim of our diplomatic agents. And may I ask that in future at least the relations between the External Affairs Minister and his diplomatic agents should be a two-way traffic. They should indulge in a dialogue and not in a monologue as was the practice under the late Prime Minister. The diplomatic agents when they are brought to a conference or when they come to New Delhi should be called upon to give their free and frank opinion, unprejudiced, uninfluenced by the opinion which might prevail at the headquarters. Let these diplomatic agents of ours be given a free hand so that they may be able to exercise their independent minds on the situation as they find it and not be expected to find arguments to promote the policy of the Government.

Non-alignment may be continued to be uttered as a *mantram* but, as in private life, men are better than the creed; so, may I ask that the acts of the External Affairs Ministry may be better than its creed and, it should look to the facts and circumstances of each situation and adjust its foreign policy accordingly? It is the promotion of the national interest, it is the promotion of India's interest in the international situation that should be the guiding star of India's foreign policy.

شری اے - ایم - طارق (جموں)

ایڈٹ کشمیر : میڈم قیٹی چہرہ منہ

آج ہم اس ایوان میں پہلی بار

اس ایک خاص شخص کے بغیر مل

رہے ہیں جو ایک مدت تک

ہندوستان کی آزادی کا علم بردار رہا

تھا اور جس نے ہندوستان کے آزاد

ہونے کے بعد اس ملک کی فاریں

پالیسی کی بنیاد رکھی تھی -
جواہر لال نہرو نے دنیا میں یہ
ثابت کیا کہ دنیا کی خارجی
پالیسیاں صرف طاقت کے بل بوتے
پر نہیں بلکہ دانش مندوں، یقین اور
ہمہ گیر دوستی سے بن سکتی ہیں
اور بدل سکتی ہیں - جواہر لال
نہرو جی کو اس چہرے میں کامیابی
رہی اور اس حد تک کامیابی رہی
کہ آئے والی دنیا جواہر لال نہرو کو
ہمیشہ یاد رکھ گئی -

اگرچہ جواہر لال نہرو کے پاس
فوجی طاقت نہیں تھی لیکن اس
کے پاس دنیا کے لئے دوستی کا پیغام
صحبت اور خلوص تھا اور اسی
لئے اس نے پچھلے سالوں میں
دنیا کو جنگ سے بچایا - یہ کہنا
درست نہیں ہے کہ ہم لوگوں کی
نان الائنمنٹ کی پالیسی نے ہندوستان
کو نقصان پہنچایا بلکہ یہ حقیقت
ہے کہ اس پالیسی نے ہندوستان کو
ترقی کا موقعہ بخشا - ہندوستان
کو زندہ رکھا اور اس کے ساتھ ہی
ساتھ دنیا کے چھوٹے چھوٹے ملکوں
اور نئے آزاد ملکوں کی راہ نمائی
کی - مجھے امید ہے کہ ہندوستان
کے موجودہ وزیر اعظم اور ان کے وزیر
خارجہ جن کا میں اس سال میں
خبر مقدم کرتا ہوں اسی پالیسی
پر عمل پیرا ہیں - کیونکہ یہ جو

پالیسی ہے وہ ہندوستان اور دنیا
کے لئے ایک بہترین فضا پیدا کرتی
ہے -

وزیر خارجہ کو میں ذاتی طور
پر جانتا ہوں وہ نہایت شریف
آدمی ہیں - ان میں صبر و تحمل
ہے اور مجھے امید ہے کہ وہ ان
لوگوں میں سے ہیں جو ہمیشہ
ذاتی طور پر، سیاسی طور پر، پیروکار
رہتے ہیں - مجھے امید ہے کہ وہ
جواہر لال نہرو کے بتائے ہوئے راستہ
پر چلنے کی ہر ممکن کوشش کریں
گے اور دنیا کو یہ ثابت کر دیں
گے کہ جواہر لال نہرو کے نہ ہوتے
ہوئے بھی ہم جواہر لال نہرو کو اپنے
پاس محسوس کرتے ہیں -

مہتمم دیپتی چیرمین - میں نے
اپنے مختصر دوست بی - کے - پی
ملہا کی تقریر کو بہت غور سے
سنا اور میں ان کی اس رائے سے
اتفاق کرتا ہوں کہ اس بات کی
بے حد ضرورت ہے کہ ہندوستان کو
جغتی جلدی ہو سکے یہ کوشش
کرنی چاہیئے کہ ہم تمام دنیا کے
لوگوں کے ساتھ دوستی چاہتے ہیں
اور اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ پاکستان
جو ہمارا ہم سایہ ملک ہے
اس سے بھی دوستی چاہتے ہیں
یہ درست ہے کہ پاکستان ایک

[شری اے - ایم - طارق]

پاکستان کے لوگ ہم میں سے ہی ہیں۔ پاکستان کا کلچر پاکستان کی زبان اور پاکستان کے لوگوں سے ہمارے صدیوں پرانے جو تعلقات ہیں وہ قائم رہیں گے۔ لیکن صرف یہ کہنا درست نہیں ہے کہ ہندوستان کا دشمن صرف چین ہے اور خالص چین حملہ آور ہے۔ حملہ آور دونوں ہیں۔ اور میں یہ چاہتا ہوں کہ ہر ممکن طریقہ سے ہندوستان کے وقار، عظمت اور خودداری کو قائم رکھتے ہوئے ہم دونوں سے مصالحت کریں اور دونوں سے دوستی کریں۔ خوف کے مارے نہیں بلکہ اس لئے کہ ہم دنیا میں اس قائم کرنا چاہتے ہیں اور ہندوستان کو ایک خوش حال ملک بنانا چاہتے ہیں۔ اس لئے یہ ضروری ہے کہ تمام ہمسایوں سے ہمارے تعلقات بہتر ہوں۔ میں ان لوگوں میں سے ہوں جو یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ پاکستان سے ہمارے تعلقات بہتر ہوں اور اس کے لئے ایک ہندوستان کی حیثیت سے، ہندوستانی کے ایک شہری کی حیثیت سے اور ایک کشمیری کی حیثیت سے جو کچھ مجھ سے ممکن ہو سکتا ہے میں کروں گا۔ ہم پاکستان اور چین یا کسی اور ملک سے لڑنا نہیں چاہتے لیکن یہ درست ہے کہ چین طاقت نے بل بوتے پر دنیا میں اپنی بلندی یا اپنی طاقت کو مفاد

چاہتا ہے۔ چین اپنے قریب کے چھوٹے چھوٹے ملکوں پر ہی نہیں بلکہ روس جیسے عظیم ملک پر بھی چھا جانا چاہتا ہے لیکن م صرف اپنے یقین اور عمل سے اس کو شکست دے سکتے ہیں اور دنیا کو امن دے سکتے ہیں۔ اس کے ساتھ یہ بھی ہے کہ ہم پاکستان کے ساتھ نہایت دانشمندانہ طور پر اپنے مسائل کو حل کریں۔ جہاں تک کشمیر کا سوال ہے میرے لئے اور ہندوستان نے لوگوں کے لئے یہ کوئی مسئلہ نہیں ہے۔ مجھے امید ہے کہ وزیر خارجہ جب اپنی تقریر کریں گے تو وہ اس بات کا ذکر کریں گے کہ جو یونائیٹڈ نیشنس میں ہندوستان کے ڈیپلومیٹکیشن کے نیٹا مسٹر چوٹلا نے اسٹیٹ لہا تھا۔ ہندوستان اس پر ہمیشہ کے لئے کاربند رہے گا اور وہی ہندوستان کا اسٹیٹ ہے۔

مجھے اس بات سے اتفاق ہے کہ دنیا کے ساتھ اچھے تعلقات پیدا کرنے میں اچھے سفیروں، اچھے آفیسروں اور اچھی پولیسیٹی کی بے حد ضرورت ہے لیکن مجھے انتہائی افسوس ہے کہ دنیا پرتا ہے کہ باوجود اس کے کہ اس ایوان میں کئی دفعہ ہم نے اس چوڑ پر بحث کی کہ ہماری پولیسیٹی جس پر ہم بہت رویہ خرچ کرتے ہیں ایسی نہیں ہے جیسی کہ ہونی چاہیئے۔ اس کی دو

وجہیں ہیں - ایک یہ ہے کہ ہم اچھے افسر نہیں بھیجتے ہیں - ہم تجربہ کار لوگوں کو نہیں بھیجتے ہیں - ہم صرف اس چیز کو دیکھتے ہیں کہ آدمی آئی - ایف - ایس ہے - اس کی تعلیم کیا ہے - اور وہ کتنا سمارٹ ہے - ایک سوال کے جواب میں اسی ایوان میں خود وزیراعظم پلڈت جوائنر لال نہرو نے یہ کہا تھا -

"In consultation with the U.P.S.C we reverted to it (i.e., giving our own men some special training in publicity) and absorbed our publicity men into our Foreign Service."

آج اس بیان کو دیتے ہوئے تقریباً چار سال ہو گئے - اس کے اوپر پھر میں نے وزیراعظم سے پوچھا لیکن مجھے انتہائی افسوس ہے کہ یہ کہنا پڑتا ہے کہ تجربہ کار افسروں کو نہ بھیج کر نا تجربہ کار لوگوں کو محض اس لئے بھیجا جاتا ہے کہ وہ کسی نہ کسی صورت سے آئی - ایف - ایس - ہو گئے ہیں - اچھی پبلیسٹی کے لئے، اچھے پروپیگنڈا کے لئے انسان کو تجربہ کی، ذہانت کی اور قیہ کی ضرورت ہوتی ہے - اس کے لئے کسی یونیورسٹی کی ڈگری ہونا یا لی - آئی - ایف - ایس ہونا ضروری نہیں ہے - دنیا کے بہت اچھے پروپیگنڈسٹس میں گہلس تھا - شاید وہ لندن کی یونیورسٹی کا

ڈیپارٹمنٹ نہیں تھا یا فارن سروس کا نہیں تھا -

श्री प्रकाश नारायण मप्र (उत्तरप्रदेश):
गोयलवल्लभ का नाम मत लीजिये ।

شری اے - ایم - طارق - جہاں تک پبلیسٹی کا تعلق ہے وہ بہت سی اچھا آدمی تھا - دنیا میں شیطان کا بھی ایک رول ہے - انسان شیطان سے نفرت کر سکتا ہے لیکن شیطان کے جو کارنامے ہیں ان سے انکار نہیں کر سکتا - تو پبلیسٹی کے لئے تجربہ کی بہت ضرورت ہے - ذہانت کی اور قیہ کی بہت ضرورت ہے - باہر کے ملکوں سے بہت سے اچھے لوگ یہاں آتے ہیں - آپ روسی سفارت خانے میں دیکھئے آپ دنیا میں روسی سفارت خانوں کو دیکھئے - (Interruption) - وہاں ایسے آدمی نہیں ہوں جو فارن سروس کے ہی ہوں - اصل میں دیکھنا یہ ہوتا ہے کہ ایک شخص اپنے ملک کے حالات کو کس طرح محسوس کرتا ہے اور کس سختی اور شدت کے ساتھ باہر کے ملکوں کو سمجھا سکتا ہے یہ بلیٹی متصد ہمیں نظر میں رکھنا چاہئے - مجھے موجودہ فارن مینسٹر سے یہ امید ہے اور ان کے ذہنی بھی یہ سن رہے ہیں کہ پچھلے چار پانچ سالوں میں پبلیسٹی ڈویژن میں جو کچھ لوگ بے انصافی کا شکار ہوئے ہیں - جس کی وجہ سے ہمارے ملک کو بہت نقصان

[شری اے۔ اے۔ طارق]

ہوا ہے وہ آئندہ نہیں ہوگا۔ پچھلے چند سالوں میں ہمیں افریقی ملکوں اور کچھ عرب ملکوں میں جانے کا اتفاق ہوا۔ جب ہم وہاں کے لوگوں سے بات کرتے تھے تو ایسا محسوس ہوتا تھا کہ پبلہسیٹی اچھی نہ ہونے کی وجہ سے وہ ہندوستان سے کافی کمٹ گئے ہیں۔ پچھلی دفعہ جب مجھے الجیبریا جانے کا موقع ملا۔ تو مجھے یہ معلوم ہوا کہ آزاد ہونے کے بعد جب الجیبریا کی حکومت نے ہندوستانی سفارت خانہ سے یہ درخواست کی کہ وہ ہمیں ہندوستانی آنٹن کی ایک کاپی فرانسیسی زبان میں دیں تو تقریباً ایک سال انتظار کرنے کے بعد فرانس سے جو کاپی الجیبریا پہنچی وہ اس قابل نہیں تھی کہ حکومت تو درکنار بن بھلا تو درکنار کسی ایک معمولی آدمی کو بھی وہ پیس کی جاتی۔ میں اس کاپی کو اپنے ساتھ لایا اور مرحوم وزیر اعظم کو اسے پیش کیا۔ اس کے پہلے چار صفحے تو بالکل غائب تھے اور بیچ لے کئی صفحوں پر بڑے بڑے سوراخ ہو گئے تھے۔ معلوم یہ ہو رہا تھا کہ یہ ہندوستان کے آنٹن کا فرانسیسی ترجمہ نہیں ہے بلکہ تیبو سلطان کی کوئی دستاویز ہے۔ تو باوجود اس کے کہ جب ہم لاکھوں روپیہ خرچ کرتے ہیں اس پبلہسیٹی پر ہم اس قابل نہیں ہیں کہ ایک

ملک جس نے اتنی جد و جہد سے اپنی آزادی حاصل کی ہے اس کو ہم ایک فرانسیسی کاپی بھی اپنے آنٹن کی دے سکیں۔

یہی حالت کسی حد تک ہمارے سب سفیروں کی بھی ہے۔ میں ایک واقعہ وزیر خارجہ کے نوٹس میں لانا چاہتا ہوں۔ مصر کے ایک عظیم اخبار کے ایڈیٹر عراق گئے ہوئے تھے اور وہاں سے وہ کراچی جا رہے تھے کیونکہ کراچی کی حکومت نے ان کو دعوت دی تھی۔ وہ عراق میں ہمارے ہندوستانی سفیر کے پاس کھانا کھانے گئے تو ان سے ملاقات کرنے گئے نہ اور انہوں نے ان سے کراچی جانے کا تذکرہ کیا شاید اس امید میں کہ ہندوستانی سفیر مجھ سے یہ کہیں گے کہ آپ ہندوستان بھی جائیے۔ ہندوستان بھی ایک ملک ہے۔ لیکن ہمارے سفیر نے ان سے یہ کہا کہ صاحب۔ آپ تو یہ جانتے ہیں کہ میں تیرو میں سفیر نہیں بلکہ عراق میں ہوں۔ اس طرح بچائے اس کے کہ ہم اس باہر سے آئے ہوئے اخبار نویس کی جو کراچی جا رہا تھا حوصلہ افزائی کرتے ایک لحاظ سے ہم نے اس کی توجہ نہیں کی اس کی انسلیٹ کی۔ ہمارے سفیروں کا یہ فرض ہونا چاہئے چاہے وہ مصر میں ہوں، عراق میں ہوں، کہ اگر ان کو اس بات کا احساس

ہو کہ ایک آدمی جو اخبار نویس ہے کہیں جا رہا ہے تو وہ اپنے پرائیویٹ طریقہ سے اس ملک کی امبیسسی کو یہ لکھ سکتا ہے کہ ایک صاحب کراچی جا رہے ہیں - آپ ان کو ہندوستان بھی مدعو کیجئے - مگر یہ حقیقت ہے کہ ہمارے ہندوستان نے سفیروں میں چاہے وہ کسی بھی ملک میں ہمیں آہنس میں یک جہتی نہیں ہے - جس یک جہتی کا سبق ہم دنیا کو پڑھاتا چاہتے ہیں وہ یک جہتی ہمارے سفیروں کے لئے بے حد ضروری ہے -

میں یہ جانتا ہوں کہ جہاں تک افریقی ملکوں اور عرب ملکوں کی آزادی کا تعلق ہے اس میں ہندوستان کا ایک بڑا رول رہا ہے - مجھ سے خود مصر کے بہت بڑے بڑے لیڈروں نے جن میں مصر کی آزادی کے لئے لڑنے والے لوگ بھی شامل تھے - اس بات کا تذکرہ کیا کہ صاحب - ہم جن لوگوں کو ہندوستان میں جانتے تھے وہ تقریباً تقریباً ختم ہو چکے ہیں - اس وقت پلڈت جی زندہ تھے - ان کا کہنا تھا کہ ہم محمد علی کو جانتے ہیں، شوکت علی کو جانتے ہیں، مہاتما گاندھی کو جانتے ہیں، ڈاکٹر انصاری کو جانتے ہیں، جواہر لال نہرو کو جانتے ہیں اور اس کے بعد کیا ہے ؟ ہمارے ان سے تعلقات ایک لحاظ سے سماجی طور پر اور کلچرل طور پر اس قدر کٹ گئے

ہیں کہ یہ تعلقات اوپری لیول ہی رہ گئے ہیں - ایمپیسڈر اور منسٹروں کا تعلق رہا ہے - عام لوگوں کا ان ملکوں کے ساتھ جو تعلق بنا تھا جس کے پیچھے ایک تاریخی پس منظر تھا وہ ختم ہو رہا ہے - مجھے امید ہے کہ موجودہ وزیر خارجہ اور وزیر اعظم اس چیز کو اپنے سامنے رکھیں گے اور ایسے لوگوں کو یہاں سے بھیجنے کی اور ایسے لوگوں کو وہاں سے لانے کی کوشش کریں گے جن کے ساتھ سیاست یا تحریک کا پس منظر ہو تاکہ ایک دوسرے کو سمجھنے میں آسانی ہو -

الجزیریا کے لوگوں کی رقم نے بے حد مدد کی اس میں کوئی دو رائے نہیں ہیں لیکن جب الجزیریا آزاد ہوا تو ہماری تھوڑی سی غفلت سے الجزیریا کے لوگوں کے دلوں میں ہمارے لئے شک پیدا کیا - جواہر لال کی ذات کے لئے نہیں - اس کے باوجود پلڈت جواہر لال نہرو کی ذات پر ان کو بھروسہ تھا اور وہ یہ سمجھتے تھے کہ جواہر لال نہرو ہمارا دوست ہے - مجھے امید ہے کہ موجودہ حکومت کے موجودہ وزیر خارجہ اس وزارت کے ذریعہ وہاں کے لوگوں کو یہ احساس دلائیں گے کہ جواہر لال نہرو زندہ ہے - اور تمام ہندوستان کے لوگ نئے افریقہ اور عرب ملکوں کے ایسے ہی دوست ہیں جیسے مہاتما گاندھی تھے -

[شری اے - ایم - طارق]
مجھے اس بات سے اتفاق نہیں ہے
کہ کپرو کانفرنس کے نتیجے اچھے نہیں
ہو سکتے۔ مجھے اتنا سوامی جی کی
اس بات سے بھی اتفاق نہیں ہے کہ
جواہر لال نہرو بلگراد کانفرنس سے
مایوس ہوئے تھے۔ جواہر لال نہرو
زندگی میں کبھی مایوس نہیں ہوئے
بلکہ جواہر لال نہرو ہمیشہ یہ چاہتے
تھے کہ چھوٹے چھوٹے ملکوں کی سمیت
کانفرنس ہو۔ ایسے لوگ جو اقتصادی
طور پر فوجی طور پر یا علمی طور پر
کسی نہ کسی اثر کے تحت کسی
بڑے ملک کے قبضہ میں آ سکتے
ہیں وہ اس سے الگ رہیں۔ اور
اپنی ایک جماعت بنا کر دنیا کو الگ
رہتے ہوئے بھی یک جہتی کا سبق
دیں۔

میں امید رکھتا ہوں اور مجھے
امید ہے کہ موجودہ حکومت اس
پالیسی پر کاربند رہے گی کہ یہی
ایک پالیسی ہے جو دنیا کو امن دے
سکتی ہے۔

†[ش्री ए० एम० तारिक (जम्मू और
काश्मीर) मैडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन, आज हम
इस ऐवान में पहली बार उस एक खास
श्रुति के बगैर मिल रहे हैं जो एक मुद्दे तक
हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी का अलमबरदार रहा
था और जिस ने हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने
के बाद इस मुल्क की फौरन पोलिसी की
बुनियाद रखी थी। जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने

† [] Hindi transliteration.

दुनियां में यह साबित किया कि दुनिया
की खान्जी पोलिमिया निर्फ ताकत के
बलबूने पर नहीं बल्कि दानिशमन्दी, यकीन
और हमागीर दोस्ती से बन मागो है
और बदल सकती है। जवाहरलाल नेहरू
जी को इस चीज में कामयाबी रही औ
इस हद तक कामयाबी रही कि आने वाली
दुनिया जवाहरलाल नेहरू को हमेशा याद
रखेगी।

अगरचे जवाहरलाल नेहरू के पास फौजी
ताकत नहीं थी लेकिन उनके पास दुनिया
के लिए दोस्ती का पैगाम, मोहब्बत और
खुलूस था और इसीलिए उसने दुनिया
को पिछले सालों में जग में बचाया। यह कहना
दुरुस्त नहीं है कि हम लोगों की नौन-एला-
इनमेंट की पोलिसी ने हिन्दुस्तान को नुकसान
पहुचाया बल्कि यह हकीकत है कि इस पोलिसी
ने हिन्दुस्तान को तरक्की का मौका बख्शा,
हिन्दुस्तान को जिन्दा रखा और इस के
साथ ही साथ दुनिया के छोटे-छोटे मुल्कों
और नए आजाद मुल्कों की राह-नुमाई की।
मुझे उम्मीद है कि हिन्दुस्तान के मौजदा
वजीरेआजम और उनके वजीरेखार जा जिनका
मैं इस हाउस में खैर मकदम करता हू उसी
पोलिसी पर अमलपैग है, क्योंकि यह जो
पोलिसी है वो हिन्दुस्तान और दुनिया के
लिए एक बहतरीन फिजा पैदा करती
है।

वजीरे खारजा को मैं जाती तौर पर
जानता हूँ। वो निहायत शरीफ आदमी
है। उनमें सबर व पहम्मल है और मुझे
उम्मीद है कि वो उन लोगों में से है जो हमेशा
जाती तौर पर सियासी तौर पर, पैगोकार
रहते हैं। मुझे उम्मीद है कि वो जवाहरलाल
नेहरू के बताए हुए रास्ते पर चलने की हर
मुमकिन कोशिश करेंगे और दुनिया
को यह साबित कर देंगे कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू
के न होते हुए भी हम जवाहरलाल नेहरू
को अपने पास महसूस करते हैं।

मैडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन, मैंने अपने मुह-तरिम दोस्त बी० के० पी० सिन्हा की तकरीर को बहुत गौर से सुना और मैं उनकी इस गाय में इतिफाक करता हूँ कि इस बात की बेहद जरूरत है कि हिन्दुस्तान को जितनी जल्दी हो सके यह कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि हम तमाम दुनिया के लोगों के साथ दोस्ती चाहते हैं और इसके साथ ही साथ पाकिस्तान जो हमारा हमसाया मुल्क है उससे भी दोस्ती चाहते हैं। यह दुरुस्त है कि पाकिस्तान एक जमाने में हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा था। पाकिस्तान के लोग हम में ही हैं, पाकिस्तान का कल्चर पाकिस्तान की जवान और पाकिस्तान के लोगों से हमारे सदियों पुराने जो ताल्लुकात हैं वो कायम रहेंगे लेकिन सिर्फ यह कहना दुरुस्त नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान का दुश्मन सिर्फ चीन है और खालिम चीन हमलावर है। हमलावर दोनों हैं। और मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हम मुमकिन तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान के वक्कार, अजमत और खुदारी को कायम रखते हुए हम दोनों से ममालहत करे और दोनों में दोस्ती करे। खोफ के मारे नहीं बल्कि इसलिए कि हम दुनिया में अन्न कामय करना चाहते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान को एक खण्डाल मुल्क बनाना चाहते हैं इसलिए यह जरूरी है कि तमाम हमसायों से हमारे ताल्लुकात बेहतर हो। मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ जो यह चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान से हमारे ताल्लुकात बेहतर हो और उसके लिए एक हिन्दुस्तानी की हैसियत से एक हिन्दुस्तानी के शहरी की हैसियत से और एक काश्मीरी की हैसियत में जो कल्लमुझ में मुमकिन हो सकता है मैं कहूँगा। हम पाकिस्तान और चीन या किसी और मुल्क में लडना नहीं चाहते। लेकिन यह दुरुस्त है कि चीन ताकत के बलबूते पर दुनिया में अपनी बुलन्दी या अपनी ताकत का मनवाना चाहता है। चीन अपने करीब के छोटे छोटे मुल्कों पर ही नहीं बल्कि रूस जैसे अजीम मुल्क पर भी छा जाना चाहता है लेकिन हम सिर्फ अपने यकीन और अमल से उसको शिकस्त दे सकते

हैं और दुनिया को अन्न दे सकते हैं। इसके साथ यह भी है कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ निहायत दानिशमन्दाना तौर पर अपने मसायल को हल करें। जहाँ तक काश्मीर का मवाल है मेरे लिए और हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के लिए यह कोई मस्ला नहीं है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि वजीरे खारजा जय अपनी तकरीर करेंगे तो वे इस बात का जिक्र करेंगे कि जो यूनाइटेड नेशनल में हिन्दुस्तान के डेलीगेशन के नेता मि० छागला ने स्टेड लिया था हिन्दुस्तान उस पर हमेशा के लिए कारबन्द रहेगा और वही हिन्दुस्तान का स्टेड है।

मुझे इस बात से इतिफाक है कि दुनिया के साथ अच्छे ताल्लुकात पैदा करने में अच्छे सफ़ीरो, अच्छे आफ़ीसरो और अच्छी पब्लिसिटी की बेहद जरूरत है लेकिन मुझे इन्तहाई अफ़मोस से यह कहना पडता है कि बावजूद इसके कि इस ऐवान में कई दफा हम ने इस चीज पर बहस की कि हमारी पब्लिसिटी जिस पर हम बहुत रुपया खर्च करते हैं ऐसी नहीं है जैसी कि होनी चाहिए। इसकी दो वजहे हैं। एक यह है कि हम अच्छे आफ़ीसर नहीं भेजते। हम तजुबेकार लोगों का नहीं भेजते हैं, हम सिर्फ़ इस चीज का देखते हैं कि आदमी आई० एफ० एम० है उसकी तालीम क्या है और वो कितना स्मार्ट है। एक सावल के जवाब में इसी ऐवान में खुद वजीरे आजम प० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने यह कहा था

"In consultation with the U.P.S.C we reverted to it (i.e., giving our own men some special training in publicity) and absorbed our publicity men into our Foreign Service"

आज, इस ब्यान को दिये हुए तकरीबन चार साल हो गये। उसके ऊपर फिर मैंने वजीर आजम में पूछा लेकिन मुझे इन्तहाई अफ़मोस से यह कहना पडता है कि तजुबेकार आफ़ीसरो

[श्री ए० एम० तारिक]

को न भेजकर नातजुबेकार लोगों को महज इसलिए भेजा जाता है कि वो किसी न किसी सूरत से आई० एफ० एम० हो गये है। अच्छी पब्लिसिटी के लिए, अच्छे प्रोपेगेंडे के लिए इन्मान को तजुबे की, जहानत की और डैश की जरूरत होती है। इसके लिए किसी यूनिवर्सिटी की डिग्री होना या आई० एफ० एम० होना जरूरी नहीं है। दुनिया के बहुत अच्छे प्रोपेगेंडे मिस्टर्स में गॉयबल्स था। शायद वह लन्दन की यूनिवर्सिटी का ग्रेजुएट नहीं था या फौरन सर्विस का नहीं था।]

श्री प्रकाश नारायण मधु (उत्तर प्रदेश)
गॉयबल्स का नाम मत लीजिये।

†[श्री ए० एम० तारिक : जहानक पब्लिसिटी का ताल्लुक है वो बहुत ही अच्छा आदमी था। दुनिया में जैतान का भी एक रोल है। इन्मान जैतान में नफरत कर सकता है लेकिन जैतान के जो कारनाम हैं उनमें इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। तो पब्लिसिटी के लिए तजुबे की बहुत जरूरत है, जहानत की और डैश की बहुत जरूरत है। बाहर के मुल्को में बहुत से अच्छे लोग यहाँ आते हैं। आप रूसी मिफाग्न खाने में देखिये। आप दुनिया में रूसी मिफाग्न खान को देखिये। (Interuption) वहाँ ऐसे आदमी नहीं हैं जो फौरन सर्विस के ही हों। असल में देखना यह होता है कि एक शख्स अपने मुल्क के हालात को किस तरह महसूस करता है। और किस के साथ बाहर के मुल्को को समझा सकता है। यह बुनियादी मकसद हमें नजर में रखना चाहिए। मुझे मौजदा फौरन मिनिस्टर से यह उम्मीद है और उनके टिपुट्टी भी यह मुन रहे हैं कि पिछले चार-पांच सालों में पब्लिसिटी डिवीजन में जो कुछ लोग बेइन्साफी का शिकार हुए हैं, जिनकी वजह से हमारे मुल्क को बहुत नुकसान हुआ है वा आईन्दा नहीं होगा। पिछले चन्द सालों में हमे अफ्रीकी मुल्को और कुछ अरब मुल्कों में जाने का इलिफाक हुआ। अब

हम वहाँ के लोगों से बात करते थे तो ऐसा महसूस होता था कि पब्लिसिटी अच्छी न होने की वजह से वो हिन्दुस्तान में काफी कट गये हैं। पिछली दफा जब मुझे एलजीरिया जाने का मौका मिला, तो मुझे यह मालूम हुआ कि आजाद होने के बाद जब अलजीरिया की हुकूमत ने हिन्दुस्तानी मिफाग्न खान से यह दरखवास्त की कि वो हमें हिन्दुस्तानी आईन की एक कौपी फासीसी जवान में दे तो तकरीबन एक साल इन्तजार करने के बाद फांस में जो काफी अलजीरिया पहुँची वो इस काबिल नहीं थी कि हुकूमत तो दर किनार, बेन बेला तो दर किनार, किसी एक मामूली आदमी को भी वहाँ पेश की जाती। मैं उस काफी को अपने साथ लाया और मरहूम वजीरे आज़म को उसे पेश किया। उसके पहले चार सफहे तो बिल्कुल गायब थे और बीच के कई सफहों पर बड़े बड़े सूरख हो गये थे। मालूम यह हो रहा था कि यह हिन्दुस्तान के आईन का फासीसी तर्जुमा नहीं है बल्कि टीपू मुल्तान की कोई दस्तावीज है। तो बावजूद इसके कि जब हम लाखों रुपये खर्च करते हैं इस पब्लिसिटी पर हम इस काबिल नहीं हैं कि एक मुल्क जितने इतनी जिद्दों-जहद से अपनी आजादी हासिल की है उसको हम एक फासीसी काफी भी अपने आईन की दे सकें।

यही हालत किसी हद तक हमारे सब सफीरो की भी है। मैं एक वाक्या वजीरे खारजा के नोटिस में लाना चाहता हूँ। मिश्र के एक अजीम अखबार के एडिटर ईराक गये हुए थे और वहाँ से वो कराची जा रहे थे क्योंकि कराची की हुकूमत ने उनको दावत दी थी। वो ईराक में हमारे हिन्दुस्तानी सफीर के पास खाना खाने गये थे या उनसे मुलाक़ात करने गये थे और उन्होंने उनसे कराची जाने का तजकरा किया शायद इस उम्मीद में कि हिन्दुस्तानी सफीर मुझ से यह कहेंगे कि आप हिन्दुस्तान भी जाइये। हिन्दुस्तान भी एक मुल्क है। लेकिन हमारे

†[] Hindi transliteration.

सफीर ने उनसे यह कहा कि साहब आप तो यह जानते हैं कि मैं कैरो में सफीर नहीं बल्कि ईराक में हूँ। इस तरह बजाय इसके कि हम इस बाहर से आये हुए अखबार नवीस की जो कराची जा रहा था हौसला अफजाई करते, एक लिहाज में हम ने उसकी तौहीन की, उसकी इन्मल्ट की। हमारे सफीरों का यह फर्ज होना चाहिए जो मिश्र में होया ईराक में हो कि अगर उनको इस बात का एहसास हो कि एक आदमी जो कि अखबार नवीस हो कही जा रहा है तो वो अपने प्राइवेट तरीके से उस मुल्क की एम्बेसी को यह लिख सकता है कि एक साहब कराची जा रहे हैं आप उनको हिन्दुस्तान भी मुद्ग्रव कीजिये। मगर यह हकीकत है, यह हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के सफीरों में चाहे वो किसी भी मुल्क में हैं आपस में एकजुती नहीं है। जिस एकजुती का सबक हम दुनिया को पढ़ाना चाहते हैं वो एकजुती हमारे सफीरों के लिए बेहद जरूरी है।

मैं यह जानता हूँ कि जहां तक अफाकी मुल्को और अरब मुल्को की आजादी व ताल्लुक है उसमें हिन्दुस्तान का एक बड़ा रोल रहा है। मुझ से खुदमिश्र के बहुत बड़े-बड़े लीडरों ने जिनमें मिश्र की आजादी के लिए लड़ने वाले लोग भी शामिल थे, इस बात का तजकरी किया कि साहब हम जिन लोगों को हिन्दुस्तान में जानते थे वो तकरीबन तकरीबन खत्म हो चुके हैं। . . . उस वक्त पंडित जी जिन्दा थे . . . उनका कहना था कि हम मुहम्मद अली को जानते हैं, शौकतअली को जानते हैं, महात्मा गांधी को जानते हैं, डा० अन्सारी को जानते हैं, जवाहरलाल नेहरू को जानते हैं और इसके बाद क्या है? हमारे उनमें ताल्लुक एक लिहाज से समाजी तौर पर और कल्चरल तौर पर इस कदर कट गये हैं कि यह ताल्लुकान उपरी लेवल पर ही रह गये हैं। एम्बेसडर और मिनिस्ट्रों का ताल्लुक रहा है। आम लोगों का इन मुल्को के साथ जो ताल्लुक बना था

जिसके पीछे एक तारीखी पसेमन्जर था वो खत्म हो रहा है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि मौजूदा वजीरे खारजा और वजीरे आजम इस चीज को अपने सामने रखेंगे और ऐसे लोगों को यहां से भेजने की और ऐसे लोगों को वहां से लाने की कोशिश करेंगे जिनके साथ मियास्त या तहरीक का पसेमन्जर हो ताकि एक दूसरे को समझने में आसानी हो।

एलजीरिया के लोगों की हमने बेहद मदद की इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है लेकिन जब अल्जीरिया आजाद हुआ तो हमारी थोड़ी सी गफलत में एलजीरिया के लोगों के दिलों में हमारे लिए शक पैदा किया। जवाहर लाल की जात के लिए नहीं। इसके बावजूद पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की जात पर उनको भरोसा था और वो यह समझते थे कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू हमारा दोस्त है। मुझे उम्मीद है कि मौजूदा हुकमत के मौजूदा वजीरे खारजा इस वजाहत के जरिये वहां के लोगों को यह एहसास दिलायेंगे कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू जिन्दा है। और तमाम हिन्दुस्तान के लोग नये अफ्रीका और अरब मुल्को के ऐसे ही दोस्त हैं जैसे कि महात्मा गांधी थे।

मुझे इस बात में इतिफाक नहीं है कि कैरो काफ्रेस के नतीजे अच्छे नहीं हो सकते। मुझे रत्नास्वामी जी की इस बात से भी इतिफाक नहीं है कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू वलथ्रेड काफ्रेस में मायूस हुए थे। जवाहरलाल नेहरू जिन्दगी में कभी मायूस नहीं हुआ बल्कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू हमेशा यह चाहता था कि छोटे छोटे मुल्को की समिट काफ्रेस हो। ऐसे लोग जो इकनसादी तौर पर, फौजी तौर पर या इल्मी तौर पर किसी न किसी अमर के तहत किसी बड़े मुल्क के कब्जे में आ सकते हैं वो उसमें अलग रहे और अपनी एक जमाअत बनाकर दुनिया को अलग रहते हुए भी एकजुती का सबक दें।

मैं उम्मीद रखता हूँ और मुझे उम्मीद है कि मौजूदा हुकमत इस पोलिसी पर कारबन्द

[श्री ए० एम० तारीक]

रहेगी क्योंकि यही एक पोलिसी है जो कि दुनिया को अन्न दे सकती है ।]

श्री प्रहारे लाल कुरील दण्डाल -

(अंतर प्रदीप्ति) : मैं आप का زیادہ سے نہیں لونگا - هندوستان کو آزادی ہر قریبانی کے بعد ملی ہے اور ہمیں اس آزادی کی حفاظت کرنی ہے - تو جہاں آزادی کی حفاظت ہم اپنے ہتھیاروں سے کر سکتے ہیں اور اپنی سرحد کی باقاعدہ حفاظت کر سکتے ہیں وہاں پر اپنی آزادی کی حفاظت کا سب سے بڑا طریقہ یہی ہے کہ ہمارے ہم سایہ ملک جو ہیں ، ہمارے جو نیبرنگ کمنٹریز ہیں ان کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات اچھے ہوں - آزادی نو ملے سترو سال ہو گئے - مگر ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ ہمارے تعلقات اپنے ہم سایہ ملکوں سے اتنے اچھے نہیں ہیں جتنے کہ ہونے چاہئیں -

جہاں تک کہ پاکستان کا تعلق ہے : پاکستان ہندوستان کا حصہ تھا - ان کی تہذیب اور ہماری تہذیب میں کوئی فرق نہیں - ان کی زبان اور ہمارے زبان میں کوئی فرق نہیں - جو لوگ کبھی ہندوستان میں رہتے تھے وہ آج پاکستان میں رہ رہے ہیں - جو کبھی پاکستان میں رہتے تھے وہ آج ہندوستان میں رہ رہے ہیں - تو ہم بڑی آسانی کے ساتھ

ایک دوسرے کے تعلقات کو بہتر بنا سکتے ہیں مگر اس سبب سے ہم نے کبھی بھی کوشش نہیں کی - ہمارے اور پاکستان کے بیچ جو کشیدگی چل رہی ہے وہ تو چل ہی رہی ہے - پھر بھی ہماری طرف سے کوئی ایسی کوشش نہیں ہوئی - جس کی وجہ سے ہم پاکستان کے ساتھ اچھے تعلقات بنا سکیں -

ان تعلقات کو اچھا بنانے کے لئے میں ایک بات جو آپ کے سامنے کہونگا وہ یہ ہے کہ ایسے ملکوں میں جن کے ساتھ ہم آسانی سے اپنے تعلقات بہتر بنا سکتے ہیں - وہاں پر جہاں اور سرکاری کام ہوتے ہیں ان تعلقات کو بہتر بنانے کے لئے آپ نان آفیشل ڈیلیگیشن بھی بھیجیں اور ان میں ایسے آدمیوں کو لیں جو اس ملک کی تہذیب سے واقفیت رکھتے ہیں یا اس ملک میں جا چکے ہیں یا اس ملک میں انہوں نے تعلیم پائی ہے جو وہاں کی زبان دو جانتے ہیں ، وہاں کے لوگوں کو جانتے ہیں - ایسے ڈیلیگیشنوں کا بھیجنا از حد ضروری ہے - ایسے ڈیلیگیشن ایک دوسرے ملک کے تعلقات کو خوش گوار بنانے میں بہت حد تک مدد دے سکتے ہیں - مگر ہم نے اس قسم کی کوئی کوشش نہیں کی - ایسے ڈیلیگیشن بھیجئے میں آپ اس بات

کا خیال نہ رکھیں کہ صرف ٹانگریس کے آدمی بھیجیں بلکہ جو مخالف پارٹی کے آدمی ہیں ان کو بھی آپ بھیجیں۔ انہیں اس لئے بھیجیں کہ ان میں کئی ایسے آدمی ہیں جو کہ اس دیش میں رہے ہیں۔ میں اپنے لئے نہیں کہتا۔ میں سرحد کا بھی علاقہ جانتا ہوں۔ پنجاب کا علاقہ جانتا ہوں۔ وہاں پر مہری پرورش ہوئی ہے۔ وہاں کی پشتو، پنجابی، فارسی اور اردو سب زبانیں جانتا ہوں۔ مہری کئی کتابیں وہاں اردو کی چھپی ہیں۔ ایسے بہت سے آدمی ہیں جن کو آپ اس خیال سے لے سکتے ہیں۔ مجھے کوئی خواہش نہیں ہے۔ میرا تو سرحد کا سبھی علاقہ دیکھا ہوا ہے۔ پنجاب کا علاقہ دیکھا ہوا ہے۔ لیکن میں اس بات کی طرف منسٹر صاحب کی توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایسے آدمیوں کو ان ٹیلیکیشنوں میں لوں جو کہ تجربہ کار ہوں۔ جو ہمارے کی تہذیب سے، وہاں کی زبان سے واقفیت رکھتے ہوں۔ جن کے اپنے تعلقات وہاں کے لوگوں سے ہوں۔ اس کی طرف میں خاص طور پر دھیان دلاؤں گا۔

برما سے اپنے تعلقات جتنے اچھے ہونے چاہئیں انہیں ہوں۔ اسی سدن میں برما کے نمائندے ہوا کرتے تھے۔ برما کسی وقت ہندوستان کا

حصہ تھا۔ آپ برما کو قریب لا سکتے ہیں مگر ہم کہا دیکھتے ہیں۔ برما کے ہندوستانیوں پر جو مظالم ہوئے ہیں اس سے ہمیں کچھ پتہ نہیں چلتا کہ ہمارے تعلقات برما سے کچھ اچھے ہیں۔ وہاں سے جس طرح سے ان کو اپنے زیور نہیں لانے دئے گئے اپنا روپیہ نہیں لانے دیا گیا اور جس طریقہ سے ان کو دیہے سے نکالا گیا اور جس زبردستی سے ان کی جائیدادوں پر اور ان کے کاروبار پر قبضہ کیا گیا ہے وہ اس بات کا شاهد نہیں ہے کہ ہمارے تعلقات برما سے اچھے ہیں۔ تو وہاں پر بھی ہمارا ٹیلیکیشن بھیجا جانا چاہئے جہاں سرکاری ٹیلیکیشن بھیجنا چاہئے وہاں غیر سرکاری بھی بھیجنا چاہئے۔ چونکہ ہمارا ان سے کوئی قریبی تعلق نہیں رہا ہمارا ان کا آنا جانا نہیں ہے جیسا کہ ہونا چاہیئے۔ ررنہ یہ باتیں نہ ہونیں جو اس وقت ہو رہی ہیں۔ پھر ہمارا یہ بھی فرض ہے کہ ان دیہوں سے ہمارے ہندوستانی جو آئے ہیں ان کے زیورات اور ان کے پیسے جو انہوں نے وہاں امبھسی میں جمع کئے تھے انہیں دلوائے جائیں اور برما سرکار پر بھی دیا وٹالیں کہ انہیں کمپنیشن دے۔ یہ بھی ہمارا فرض ہے۔ یہ بھی ایک طریقہ ہے تعلقات کو تھیک کرنے کا کیوں کہ وہاں سے جو لوگ آتے تھے وہ یہاں ہزار قسم کی باتیں ان دیہوں

[شری بہارے لال کوہل (دھڑلہ)]

کے متعلق پہلا سکتے ہیں جس سے
سے ہمارے تعلقات اچھے بننے کے بجائے
اور خراب ہوں گے۔ اس لئے جو
لوگ آئے ہیں انہیں بھی سسٹمسٹائی
کرنا ضروری ہے۔

اسی طرح سے سیلون کو دیکھ
لیجئے۔ آفریکن کنٹریز کو دیکھ
لیجئے۔ وہاں ہمارے ہندوستانوں کے
ساتھ کیا سلوک ہو رہا ہے۔ تو اگر
ہم یہ کوشش کریں گے کہ ان ممالک
کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات اچھے ہوں
تو یہ ہماری حفاظت کے لئے، ہماری
آزادی کی ابدی حیات کے لئے ہی
ہوگی۔ یہ بہت ضروری ہے۔ ہمیں
زیادہ سے زیادہ ان چھوٹے چھوٹے ملکوں
کی طرف دھیان دینا چاہئے۔ ان
کو اپنا دوست بنانا چاہئے اور ان کو
دوست بنا کر ان کی لہذرشپ کو اپنے
ہاتھ میں لے لہنا چاہئے۔ ہندوستان
ہی ایک ایسا دیش ہے جو ایشیون
کنٹریز کو لہذا کر سکتا ہے۔ اگر
ہماری قانون پالیسی صحیح ہو۔
اگر ان چھوٹے چھوٹے دیشوں کے ساتھ
ہمارے تعلقات اچھے ہوں تو ہماری
اپنی ایک آواز ہو سکتی ہے، ہمارا
اپنا ایک بلاک ہو سکتا ہے۔ خالص
طور پر اس وقت جتنے ساؤتھ ایشیون
کنٹریز ہیں ان کو ہمیں لہذا دینی
چاہئے کہوں کہ چائنا کا تہذیب ہے۔
چائنا ہمارے بارہر تک آ پہنچا ہے۔

ہماری ہزاروں مربع میل زمین آج
اس کے قبضہ میں ہے۔ اب ہم کو
اس لئے نہیں خاموش ہونا ہے کہ
چائنا اب آئے نہیں بڑھ رہا ہے مگر
یہ سمجھنا ہے کہ یہ ایک بڑا بھاری
تہذیب ہے ان ساؤتھ ایشیون
کنٹریز کے لئے۔ تو ہم کو اس طرف
دھیان دینے کی ضرورت ہے۔ کہیں
ایمان نہ ہو کہ ہماری آزادی خطرہ میں
پڑ جائے اور ان چھوٹے چھوٹے دیشوں
کی آزادی خطرہ میں پڑ جائے۔
چائنا ہمارے لئے ہی تہذیب نہیں
ہے وہ برما کے لئے بھی تہذیب ہو
سکتا ہے۔ پاکستان کے لئے بھی
تہذیب ہو سکتا ہے اور بہت سے دیشوں
کے لئے خطرہ بن سکتا ہے۔ ہمیں
اس بات کی طرف ان چھوٹے چھوٹے
ملکوں کی توجہ دلانی ہے۔ ان کو
بتلانا چاہئے کہ یہ ہمارا ہی سوال
نہیں ہے بلکہ ہم سب کا سوال ہے
اور متحدہ طور پر چائنا کے اس
تہذیب کا اس خطرہ کا مقابلہ کرنے
کی ضرورت ہے۔

دوسری بات جس کی طرف میں
آپ کا زیادہ دھیان دلانا وہ یہ ہے
کہ باہر کے ملکوں میں ہماری
پہنچ سہتی نہیں ہے۔ ہمارے کاز کو
کوئی جانتا نہیں ہے۔ معلوم نہیں
کیوں وہ پاکستان کی پالیسی کو
اچھا سمجھتے ہیں ان کی باتوں کو
زیادہ سمجھتے ہیں۔ وہ ہماری

باتوں کو کہیں نہیں سمجھتے ہیں - ہمارا جسٹ کاڑ ہے - کشمیر کا اکسپشن مکمل ہے اور اس میں کسی قسم کی کوئی بڑھادی تبدیلی نہیں ہو سکتی - مگر ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ اُن دن طرح طرح کی باتیں ہوتی ہیں - کامن ویلتھ کمیونٹک میں اس کا ذکر ہی آجاتا ہم سمجھتے ہیں کہ بہت بڑی تشویش ناک بات ہے - یہ ہمارے بڑی بھاری کمزوری کی طرف اشارہ کرتا ہے - کسی طرح سے اس کا ریفرنس آگیا ؟ ابھی تک نہیں آیا اور اب کہیں اچانک آگیا ؟ اس سے ظاہر ہونا ہے کہ ہمارے پوزیشن آف ویو کو ہمارے نعرے کو دوسرے ملکوں کے سامنے صحیح طور پر جیسا رکھنا چاہئے ویسا نہیں رکھا جاتا -

اس کی طرف ہم کو جس طرح دھیان دینا چاہئے اس طرح ہم دھیان نہیں دیتے ہیں - اس کے علاوہ جو ہمارے سفیر ہوتے ہیں ٹھیک ہے اس کام کے لئے آئی - سی - ایس آدمی کو آپ بھیجتے ہیں تو آپ بھیجتے - اگر ان میں کوئی خاص قابلیت ہے - مگر محض آئی - سی - ایس آدمیوں کو جو آپ بھیجتے ہیں تو اس کے بارے میں جیسا کہ ہمارے طارق صاحب نے کہا اس کے لئے زیادہ سے زیادہ نان آفیشیل سفیر کو آپ لہجئے جو جتنا سے تعلق رکھتے

ہیں - جو جتنا کے دلوں کو قبول کرتے ہیں - جو اپنے دل کی بات کہہ سکتے ہیں - دوسروں کے دلوں کی بات سن سکتے ہیں - آفیسروں کا رویہ آپ نے دیکھا ہی ہے جو نہ جتنا میں جا سکتے ہیں نہ جتنا میں مل سکتے ہیں - آپ ایسے آدمیوں کو لہجئے جو جتنا میں مل سکیں ، جتنا میں جا سکیں لیکن میں دیکھتا ہوں کہ آپ زیادہ سے زیادہ آفیسرس کو ، آفیشلس کو سرکاری ملازموں کو وہاں بھیجتے ہیں اور نان آفیشلس کو نہیں بھیجا جاتا ہے - میں یقین دلانا ہوں کہ جتنا کام ہمارے نان آفیشیل لوگ سفیر کا کر سکتے ہیں اتنا آفیسر نہیں کر سکتے ہیں - ہمارے فارن آفیسرس منسٹر صاحب ہیں وہ جہاں "جائیں گے" وہاں پاپولر ہونگے ، جہاں جائیں گے وہ ایسا نام کرینگے - جہاں جائیں گے لوگوں کے دلوں میں چھائیں گے - غواہان کی جگہ پر آپ آفیشلس کو لے آئیے کہیں وہ لوگ لوگوں سے اتنی خلد پھشائی سے نہیں مل سکتے ہیں - اس لئے میں زیادہ سے زیادہ درخواست کروں گا کہ نان آفیشلس کو لہجئے اور سفیر بنا کر بھیجئے - آفیشلس کے اندر معلوم نہیں کہ کیا بات ہے کہ انہوں نے خاص طور پر ایک محتاذ بنا لیا ہے کہ ہم نان آفیشلس کو نہیں بھیجینگے - وہ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہمیں کو بھیجا جائے - ہم ہی اپنے آدمیوں کو وہاں بھیجیں -

[شری پیارے لال کرپل دوطالبہ]

میں آپ کو یقین دلانا ہوں ان کی وجہ سے بہت سی زیادہ ویسٹج ہمارے فارن ایمبسیز میں ہو رہا ہے اور اگر ان کی جگہ آپ نان آفیشیلس کو بھیجیں گے تو یہ ہیوج ویسٹج جو ایمبسیز کے اندر ہو رہا ہے وہ نہیں ہوگا۔

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA
(Orissa): Bureaucratic clique.

شری پیارے لال کرپل دوطالبہ :

اس لئے میں آپ سے خاص طور پر گزارش کروں گا کہ ہم نے جو ہمیشہ یہ نظریہ بنا لیا ہے اس کو بدلنا چاہئے ہمارے کاسلی وال صاحب کے بارے میں نہ جانے کب سے سوچا جا رہا ہے کہ وہ ایمبسیڈر بنا کر بھیجے جائیں۔ ہمارے محکمہ وزیر اعظم صاحب جب زندہ تھے تب ان کی بات چل رہی تھی آج کوئی اس کی طرف دھیان نہیں دیتا۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ اچھے آدمی کو باہر بھیجئے جو دیہ کی تہذیب کو اچھی طرح سے جانتے ہیں۔ یہاں کی ہر بات کو جانتے ہیں۔ جو جنتا کے نمائندے ہیں۔ جو ہمارے انہاس کو جانتے ہیں اور اس سے کھری واقف رکھتے ہیں۔

میں ایک اور چہرے کی طرف آپ کی توجہ دلاؤں گا۔ جو اوگ وہاں بھیجے جائیں پہلے ان کو ایک قسم کی ٹریننگ دی جائے کہ انہیں

وہاں پر کیا کرنا ہے، کس طرح سے کام کرنا ہے۔ ٹریننگ کی تیزی بہاری کمی ہے۔ ہمارے لوگ جو وہاں باہر جاتے ہیں اس خہال سے جاتے ہیں کہ سیر کرنا ہے، تفریح کرنی ہے۔ دوسرے ملکوں کو دیکھنا ہے۔ یہ بات ان کے اندر نہیں ہونی چاہئے۔ وہ تو ہمارے ملک کو ریپریزنٹ کرتے ہیں۔ دیہ کے نمائندے ہیں ان کو تو دیہ کی تصویر کو دنیا کے سامنے رکھنا چاہئے۔ دیہ کے انٹرسٹ کو اپنے سامنے رکھنا چاہئے اور اس خہال سے وہاں نہیں جانا چاہئے کہ پیسہ کماتا ہے، پیسہ بلاتا ہے۔ سیرو سیاحت کرنی ہے۔ عام طور سے لوگ اس خہال سے جاتے ہیں کہ ہمیں دوسرے ملکوں کو دیکھنے کا موقع ملتا ہے۔ ہماری امپرسی میں جو آدمی ہوں، وہ اسٹاف کے لوگ ہوں وہ ایسے ہوں کہ جن کی انٹیگریٹی پر کسی قسم کا ڈاؤت نہ ہو، جن کے اندر روپیہ بنانے کا لالچ نہ ہو جو کوریپٹر کے آدمی ہوں۔ ایسے آدمیوں کو آپ بھیجیں گے تو باہر کے دیہوں کے ساتھ آپ کے تعلقات اچھے بنیں گے۔ کیونکہ ان باتوں کی از حد ضرورت ہے۔

میں زیادہ نہ کہتے ہوئے، کہوں کہ میرا تائم ہو گیا ہے، آپ کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں کہ آپ نے مجھے بولنے کا وقت دیا۔

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब" (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा। हिन्दुस्तान को आजादी बड़ी कुर्बानी के बाद मिली है और हमें इस आजादी की हिफाजत करनी है। तो जहां आजादी की हिफाजत हम अपने हथियारों से कर सकते हैं और अपनी सरहद को बाकायदा हिफाजत कर सकते हैं वहां पर अपनी आजादी की हिफाजत का सबसे बड़ा तरीका यही है कि हमारे हमसाया मुल्क जो हैं, हमारे जो नेबरिंग कंट्रीज हैं उनके साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे हों। आजादी को मिने १७ साल हो गये। मगर हम देखते हैं कि हमारे ताल्लुकात अपने हमसाया मुल्कों ने इतने अच्छे नहीं हैं जितने कि होने चाहियें।

जहां तक कि पाकिस्तान का ताल्लुक है, पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा था। उनको तहजीब और हमारी तहजीब में कोई फर्क नहीं। उनकी जवान और हमारी जवान में कोई फर्क नहीं। जो लोग कभी हिन्दुस्तान में रहते थे वो आज पाकिस्तान में रह रहे हैं। जो कभी पाकिस्तान में रहते थे वो आज हिन्दुस्तान में रह रहे हैं। तो हम बड़ी आसानी के साथ एक दूसरे के ताल्लुकात को बेहतर बना सकते हैं। मगर इस सम्बन्ध में हमने कभी भी कोशिश नहीं की। हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच जो कशोदगी चल रही है वो तो चल ही रही है, फिर भी हमारी तरफ से कोई ऐसी कोशिश नहीं हुई जिसको वजह से हम पाकिस्तान के साथ अच्छे ताल्लुकात बना सकें।

इन ताल्लुकात को अच्छा बनाने के लिये मैं एक बात जो आपके सामने कहूंगा वो यह है कि ऐसे मुल्कों में जिनके साथ हम आसानी से अपने ताल्लुकात बेहतर बना सकते हैं वहां पर जहां और सरकारी काम होते हैं उन ताल्लुकात को बेहतर बनाने के लिये आप

नान-आफीशियल डेलीगेशन भी भेजें और उनमें ऐसे आदमियों को लें जो इस मुल्क की तहजीब से वाकफियत रखते हैं या उस मुल्क में जा चुके हैं या उस मुल्क में उन्होंने तालीम पाई है जो वहां की जवान को जानते हैं, वहां के लोगों को जानते हैं। ऐसे डेलीगेशनों को भेजना अजहद जरूरी है। ऐसे डेलीगेशन एक दूसरे मुल्क के ताल्लुकात को खुशगवार बनाने में बहुत हद तक मदद दे सकते हैं। मगर हमने इस किस्म की कोई कोशिश नहीं की। ऐसे डेलीगेशन भेजने में आप इस बात का ख्याल न रखें कि मिर्फ कांग्रेस के आदमी भेजे बल्कि जो मुखालिफ पार्टी के आदमी हैं उनको भी आप भेजें। उन्हें इसलिये भेजें कि उनमें कई ऐसे आदमी हैं जो कि उस देश में रहे हैं। मैं अपने लिये नहीं कहता। मैं सरहद का भी इलाका जानता हूँ। पंजाब का इलाका जानता हूँ। वहां पर मेरी परवरिश हुई है। वहां की पश्तो, पंजाबी, फारसी और उर्दू और सब जवानें जानता हूँ। मेरी कई किनाबें वहां उर्दू की छपी हैं। ऐसे बहुत से आदमी हैं जिनको आप इस ख्याल से ले सकते हैं। मुझे कोई खाहिश नहीं है। मेरा तो सरहद का सभी इलाका देखा हुआ है। पंजाब का इलाका देखा हुआ है। लेकिन मैं इस बात की तरफ मिनिस्टर साहब की तवज्जी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे आदमियों को इन डेलीगेशनों में लें जो कि तजुवकार हों। जो वहां की तहजीब से, वहां की जवान से वाकफियत रखते हों। जिनके अपने ताल्लुकात वहां के लोगों से हों। इसकी तरफ मैं खास तौर पर ध्यान दिनाऊंगा।

बर्मा से अपने ताल्लुकात जितने अच्छे होने चाहियें, उतने नहीं हैं। इसी सदन में बर्मा के तुमाइन्दे हुआ करते थे। बर्मा किसी बक्त हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा था। आप बर्मा को करीब ला सकते हैं। मगर हम क्या देखते हैं। बर्मा के हिन्दुस्तानियों पर

† [] Hindi transliteration.

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब"]

जो मूजानिम हुए हैं उससे हमें कुछ पता नहीं चलता कि हमारे ताल्लुकान बर्मा में कछु अच्छे हैं। वहाँ से जिस तरह से उनको अपने जेवर नहीं लाने दिये गये, अपना रुपया नहीं लाने दिया गया और जिस तरीके से उनको देश से निकाला गया और जिस जबरदस्ती से उनकी जायदादों पर और उनके कारोबार पर कब्जा किया गया है वो इस बात का शाहद नहीं है कि हमारे ताल्लुकात बर्मा से अच्छे हैं। तो वहाँ पर भी हमारा डेलीगेशन भेजा जाना चाहिये। जहाँ सरकारी डेलीगेशन भेजना चाहिये वहाँ गैर-सरकारी भी भेजना चाहिये। चूँकि हमारा उनसे कोई करीबी ताल्लुक नहीं रहा। हमारा उनका आना जाना नहीं है जैसा कि होना चाहिये। वरना ये बातें न होती जो इस वक्त हो रही हैं। फिर हमारा यह भी फर्ज है कि इन देशों से हमारे हिन्दुस्तानी जो आये हैं उनके जेवरात और उनके पैसे जो उन्होंने वहाँ एम्बेसी में जमा किए थे उन्हें दिलवाये जाये और बर्मा सरकार पर भी दबाव डालें कि उन्हें कम्पेंसेशन दें। यह भी हमारा फर्ज है। यह भी एक तरीका है ताल्लुकात को ठीक करने का। क्योंकि वहाँ से जो लोग आयेगे वो यहाँ हजार किस्म की बातें उन देशों के मुत्तल्लिक फैला सकते हैं जिससे हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे बनने के बजाय और खराब होंगे। इसलिये जो लोग आये हैं उन्हें भी मेडिटस्फाई करना जरूरी है।

इसी तरह से सीलोन को देख लीजिये। अफ्रीकन कंट्रीज को देख लीजिये। वहाँ हमारे हिन्दुस्तानियों के साथ क्या सलूक हो रहा है। तो अगर हम यह कोशिश करेंगे कि इन मुमालक के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकान अच्छे हो तो ये हमारी हिफाजत के लिये, हमारी आजादी की अर्बदी हयात के लिये ही होगी। यह बहुत जरूरी है। हमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा इन छोटे छोटे मुल्कों की तरफ

ध्यान देना चाहिये। उनका अपना दोस्त बनाना चाहिये और उनको दोस्त बना कर उनकी लीडरशिप को अपने हाथ में ले लेना चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तान भी एक ऐसा देश है जो एशियन कंट्रीज को लीड कर सकता है अगर हमारी फोरन पालिसी सही हो। अगर इन छोटे छोटे देशों के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे हों तो हमारी अपनी एक आवाज हो सकती है। हमारा अपना एक ब्लाक हो सकता है। खास तौर पर इस वक्त जितने साउथ एशियन कंट्रीज हैं उनको हमें लीड देनी चाहिये क्योंकि चायना का थ्रोट है। चायना हमारे बोर्डर तक आ पहुँचा है। हमारी हजारों मुरब्बा वर्ग जमीन आज उसके कब्जे में है। अब हमको इसलिये नहीं खामोश होना है कि चायना अब आगे नहीं बढ़ रहा है। मगर यह समझना है कि यह एक बड़ा भारी थ्रोट है इन साउथ ईस्ट एशियन कंट्रीज के लिये। तो हमको इस तरफ ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि हमारी आजादी खतरे में पड़ जाये और इन छोटे छोटे देशों की आजादी खतरे में पड़ जाये। चायना हमारे लिये ही थ्रोट नहीं है वो बर्मा के लिये भी थ्रोट हो सकता है। पाकिस्तान के लिये भी थ्रोट हो सकता है और बहुत से देशों के लिये खतरा बन सकता है। हमें इस बात की तरफ इन छोटे छूटे मुल्कों को तवज्जो दिलानी है। उनको बतलाना चाहिये कि यह हमारा ही सवाल नहीं है बल्कि हम सब का सवाल है और मुत्ताहिदा तौर पर चायना के इस थ्रोट का, इस खतरे का, मुकाबिला करने की जरूरत है।

दूसरी बात जिसकी तरफ मैं आपका ज्यादा ध्यान दिलाऊंगा वो यह है कि बाहर के मुल्कों में हमारी पब्लिसिटी नहीं है। हमारे कोज को कोई जानता नहीं है। मालूम नहीं क्यों वो पाकिस्तान की पौलिसी को अच्छा

समझते हैं, उनकी बातों को ज्यादा समझते हैं। वो हमारी बातों को क्यों नहीं समझते हैं। हमारा जस्ट काज है। कश्मीर का एक्मेशन मुकम्मिल है और उसमें किसी किस्म की कोई बुनियादी तबदीली नहीं हो सकती। मगर हम देखते हैं कि आये दिन तरह-तरह की बातें होती हैं। कौमनवैलथ कम्युनिक में इसका जिक्र भी आ जाना हम समझते हैं कि बहुत बड़ी तशबीशनाक बात है। यह हमारी बड़ी भारी कमजोरी की तरफ इशारा करता है। किस तरह से इसका रेफरेन्स आ गया। अभी तक नहीं आया और अब क्यों अचानक आ गया। इससे जाहिर होता है कि हमारे पॉइन्ट आफ व्यू को, हमारे नजरिये को, दूसरे मल्को के सामने सही तौर पर जैसा रखना चाहिये वैसा नहीं रखा जाता।

इसकी तरफ हमको जिस तरह ध्यान देना चाहिये उस तरफ हम ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। इसके अलावा जो हमारे सफीर होंते हैं, ठीक है, इस काम के लिये आई० सी० एस० आदमी को आप भेजते हैं तो आप भेजिये अगर उनमें कोई खास काबलियत है। मगर मरज आई० सी० एस० आदमियों को जो आप भेजते हैं तो उसके बारे में जाँसा कि हमारे तारिक साहिब ने कहा उसके लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा नोन-आफीशियल सफीर को आप लीजिये जो जनता से ताल्लक रखते हैं, जो जनता के दिलों को टटोल सकते हैं, जो अपने दिल की बात कह सकते हैं, दूसरों के दिलों की बात सुन सकते हैं। आफिसरों का रवैया आपने देखा ही है जो न जनता में मिल सकते हैं न जनता में जा सकते हैं। आप ऐसे आदमियों को लीजिये जो जनता में मिल सकें, जनता में जा सकें। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि आप ज्यादा से ज्यादा आफीसर्स को आफीशियल्स को, सरकारी मुलाजिमों को बर्ना भेजते हैं और नोन-आफीशियल्स को नहीं भेजा जाता है। मैं यकीन दिलाता हूँ

कि जितना काम हमारे नोन-आफीशियल लोग सफीर का कर सकते हैं उतना आफीसर नहीं कर सकते हैं। हमारे फौरेन एफेयर्स मिनिस्टर साहब हैं वो जट्टा जायेगे वहाँ पोपुलर होंगे जट्टा जायेगे वो अपना नाम करेंगे, जहाँ जायेगे लोगों के दिलों में छायेगे। जरा उनकी जगह पर आप आफीशियल्स को ले आइये। कभी वो लोग लोगों से इतनी खन्दापेशानी से नहीं मिल सकते हैं। इसलिये मैं ज्यादा से ज्यादा दरखवास्त करूँगा कि नोन-आफीशियल्स को लीजिये और सफीर बना कर भेजिये। आफीशियल्स के अन्दर मालूम नहीं क्या बात है कि उन्होंने खास तौर पर एक मुहाज बना लिया है कि हम नोन-आफीशियल्स को नहीं भेजेंगे। वो यह चाहते हैं कि हमी को भेजा जाये, हमी अपने आदमियों को बर्ना भेजे। मैं आपको यकीन दिलाता हूँ उनकी वजह से बहुत ही ज्यादा वेस्टेज हमारी फौरेन एम्बेसीज में हो रहा है और अगर उनकी जगह आप नोन-आफीशियल्स को भेजेंगे तो यह ह्यूज वेस्टेज जो एम्बेसीज के अन्दर हो रहा है, वो नहीं होगा।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA
(Orissa): Bureaucratic clique

श्री ग्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' इस लिये मैं आपसे खास तौर पर गुजारिश करूँगा कि हमने जो हमेशा यह नजरिया बना लिया है उसको बदलना चाहिये। हमारे कासलीवाल साहब के बारे में न जाने कब से सोचा जा रहा है कि वो एम्बेसेडर बना कर भेजे जाये। हमारे मरहूम वजीरे आजम साहब जब जिन्दा थे तब उनकी बात चल रही थी। आज कोई इसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं देता। मैं कहता हूँ कि अच्छे आदमी को बाहर भेजिये जो देश की

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब"]

तहजीब को अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, यहां की हर बात को जानने हैं, जो जनता के नुमाइन्दे हैं, जो हमारे इतिहास को जानने हैं और इससे गहरी वाकफियत रखते हैं। मैं एक और चीज की तरफ आपकी तवज्जो दिलाऊंगा कि जो लोग वहां भेजे जायें पहले उनको एक किस्म की ट्रेनिंग दी जाये कि उन्हें वहां पर क्या करना है, किस तरह से काम करना है। ट्रेनिंग की बड़ी भारी कमी है। हमारे लोग जो वहां बाहर जाते हैं इस खयाल से जाते हैं कि सैर करना है तफरीह करनी है, हमारे मुल्कों को देखना है। यह बात उनके अन्दर नहीं होनी चाहिये। वो तो हमारे मुल्क को रिप्रजेंट करते हैं, देश के नुमाइन्दे हैं। उनको तो देश की तस्वीर को दुनिया के सामने रखना चाहिए। देश के इंटेरेस्ट को अपने सामने रखना चाहिये और इस खयाल से वहां नहीं जाना चाहिये कि पैसा कमाना है, पैसा बनाना है, सैरो सियाहत करनी है। आम तौर से लोग इस खयाल से जाते हैं कि हमें दूसरे मुल्कों को देखने का मौका मिलता है। हमारी एम्बेसी में जो आदमी हों, वो स्टाफ के लोग हों वो ऐसे हों कि जिनकी इन्ट्रेप्रेटी पर किसी किस्म का डाउट न हो, जिनके अन्दर रुपया बनाने का लालच न हो, जो करेक्टर के आदमी हों। ऐसे आदमियों को आप भेजेंगे तो बाहर के देशों के साथ आपके नाल्लुकात अच्छे वनेंगे, क्योंकि इन बातों की जहद जरूरत है।

मैं ज्यादा न कहें हुए, क्योंकि मेरा टाइम हो गया है, आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का वक्त दिया।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to congratulate Sardar Swaran Singh on the admirable speech that he delivered yesterday. He is the successor of one of the greatest statesmen that the world has produced and I have no doubt that he will, to the best of his ability, endeavour to continue and maintain the traditions left by our late Prime Minister. I should like to

say a word about the policy of non-alignment which came in for criticism from certain quarters in this House. I happen to read the British press. I am not very much interested in the American press, but I happen to read the British press at all events rather carefully, and I came across an article, or rather I have come across several articles in the *Manchester Guardian* which speak of our policy of non-alignment in terms of praise. In a moving tribute to Jawaharlal Nehru which it describes as one of the great men of our age, the *Guardian* says:

"But his admission of this does not imply that his policy of non-alignment was misconceived. It was the only possible one for a country in India's position, as the rulers of the Great Powers in both East and West eventually acknowledged. And before they came to do so, in the harshest days of the cold war, Nehru's Government made good use of its place in the middle for the benefit of both sides. It is partly, thanks to him, that the world has since emerged from under those clouds, so that President Johnson's views of the Communist world (to judge from his recent statement) now seem much more like Mr. Nehru's than Mr. Dulles's."

No greater tribute could have been paid to the foresight of Mr. Nehru than has been done by the *Guardian* which is not exactly what you would call a red paper, but which is a very sober and moderate organ of public opinion in England.

May I also say that we have to be firm about our policy because the American and British elections are due in October and November? I am particularly worried about the American elections because the Republican Party has put up Senator Goldwater who has something of the Macarthy touch about him. It is, therefore, very necessary for this country to be clear in its mind that it shall not depart,

happen what may, from the main lines of the policy laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

May I in this connection make a brief reference to the Indo-Pakistan relations? One of the great acts of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his last days was to release Sheikh Abdullah. I have no doubt that the Sheikh stands for Indo-Pakistan amity. We may agree with his views or we may not agree with his views, but I have no doubt as to the secular nature and character of his outlook. The question of Indo-Pakistan relations is a difficult one. I think we need today some rethinking on this question, including that of Kashmir. I do not say or I do not suggest that we should give up our basic stand. We have a basic stand as a secular State. But there are certain things which can be done within the limits of our policy to create a more cordial atmosphere between India and Pakistan. We can, for example, think in terms of a common market or we can think in terms of freer facilities for travel and ultimately, though Pakistan gets rather annoyed when we talk like that, we can think in terms of a loose confederation which shall include India, Pakistan and Kashmir. There is, Madam Deputy Chairman, a mystic unity which underlies this country. Geography intended this country to be one, culture has made this country to be one and it is a tragedy that we should find murders like those of Rourkela and Jamshedpur in our part of the country and we should live to see our Hindu brethren driven out and murdered in cold blood in parts of East Bengal where, it must, however, be remembered that thirty-four Muslim young men gave their lives to save those harassed Hindus. The task is, though in appearance it may be appeasement—well, I do not believe in appeasement—to rethink our policies in regard to Pakistan and I am not one of those who think that Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan has not been doing good by his visit to Pakistan or to Nagaland. Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan is one of those independent-

minded thinkers in India and while it may not be possible . . .

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): More confused.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: My hon. friend is perhaps more confused.

And while it may not be possible for me to agree completely with Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan, I am in active politics, I think he has done rethinking and rethinking needs to be done on this question.

May I also say a word about China? Now, we have been hearing a lot about the Colombo Proposals. There are no settled facts in politics. Lord Morley once described the partition of Bengal as a settled fact but that had to be unsettled. What we need more than anything else is a desire to come to terms with China. We cannot fight on two fronts. We cannot fight poverty and we cannot fight China and we cannot fight Pakistan and we cannot fight the whole world, and, therefore, while I stand by the Colombo Proposals, I do not look upon them as the law of the Medes and Persians. We have to make sure that the terms which we negotiate with China are of a reasonable character, of a character which do honour to both of us and the Chinese people. My reading of the Chinese situation is that much of the trouble with China is due to the fact that she has been completely isolated from the world by the mishandling of the question of China's admission to the United Nations. We cannot think in terms of Taiwan just at this time but we have to be firm in our determination that we find some solution of the Chinese question. Every revolution has, in its initial stages, been expansionist in character. The French Revolution was expansionist in its character when it started but after a time the revolution settles down and affluence brings steadiness of character, brings stability and I think if China becomes affluent and if we become affluent, the problem of relationship between us two will be easier than it was before.

[Shri P. N. Saprú.]

May I now pass on to one or two other questions. The question was raised yesterday about the attitude of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari at the Commonwealth Conference and included with Mr. Krishnamachari was our dearly loved sister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Now, there is an unnecessary reference to the summit conference that is to be held between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India in the Communiqué but I think there has been no departure from convention and it is not a matter which should make us hysterical. I think that the reference is of a casual character. Kashmir has not been mentioned by name, no solution of the Kashmir problem has been put forward in that Communiqué and Sir Alec Douglas-Home may have said things outside the conference which we do not like, Mr. Pearson, with greater detachment than Sir Alec may have said things to which we may object but let us also remember that there is a vast mass of public opinion in Britain which is not represented by Sir Alec Douglas-Home. There is the Labour Party of which Mr. Harold Wilson is the leader. I hope that on the 16th October we shall have Labour installed in office and it would be a mistake for us to break off relations with a Commonwealth which is the creation of Jawaharlal Nehru. The present Commonwealth is not the Commonwealth of 1932. It is not the Commonwealth of Dominion Status and the Balfour Declaration. Asians and Africans are in a majority in the Commonwealth and it is a political club which serves the purpose of bringing together statesmen from Asia and Africa and other parts of the world. We took, I think, a decided line on the question of Southern Rhodesia. I think independence should not be given to the Southern Rhodesian whites. We should also take interest in the question of Mozambique and Algeria.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, this question of foreign affairs is a vast

one but I would like to conclude—because I do not have to say anything about Latin America and so on and so forth—my speech not by referring to the old, old question of the Test Ban Treaties but to the question of the future of the two Germanys, including a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe. I think those two things appear to me to be vital for the preservation of peace in Europe and peace in Europe means peace in Asia also. In Asia too, I do not think that the policy pursued by the Americans has been quite right so far as Vietnam is concerned or so far as we are concerned. We want that question to be referred to the Conference of Fourteen Powers; maybe they may invite America also on that occasion. In any case I certainly must say here that I differ from my esteemed friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, with regard to the relationship between Indonesia and Malaysia. I think Tunjku Abdul Rehman is a democrat. He has achieved his victory in Malaysia by democratic methods. He was one of the first to support us on the question of China and I think it is our duty to stand by him in this crisis. We should use our endeavour to see that this question is settled in an amicable manner. Our Prime Minister will be leaving the country on the 2nd of next month and he will have a hard task before him at the non-aligned conference. The Foreign Minister will also be going there. The Foreign Minister, we know, is a very very skilful negotiator. He has talked with the Pakistan Minister for, I do not know, how many days; 12 days or 14 days. I do not know how he managed to do so. We want them to go there with the united good wishes of a country which has no aspiration to lead the world but which wants a world free from war, which wants a world free from want, which wants a world free from colonialism whether of the old type or of the new type.

Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Chairman, for showing me the courtesy of giving me so much time.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI: (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I would first deal with the Chinese affairs. As regards this, the other day there has been very good news broadcast that when some Japanese parliamentarians had a talk with Mr. Khrushchev he told them that Sinkiang was not China's and that Tibet was also not China's. This was a very important statement from a personality like Mr. Khrushchev. Here I would like to say that the Chinese occupation of the Himalayan region is a matter of constant national anxiety. As long as this menace is there, our very national security is at stake. No Indian who is true to his soil can forget this event even for a moment. We cannot rest unless and until this menace is removed. Therefore the biggest task before us is to remove it at the earliest and permanently. In order to check this expansionist attitude of China we must try to seek some definite understanding with those who have common grievance against China. The Soviet Union and Mongolia, like us, are other neighbouring countries against whom China's expansionist moves are there. The attitude of the Soviet Union is not to encroach upon the rights of other Afro-Asian nations; on the other hand its existence has given a stimulus to dependant nations in their struggle for freedom and thereafter. Because of the expansionist policy of China the very Soviet Union which helped them materially to fight against Chiang kai-Shek is no more a friend but clashed with China just as we were China's friends when China agreed to panchsheel but are now in great distress because of China's menacing aggression. So we both have common grievances against China. We may therefore make a common cause to settle the differences with China and particularly the latest pronouncement of Mr. Khrushchev that Sinkiang is Russian territory wrongly occupied by China and that Tibet is an independent territory is very significant for us Indians. Despite our non-alignment policy we

should have an understanding with the Soviet Union and Mongolia for the safety of the people of all the countries concerned that in the event of aggression by China on either of these countries we would stand together for this limited purpose. It is entirely vital for world peace.

Now, my next point is about Pakistan. We all know that Pakistan is the creation of Britain. We also know that the cease-fire in Kashmir came about also under the British influence. We have seen recently at the U.N. meetings Britain took a distinctly pro-Pakistan and anti-Indian stand in regard to Kashmir. Kashmir is also a plank for anti-Indian propaganda by Pakistan. The Pak-China alliance is again a menace to our country. Whenever we have any negotiations with Pakistan we must always remember these glaring facts. I have something to say about America also in this regard. America gave the best arms to Pakistan years ago. We had also negotiations with America in the past and as the hon. Defence Minister stated the other day he had also recent talks with the authorities in America about the supply of jet fighters to us but they are hesitant in our case. But they have given these arms to Pakistan and after that it is a well known fact that Pakistan has made an alliance with China. We all know that Pakistan is always and everywhere carrying on propaganda incessantly about Kashmir as if Kashmir was her territory. Pakistan is raising this question all the time and at the same time there are some big nations also which give them some sort of support. That is a peculiar thing. But in the last two sessions of the U.N. meetings our case has been put forward so strongly that people who wanted to know about these things have come to know the reality. We always speak of mediation with Pakistan, but what is the attitude of Pakistan towards India? Not only the question of Kashmir is there but also there are other affairs. We are constantly having border troubles. Firings on a wide scale have been

[Shri J. C. Chatterji.]
reported. Important officials have been caught hold of by Pakistan in our own territory. They have been taken there and given heavy sentences. These things are happening constantly.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: And our Government is sending protest notes.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI: Yes.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: That is what every Government does.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI: Every Government has to do that. We cannot go in for an open fight unless there is some atmosphere like that. That is why I am not exactly for negotiations for the sake of negotiations. We must have negotiations. We must have talks and at the same time we must strengthen our position in order to get our rights. These border troubles undoubtedly are wilful things and these are clearly deliberate aggressions. Now, in East Pakistan we are seeing that they are deliberately driving away non-muslims from East Pakistan and those acts of theirs are planned and deliberate. Now, I will not go into the details of this, because it is a long-standing thing. Everybody knows it. The whole country is perturbed over this for so many years. I have in the past also, on several occasions, suggested remedies according to my understanding. Again, today I would like to state before this honourable House that I do not like the way that is being followed by my old friend, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. Even the latest visit of Shri Jayaprakash Narayan to Pakistan has not produced any result so far as newspaper reports are concerned. Mr. Narayan had stated at some meeting that he found something hopeful. But Pakistan papers and other news regarding that do not support that view at all.

I wanted always that we should raise a voluntary militia on the borders particularly. This I suggested for the borders of West Bengal, Tripura and Assam. This voice has not

been raised by me alone, though I was the first person to do so. Later on in the Lok Sabha both Congress and Opposition Members raised this question and during the last NEFA debate here also some Congress and Opposition Members raised the same question. I want that the East Pakistan refugees should be settled on the border land, giving them a definite military training. I welcome the idea of the hon. Rehabilitation Minister, as has been expressed through the papers, that he wanted to give training to East Pakistan refugees on defensive lines. That is a very good idea. That tallies with the ideas so long I have been putting forward before this House and that is why I welcome this idea. During the last Budget Session I had a talk with Mrs. Indira Gandhi. She was not in the Government then. Still as the Chairman of the Citizens' Council she asked me to submit a scheme for the voluntary militia. Later on I submitted an outline, but I do not know what has happened to that. Actually for the Citizens' Council to raise a voluntary militia, it was a difficult affair because it involved many things. Without the help of the Government and the military particularly this could not be done. So, I would like very strongly to urge that our Government should now take it up and now that Mrs. Indira Gandhi is in the Government, I hope she will also put forward her viewpoint before the authorities concerned, so that if both the Rehabilitation Minister and Mrs. Indira Gandhi take up the cause, this voluntary militia idea could be fulfilled in a very short time. Thank you.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madras):
Madam Deputy Chairman, first of all, I welcome the initiative taken by our Minister of Foreign Affairs in visiting some of our neighbouring countries like Afghanistan, Nepal, Burma and Ceylon, to have direct discussions with the Governments concerned regarding some of the problems concerning them and us and I particularly welcome the attitude that has been

brought to bear, the approach that has been brought to bear, on the problem of Indians in Burma. It is with that approach, I think, that we will be able to have better relations with these countries and not with the approach of the high and mighty. It is an approach of trying to understand the policies that they are pursuing in their own countries, of not seeking to interfere in those policies in any way whatsoever. As far as the human aspect of the problem of Indian repatriates from Burma is concerned, it is as much the responsibility of the Indian Government as it is the responsibility of the other Government. And, therefore, to the extent to which our Government will come forward to discharge its responsibilities in this regard, to that extent we will have a greater right to tell the other Government that they should also fulfil those tasks, those responsibilities. Without that it will be an extremely difficult thing, when our own nationals are concerned, if they have, as a result of certain policies—which are good in themselves—adopted by a sister Government, by a neighbouring Government, found it impossible to live in that country and come here. If we are not able to discharge that duty it will be an extremely difficult thing for us.

I welcome that approach. At the same time, I want that initiative must be kept up and continuously kept up with vigour. It is with regard to that I have got my own doubts. Madam, it has been admitted by many people here and newspaper reports that have been published in the country for the last two years have made it abundantly clear that our position in the Afro-Asian Countries is not what it was a few years ago. I do not want to waste my time—because I have got very little time—by quoting many of these newspaper cuttings. But newspaper reports of diverse viewpoints, papers like the *Indian Express*, like the *Times of India* and so on have all admitted and visitors who have gone to these countries have also admitted that

India's position is not what it was a few years ago. How are we going to solve that problem?

My friend, Mr. Ruthnaswamy, for example, stated that we have got to have some arrangement with the USA. Although it is true, he said, that the opposite of non-alignment does not necessarily mean alignment, none the less the solution he put forward before this House is nothing but alignment pure and simple. He wanted that there must be some sort of military alignment between India and America, and on that basis alone, he said it would be possible to defend our country. He also stated that on that basis there must be a ring of defence bases covering Formosa, Singapore, Philippines etc. I would like to ask some of these gentlemen as to what has happened to the defence pacts which many rulers of countries have had with America? Was the defence pact with America able to save Chiang Kai-shek? Was it able to save Syngman Rhee? What happened with regard to the defence pacts that the Diem regime had in South Vietnam? What has happened to these? Let us understand the new emerging forces that are there in these countries and not try to brush aside historical experience and think that despite the fact that these gentlemen had been able to get the support of the mighty United States they were not able to save themselves. Let us also understand that with regard to India also a similar fate will overtake us if we go about doing these things. On the other hand I am extremely pained to find that some think that our country's independence can be easily crushed. A big country like ours cannot be crushed. Our country's independence in the conditions of today cannot be crushed. Border troubles or border war there might be, but let us not today exaggerate the significance of a border war and raise it to the level of a war leading to loss of our independence. No such thing is ever possible. I agree with the Foreign Minister when he stated yesterday in connection with

[Shri P. Ramamurti] some question that our country's independence in today's conditions of the world cannot easily be crushed. Let us also realise that neither America nor Britain nor any other country is going to fight our war in the border. No such thing is going to happen. If we imagine that any such thing can happen, we will be living in a fool's paradise.

At the same time I would like to ask why it is that our status in these countries of Asia and Africa is not what it was a few years ago. Is it because our propaganda machinery has not been very good? For the last two or three years this has been stated again and again and I dare say that the Government of India must have made the best efforts to improve their propaganda machine, but nonetheless why is it that our status has not improved? There must be something fundamental about it, and I would like to draw the attention of the House and the Government to it. When we talk of non-alignment, it means non-alignment between two contending parties, the socialist world and the imperialist world. But in matters of anti-imperialism, in matters of the freedom struggle of the colonial people this non-alignment does not and should not stand in the way of our taking sides. On the other hand it becomes our duty to see that we give the fullest support to the struggle of the colonial people for independence. That is what we have stated. But I fear that as far as this aspect is concerned, it is our failure or rather it is our soft-peddling this aspect of the issue that has cost us very dearly in these countries of Asia and Africa. I will just give you a few instances. In Algeria they were fighting with arms—one of the bravest struggles, one of the most heroic struggles in the annals of the history of freedom movements throughout the world. A provisional Algerian Government was established. Their representative came to India and pleaded that it should be given recognition, and that India's recognition would

weaken the position of France. Did we do that? All African countries had recognised that provisional Government. Even some of the Asian countries had recognised that provisional Algerian Government. Our refusal to recognise the provisional Government had an impact on the minds of Asian countries, on the new emergent forces of Asia and Africa. Take, for example, Congo. When all the Asian countries including Ceylon and when all the African countries had withdrawn their forces—because they felt that those forces would not be able to act independently, but on the other hand the continuance of the forces would help the U.S., we continued to keep our forces. When all the African countries and when all the Asian countries had withdrawn theirs, we did that thing. We were not able to prevent the murder of that great patriot Lumumba; before our very eyes he was murdered. Did it have a good impact on the minds of the emerging countries of Africa and Asia? Naturally they looked upon us with suspicion.

Take another example, North Vietnam. The other day there was the Tonkin Gulf incident. The U.S. Seventh Fleet was there. The U.S. Seventh Fleet also sent its bombers to bomb the coast of North Vietnam. If any such thing happened about ten years ago, the Government of India would have come out firmly against these things. When there was the Suez crisis, when Egypt was invaded, we came out firmly against that, but to-day unfortunately we are not able to do that. We do not come out against that. We do not come out, for example, against the Seventh Fleet's peregrinations in the Pacific as well as in the Indian Ocean, whereas other countries of Asia, a small country like Ceylon, have been able to come out against this. These have an impact on the minds of the people as well as the Governments of the countries of Asia and Africa.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Does my friend remember that we did not come out when Hungary was raped?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: You may talk about it, I have not got the time. So, we did not come out against these things. Today we have a great responsibility as the Chairman of the Control Commission of Vietnam. The Foreign Minister says that we have a great responsibility. How have we discharged that responsibility? Here is Vietnam about which in 1954 there was an agreement in Geneva. That agreement provided that within one year there must be elections and on the basis of free elections the whole of Viet-Nam—North and South—must be unified. But we know that in 1955 the Government that was imposed on South Vietnam by the U.S.A. the Diem Government, unilaterally repudiated it, and we have on record in this House late Jawaharlal's statement that it is a very strange thing that a successor Government repudiates a solemn agreement entered into at the Geneva Conference.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: He has been assassinated.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: That is a different matter. Here was a Government that was imposed by the U. S. A. which repudiated that agreement of 1954 and later on we know that contrary to the provisions of the agreement, in South Vietnam the Americans entered their forces and also armed them, and we know that because of this all these years there has been no peace there. The freedom of that country which was to be unified on the basis of the election by the people—that provision has been thwarted. Did our Government protest against that? What is the point in talking about a political settlement? Here is a country which has been divided provisionally pending elections, and the only settlement that is possible as far as Vietnam is concerned is to see that all these troops are removed and to hold elections for the purpose of unification

as per the provisions of the Geneva Agreement. One would have expected that our Government would take that position and come out openly and condemn the United States whose forces are introduced there today. We have on record innumerable statements made by the Cambodian Prime Minister who had stated again and again that their freedom and neutrality is being threatened by the Americans there.

2 P.M.

Then, even Mr. Souvanna Phouma, the Prime Minister of Laos, three days ago in Paris, had stated that the presence of the Americans in South Viet-Nam was the reason for the perpetual quarrel in Laos itself. These are the things which are on record. It is the people who are directly concerned who make the statements. Therefore, unless we take up this forthright stand on many of these questions, how is it possible for us to project a proper image in the minds of the countries of Asia and Africa?

And today we are saying that we are going to have better economic relations with them. Very good. But what is the way in which you are going to better your economic relations? I have read in the newspapers that Mr. D. S. Joshi had gone to African countries and there he had projected certain agreements. What sort of agreements? Collaborationist agreements between our private industrialists and some of those people there. Similarly, another mission has gone with the official blessing-mission of the FICCI—the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, which is also going to seek this kind of collaborationist agreements. With such agreements, what is going to happen? We know the private profit motive of our industrialists. We know what insa-

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

liable greed they have. On that basis the Government is seeking to build up better economic relations with these countries. I warn the Government that in this way better economic relations cannot be built up. On the other hand, unfortunately, because of the activities of our private industrialists on the basis of their private profit motive, people in many of these countries will begin to look upon us as a 'big brother' who has come to exploit these countries. Sooner or later, this will be the direct result of our collaborationist agreements. How can we compete with China if we begin to do this sort of thing? As far as Ceylon, is concerned, China agrees to take its rubber at a price higher than the world market price. It agrees to supply rice at a price lower than the world price. This is the way in which they are trying to build up relations. China gives Burma loans free of interest and it agrees to build a textile industry on that basis, not by asking for the profits from it. It does so many other things, I have no time to go into all those things. That is the way in which they are seeking to develop relations. If today we seek to develop our economic relations on the basis of the private profit motive of our industrialists whose depredations we know as far as the people of this country are concerned, then how can we build up better economic relations with many of these countries? There is no use of mere propaganda. Propaganda must have a line to sell and what is the line that we have to sell to these countries? The line that our industrialists will come and take the profits out of those countries? Is that our line to sell them? That is why today, I say, we are not able to improve our position.

The question therefore, arises: why is it that we are not pursuing this policy with the same amount of vigour with which we used to pursue it a few years back? Well, our Foreign Minister stated yesterday

that the clearest proof of the correctness of our policy is seen in the fact that we are getting aid, generous aid, from countries, both of the West and of the East.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: What about China?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am not talking of China either. I will come to that later.

He stated that, and later on, he also talked of the massive aid that we receive from the United States of America. Now, I wonder whether the prospect of getting aid from America has not got a bearing on this entire foreign policy, on this soft-peddalling the anti-imperialist role that we used to play before, whether that fear is not lurking behind, not consciously but unconsciously, the fear that we may not be able to get that amount of aid otherwise. Has it got anything to do with our refusal to condemn the Seventh Fleet's operations in the Pacific Ocean and in the Indian Ocean? Has it got anything to do with regard to so many other things that we are doing? Let the Government of India search its own heart. Maybe not consciously but unconsciously, this fear is bound to lurk behind. And if this getting aid is the test of the correctness of our foreign policy, then it is a wrong test. Pakistan is getting massive aid from America. The Soviet Union, without the Pakistan Government asking for it, also offers to give it, it sends people there saying that they would build up some heavy industries, oil industries and so on. But does it mean that Pakistan's foreign policy is very correct? Because it is getting aid today from America and the Soviet Union is offering to build some industries, oil industries, does it mean that Pakistan's foreign policy is a very correct policy? That cannot be the test. Let us now examine the implications of this aid. If we have got to project the proper image of India upon those countries, it is not on this basis of flaunting this

aid as proof of the correctness of our policy that we can do it we know the experience of Ceylon. When Ceylon nationalised her oil installations, we know how the Americans threatened it and we know how Mrs. Bandaranaike had the guts to say, "To hell with your aid, we will go forward." We also know that. Very recently, about fifteen or twenty days back, President Soekarno of the Indonesian Republic openly proclaimed that from a certain date, he would not take American aid because the Americans sought to interfere in their internal affairs. These facts are on record. If this is their experience and if we proclaim to the world that the correctness of our foreign policy is proved by the fact that we are getting massive aid from the United States of America, naturally it begins to create a suspicion in the minds of these people—the suspicion that possibly in the struggle against neo-colonialism or in the struggle against such things, the Government of India cannot be depended upon to act very firmly. That might be the lurking suspicion.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: That is the fact. What is the use of denying it?

Therefore, in order to see that this lurking suspicion is removed, we must act more vigorously.

Now, Madam, it is from this point of view of pursuing this policy with more vigour that I come to this question of our troubles with China. Now, it is an admitted fact that there can never be a military solution to this problem. Late Jawaharlal Nehru had stated—and I agree with it—that these two great countries, in fact the greatest countries of the world, India and China, can never hope, by means of force or military arms, to subjugate each other. Neither India can do that nor China. Such a thing is an

impossibility. And even my friend, Mr. Ruthnaswamy of the Swatantra Party, I dare say—it was a very pessimistic picture that he painted, I do not agree with it—would not say that we should go to war with China; even the idea that there should be a military solution to this problem is unthinkable. And what is the other alternative? After all, some time or the other, whether today, tomorrow or ten years hence or 50 years hence, a solution to this problem has got to be found on a political basis, on the basis of meetings, on the basis of discussions at the highest political level, between the leadership of the two countries. That is the only way by means of which this problem is going to be ultimately solved.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it that China is correct?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am coming to that, do not want to be interrupted. If you get me more time from the Chair, I am prepared to answer all interruptions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You hardly have any more time. You can take another three minutes.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Five minutes more, please. I do not want any interruption.

But the whole question is: When it is granted that a political solution has to be sought and no military solution is possible, does the continuation of the present stalemate help our country? I say, no. As for China, it does not do much harm to it because as far as the north-east portion is concerned on which they had insisted, they have already got it. You are not going to do anything about it now or at any time in the future. Therefore, what is the fun? The longer the situation continues, the greater is the strain on our economy, the greater is the need for us to go after aid, after military aid from many of these countries, and as a result of that, the image that our

[Shri P. Ramamurti.]

country is able to project for itself on the Asian countries does get tarnished. Therefore, I say that the longer this continues the worse it is for us. That is the crux of the problem. Hence, something has got to be done to break the deadlock. I ask, why not the Government of India itself take the initiative in breaking the deadlock? I ask for only 'taking the initiative', I am not suggesting any solution. I ask, why should not the Government of India itself take the initiative? I agree with Dr. Sapru when he said that the Colombo proposals are not the be-all and the end-all of all wisdom in this matter. Certainly not. Today what is the dispute with regard to the talks? We are now concerned with those seven posts. But I would like to point out . . . (Interruptions) That is a political discussion. You can discuss it later, I am not now concerned with anybody. As I said, Madam, I would like to point out that the Colombo proposals were made at a time when the Chinese forces had not withdrawn, when they were in the process of withdrawing. They had made certain proposals, that after the Chinese withdrawal certain steps should be taken to consolidate the cease-fire and then talks on the border should start. Now nearly two years have elapsed and even though we did not accept the cease-fire, the fact is that the cease-fire has been there firmly for the last one year and ten months. This is a fact. Therefore those points the Colombo Powers made in order to consolidate this cease-fire. If officials' meetings and all sorts of steps suggested for consolidation of cease-fire are now insisted upon, as our Foreign Minister has done that will naturally give a handle to the Chinese Government to do propaganda against us. The other day he was quoting the New China News Agency official press report. I would also like to read out another sentence of that report. It says:—

"According to Singh, even if the above-mentioned pre-conditions were

fulfilled, it still would not be enough and that 'there were certain other steps to be taken before starting any real negotiations'. This is another clear indication that the obstacle to negotiations is placed by India and not by China and of course had nothing to do with the seven civilian posts on the western sector."

It is exactly this that they are utilising. Therefore, today why should you not make certain things clear and state that if the civilian posts are withdrawn, we would enter into negotiations for the border question itself. I would ask: Why should the Government of India not take the initiative and why should we ask the Government of Ceylon or anybody else to plead for us? After all, we are talking to Pakistan which has refused, in spite of the United Nations Resolutions, to vacate the two-fifths of Kashmir that they have occupied. Pakistan, day after day, committed hundreds of incursions across the cease-fire line. The Pakistani press and the speeches made by their Ministers and high dignitaries are not very favourable to us. But despite all this we do not put any conditions and we are prepared to talk to these people. Then in the case of China, why should we not take the initiative? We have got diplomatic relations with them. We send them notes on ever so many questions. Then why can we not discuss with them directly what should be the conditions that must be fulfilled in order that a proper atmosphere can be created for the purpose of holding negotiations on the question of border. Then why should the Government of India not take the initiative and do something about? In the absence of the Government of India doing that, naturally, the countries of Asia and Africa see the different attitudes as regards Pakistan and China. In one case you do not put pre-conditions despite the fact that day after day incursions take place, hundreds of people are being thrown out from Pakistan into India, in spite of that you do not put any conditions; you are prepared to talk to them on the

whole Kashmir problem. In the other case, you are not prepared to have direct approach on the question of the proper atmosphere for talks on the border issue. Therefore, that unfortunately creates a suspicion among the other Asian-African people. In conclusion, Madam, I want to point out that so long as this border dispute continues, it may not be possible for Government to stop running after the American aid. That will continue and that will lead to the tarnishing of our image in the Afro-Asian countries. Therefore, having taken the initiative in visiting many of these countries I want the Government of India to act much more vigorously, pursue that initiative with logic and not lead to a situation where our attitude to different countries will be sought to be made out as one of discrimination, and misunderstood. Thank you.

SHRI M. VERO (Nagaland): Madam Deputy Chairman, I give my whole-hearted support to the general principles which guide our foreign policy and I think we should continue to make special efforts to develop and maintain friendly relations with as many of our neighbours as are willing to co-operate in the policy of friendly co-existence.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

I am particularly interested in our relation with Burma because that country borders my Nagaland. In that context it is also very desirable that the condition of things in Nagaland, being our border State, should be peaceful and satisfactory. I venture, therefore, to explain things about Nagaland, that important border State, so that our relations with Burma may be better planned.

In this connection I feel it my bounden duty to express the feelings and views of the State of Nagaland which I represent in this House. First, I should thank this House and the leaders of the country for their sympathetic attitude towards the Nagas

in tackling the delicate situation and in recognising us as full-fledged citizens of the great Union of India in spite of certain racial differences in history from time immemorial.

Fortunately or unfortunately, differences of political ideology arose among the Nagas themselves, as a result of which a group of our fellowmen decided to remain aloof from us. So the movement became out of control in the State. It also may be a fact that the rebels are supported by foreign agencies in their activities. We regret this. But every sensible person among the Nagas believes that this supply of materials by foreign agencies not only helps bloodshed among the Nagas themselves but it disturbs the security of the country too. It is my conviction that no honourable settlement of the Naga problem can be achieved through the power of foreign countries, however great these may be. Despite the above circumstances, the Government of Nagaland, with courage and at the cost of life, succeeded in many developmental plans which are bringing about great changes of understanding and faith in the minds of the Naga people in the land.

Very often we speak about the integration of the country and humanity in the world. But what does it mean? It needs sacrifice even of life. It needs energy, affection, sincerity and honesty in action so as to protect the interests of the minority and of the innocent classes of people for whom we should bear great responsibility. Only in this way can the objective of integration be achieved.

The preaching of high-sounding words about integration will not serve any purpose unless we mean what we say. Perhaps, Sir, you know that several hundreds of brave Nagas, including the President of the Naga People's Convention, Mr. Inkonglinba, lost their lives at the hands of rebels. They died not for personal gain but to bring about better understanding and emotional integration with the

[Shri M. Vero.]
country. They sacrificed their lives because it was necessary. Which other State in India has sacrificed recently the lives of its leaders for integration?

In the last general election to the Nagaland Assembly, with great difficulty, the population in the State attended the polling stations to cast their votes and elect their representatives in spite of the heavy pressure and punishment from the rebels.

Su, politically, socially and culturally my people are not backward. They know what they must do and what others are doing also. My people are called "Head Hunters" Yes, but it is not the apex of our tradition. It happened because of necessity. This is how they have preserved the prestige and the honour of the land to which they belong.

In spite of the sincere efforts of the Government of Nagaland to bring about peace and normalcy in the area hostilities still continue. We may have certain weaknesses in tackling the problem and yet our approach has always been sincere and honest. Both the Central Government and the State Government of Nagaland have done everything possible to help restore peace in Nagaland, and I think we have succeeded at least in suspension of operations from both sides.

We in Nagaland may have to bear the responsibility for many shortcomings but, at the same time, we should remember that the era of violence has left much bitterness on all sides. I know that all over India there must be widows and children of the security forces, who were killed in Nagaland. But equally, in Nagaland apart from those who have already given their lives in standing up against violence, there are many villagers and others whose dear ones have died as a result of the destruction caused by security operations. Hatred has grown on all sides and even in New Delhi some Naga students have had a bad experience during the

Chinese aggression and had stones thrown at them. All this is an unhappy legacy and is unfortunate. However, we must all now work sincerely to improve the situation.

It will need a great deal of patience and understanding before things settle down and all I can pledge from our side is that under the leadership of the Prime Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, we shall give unstinted support and active co-operation to create this better climate of understanding and to build up this great land of ours

This understanding and friendship are important not only to the Nagas but to the country as a whole. During the last war, the people played a great part in helping the resistance against invasion. They can do so again but only if they feel contented and have the feeling that they have something precious to them to defend. It seems to me important for the defence of the country that the security forces now engaged in patrols and garrisons in Nagaland should become available for their real duty of fighting any foreign aggressor with the help of the people, rather than having to deal with a discontented population of our own. This is true not only of Nagaland, but of the whole Eastern Frontier. If the people remain unreconciled, the hill barriers will be difficult to defend. If they can be won over to join enthusiastically in the defence, I am confident that no invader will be able to pass.

Before I close, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will once again plead that the national integration which we so much desire and talk about, can only come if there is a willing approach from all directions and not merely from one. Let us hope that the patience and tolerance which have produced the present stoppage of operations will continue despite all difficulties in the delicate talks that lie ahead so that a lasting peace can come to Nagaland and so that India as a whole gains a strong and friendly population on its

frontier and India becomes, though a peaceful, yet a powerful nation. Thank you.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is no difference of opinion so far as the basic principles are concerned, namely, the policy of non-alignment, the policy of peaceful co-existence and generally speaking Panchsheel that we always take pride of as our guiding foreign policy, but the same does not save us in the hour of our crisis and distress. That does not carry our prosperity far enough. That does not make our position before the whole world any more honourable or sacred unless and until we can bring our position at home and abroad to the status we possessed before October 1962. Since October 1962 our position has gone very much down. We must acknowledge this fact and there is nothing wrong in that. Our policy of non-alignment has now become a policy of alignment with everybody, whoever is available. The policy of non-alignment was conceived in the context of the two Power Camps, one the Western Bloc, led by Anglo-Americans and another Bloc led by Soviet Russia and China. Now China and Russia have fallen out and Russia and America, both, are helping us against China, not out of love but because of their own political interests. That also must be recognised. The extent of ovation any of our leaders here might get outside is not the test of the popularity of our foreign policy. is not an indication of the extent of success of our foreign policy. There are 'ovations of courtesy' and there are 'ovations of honour'. We have to understand whether anything more than the 'ovation of courtesy' we do really get and whether we deserve any.

Coming nearer home, in the last 17 years since partition, what we have seen is this. Merely for the reason that they are Hindus or other than Muslims, the minorities in East Pakistan are being slaughtered, massacred. I can safely say it is "massacre of the

innocents." They are not at all at fault but why are they being massacred? It is because Pakistan considers India in a state of cold war. Unless this cold war can be ended—because this pressure exists—unless this is removed, this man-killing will not stop. The Prophet's hair is stolen in Kashmir and the riot begins at Khulna in East Pakistan. They had nothing to do with it. I say that only for that reason the Hindus were killed in thousands. Only in the district of Dacca, 40,000 Hindus were killed and several lakhs of Hindus and Christians and other minorities have had to come to India for rehabilitation and relief. Our national economy is thus being everyday disturbed because of the situation existing in East Pakistan. We hold our policy, the ineffective and useless foreign policy in regard to Pakistan, as the reason for this. What then can be done? I never think that Kashmir is the issue. Kashmir is an integral part of India and it shall remain so. That decision is irrevocable. Kashmir is not really the issue even so far as Pakistan is concerned. They make that as the plea only. When the situation will come down to some sort of adjustments on political level in the matter, I believe Kashmir question would be dropped out. How can that be done? I have already stated that our diplomats have lamentably failed all the 17 years. They have done nothing. They are doing service all right but not advancing the cause of India. I will come to the present trend in the Indian situation as initiated by a man like Shri Javaprakash Narayan. No man could take this position better than Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. One may differ from him but he has broken the ice. Many more delegations like that may go to Pakistan, may create a climate for adjustments and negotiations. That is necessary and that is the only solution. One Ambassador, or High Commissioner or a deputy High Commissioner is not enough to cope with the situation. We must exchange delegations, we must exchange ideas. We must show and extend the spirit of tolerance

[Shri D. L. Sen Gupta]

but at the same time a man like Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan should have control over his tongue. He should not issue statements too often. That does not advance the cause of either country. That only gives rise to greater misunderstanding. Sometimes in a statement one cannot clear himself. Sometimes in a statement one makes confusion worse confounded but the move is all right and we must welcome a move of this character, as many as possible and as many times as possible. We should also invite delegations, private delegations, non-official delegations from Pakistan. We are more interested in the situation at home. Our so many delegations going to America and U.K. may be stopped for some years to come, but our relations with Pakistan must be repaired as early as possible, and that is why I say that the only solution for the refugee problem in India, which has become a headache of the Government, involving as it does a huge drain of money, is this. We cannot possibly rehabilitate all the people, all the minorities of East Pakistan if they choose to come tomorrow; possibly we cannot; many refugees have already died here, and so the best thing by which the minorities can be served is to create the climate and allow them to stay there, which they would very much like too; those who have not come here all these seventeen years will have and must have had affection for their motherland, and Pakistan is their motherland, they accepted Pakistan as their motherland. And why are they coming now? It is because of the only fault that they were minorities, not Muslims, and also because a cold war was going on between India and Pakistan. So that situation must be tackled effectively, if not for other considerations, at least for maintaining our present population strength and removing the extra burden on our already slender resources because of the influx of refugees.

Coming to the question of China, who loses if the Colombo proposals

are not accepted by China? I am the last person to give even an inch of our land to China. But since the 19th of October, 1962, what have we done to redeem our pledge given to the nation? On October 20 our late lamented Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru ordered the military forces to throw the Chinese out of India. But they were not thrown out; rather we were thrown out, and the aggression remains, and the aggression has not been vacated in the course of the last two years. Now they have not accepted the Colombo proposals? Then what? Should we still accept the position of the *status quo* being maintained? In that event we lose, and therefore some positive proposal must come from the External Affairs Ministry; the External Affairs Minister must tell us what is his positive policy. I am not envisaging a war; it is a matter for the Defence Minister, and I would have asked him that question if he were here. But so far as the Foreign Minister is concerned, he did not tell us in the course of his forty minutes' speech what he proposed to do with China. We cannot make China swallow the Colombo proposals; that strength we have not today. I do not think that China is marching at a lesser speed with military preparations than we are. So what is the solution? The solution is not sitting tight on the fence. The solution lies in understanding each other, and that must be done in our interests, either by ourselves or by those who can initiate it. Our embassy has failed; our embassy has done nothing; our embassy did not inform us what the Chinese designs were. Mr. Pathak, in his speech, said: "China is guilty of fraud, China is guilty of dishonesty, China is a war-monger." But when did we come to know of it? We did not know it when China conquered Tibet. We did not know it when we agreed to 'panchsheel' with China. We came to know of it only when they had taken a large slice of our land by use of force. So what is the good of saving all this today against China? Further, China is not represented in this House. So let us

acknowledge that we were befooled by China, that we did not understand them, that we did not understand their politics; our foreign policy was so bankrupt. Let us acknowledge the fact that we had no foreign policy, and if there was one, our foreign policy here was bankrupt. Now no patriotic Indian can tolerate aggression to continue in the manner it is being allowed to continue. It is more honourable, more respectable to come to some sort of adjustment than allow the aggressor to stand on the border all the time. It is an insult to the whole nation and we are doing nothing. We have no programme; we have no policy; we have not said anything; our hon. Minister does not say anything, how to regain the position. I want from him a positive statement, a positive line, a positive thinking, how he plans to get the aggression vacated. Either it must be by war, or by negotiation, or by allowing the *status quo* to continue. But the *status quo* cannot be allowed to stand; it is a great loss for India, both in territory and in honour and prestige. Coming to the question of war, war is impossible. So only the third solution remains and that requires first-rate imagination; that requires planned action, and that requires diplomatic tact. But where is that diplomatic tact? Where is that diplomatic outlook? There is nothing.

Coming to our neighbours Burma and Ceylon, they were once parts of India and now Indians are being ousted from Burma and Ceylon as immigrants, as refugees, and they are adding to our problems here. And if our foreign policy was really effective, if our foreign policy was sound, such things would not have happened. I therefore hold that there is flaw in our foreign policy; it requires renovation; it has become something colourless and odourless. Therefore, the basic principles remaining the same, in the present objective situation we must revise our ways of thinking so that all these problems can be solved without further delay.

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I whole-heartedly support the amendment moved by my hon. friend, Shri G. S. Pathak, to the motion under discussion.

Sir, I sincerely feel that our Foreign Minister has given us a very comprehensive review of the prevailing international situation and India's reactions thereto in a very short compass. Sir, I believe his assessment of the situation and his reactions thereto are in complete accord with the fundamental principles of our country's foreign policy.

Sir, our foreign policy, or the policy of non-alignment, I am glad to find, is receiving wider and wider appreciation in the world, and with the passage of time, more and more countries are adopting it as their own foreign policy. The critics of yesterday are being converted into the admirers of today. Shri Vajpayee is one of them.

Sir, I need not repeat an enunciation of the policy of non-alignment as it has been very well explained by our Foreign Minister in his opening speech. But I feel, Sir, that in the present world context, and especially after the Chinese invasion of 1962, there is one aspect of that policy that requires special emphasis and attention at the hands of our Government. I cannot do better than refer to it in the words of our revered departed leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Speaking in this very House, on the 3rd of September, 1963, in the Foreign Affairs debate, he said:

"Non-alignment is a thing which gives us freedom of action, which gives us freedom to function as we think best which is a part of our independence."

So non-alignment is a part of our independence. So we must always be alert and vigilant to safeguard and preserve our policy of non-align-

[Shri Krishan Dutt]
ment as jealously and unrelentingly
as we would guard our independence

Sir, we the people of India are the sentinels of our freedom. Eternal vigilance, it has been well said, is the price of freedom. We have to preserve that freedom at all cost, come what may. Again I would refer to the undying words of our revered Panditji, from the same speech. He says:

"I do not think India would be worth living in, if it loses that sense of freedom and independence."

At the present juncture of history, Mr Vice-Chairman, the freedom and independence of India stands menaced simultaneously from China and Pakistan, both aggressors, who have already by force, taken illegal possession of thousands of square miles of the sacred soil of our country. And the indications are that they are determined to remain in illegal and forcible occupation of that territory. They are not prepared to listen to reason and logic. The fanatic rulers of both Pakistan and China do not understand the language of persuasion, reconciliation, negotiation, discussion and honourable settlement. They understand settlement only in one sense and in one sense only, and that is an abject surrender of the other party to the terms dictated by them. Both of them exult in the method of war, Pakistan in the name of Jihad and Red China in the name of a war of liberation of the masses from bourgeois capitalist domination. These are their set phrases to hoodwink the world in a bid to expand their political domination and bring under their imperialism the people of other free countries. It is a matter of great pride and pleasure to them to believe that the method of war is the only true and effective method to enforce their ideologies on unwilling people who choose to differ from their ideologies. India was rudely roused to these realities in October 1962, by the ruthless, sud-

den and unprovoked invasion by Red China. India was taken by surprise. But since then we have realised the value, the effectiveness and the necessity of building up an invulnerable, modern and up-to-date defence apparatus of maximum strength and power possible so that in future no aggressor may dare to cast an evil eye on our sacred motherland. It is a matter of supreme satisfaction and gratification to find that countries with differing social and political systems are coming forward to help India in preserving its independence and integrity. The true background to this happy phenomenon is the realisation in the world powers that India's freedom is the epitome of the freedom in the world. In other words, the nations of the world have come to the conclusion that if India retains its freedom, then the freedom of the other nations of the world also remains safe and intact. And they also know that if, God forbid, India should lose her freedom to China, the aggressor, then there will be an end to all freedom in the world. That is the crux of the matter. India's role in the defence of her freedom against the Red rulers of China, has a pivotal position in the world. We are thankful to the nations who are helping us to strengthen our defence potential to preserve our freedom. The recent successful missions of our Defence Minister to the United States of America and to the Soviet Union have given the entire country and nation great satisfaction and delight. I would humbly submit that our Government should always keep up modernising our defence apparatus and keep it in the latest trim in the knowledge and belief that an independent country must always possess in reserve the highest military power it can afford, by whatever means possible. Reserve military strength is the only sure guarantee against unscrupulous powers who delight in effacing the freedom of weaker nations.

Mr Vice-Chairman, I would next proceed to consider the subject of

Indo-Pakistan relations, or more particularly, the subject of Indo-Pakistan amity. At the outset, I would assure the people of Pakistan that the people of India have the greatest love and respect for them and sincerely wish them the blessings of freedom, peace and prosperity. In fact, without mutual trust and confidence and cooperation between the people of Pakistan and India, not only the peace and prosperity of the whole sub-continent is put in jeopardy, but the very freedom and independence of the sub-continent is exposed to certain hazard and danger at the hands of the most unscrupulous and expansionist communist dictators of Red China. It is high time that the people of both Pakistan and India wake up to that realisation, the realisation of that common danger which menaces their freedom alike. I am fully confident, Mr Vice-Chairman, that the people and Government of India have already in the past laboured incessantly and untiringly to bring about the friendliest possible relations between the peoples of the two countries, and I am also confident that these efforts to win the confidence and love of the people of Pakistan by the people of India will certainly continue to be made even in the future.

But, Sir, the unfortunate fact remains that the ruling circles of Pakistan do not understand the necessity for giving top priority to these efforts at understanding and goodwill between the two peoples. The rulers of Pakistan are unnecessarily working themselves up over the question of Kashmir. The rulers of Pakistan must understand that it is their 'Hate India, policies and their adherence to the pernicious and obnoxious two-nation theory which is at the root of the whole trouble between the two countries. Once the rulers of Pakistan understand that the permanent good and the well-being of Pakistan lies in adopting a fully democratic and secular way of life, then, Sir, there will dawn a new era of brotherly affection and confidence between

the two peoples and the question of Kashmir would automatically disappear. The leaders of Pakistan, however, are never tired of repeating that the only prerequisite of good relations between Pakistan and India is the solution of the Kashmir question. I would respectfully submit, Sir, that this is tantamount to putting the cart before the horse. India is precluded by its Constitution, laws and policy from looking at the Kashmir question from the standpoint of the two-nation theory, not only that, even the people of Kashmir also are bound by their Constitution and the laws to a secular way of life and government and they have, by their own choice and free will, made the State of Jammu and Kashmir an integral part of the Union of India for ever. Therefore, those who advise and counsel that India should be generous to Pakistan and hand over Kashmir to Pakistan for achieving Indo-Pak amity do not know what they are talking about. Let me remind such people of what our illustrious departed leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, said about such a solution in this very House in the Foreign Affairs' Debate on 3rd September, 1963:

"So far as Kashmir is concerned, the House knows very well that legally and constitutionally Kashmir is completely a part of India. There is no doubt about it and nobody can challenge it but looking at it from other points of view, from practical points of view, it is obvious that any change in Kashmir would have disastrous consequences, disastrous for the people of Kashmir, disastrous for India and for Pakistan. Therefore, it is no good people telling us, as some people do in some other countries, that we must be generous about Kashmir, generous at the cost of whom? At the cost of the people of Kashmir, at the cost of the people of India? It is quite absurd. Kashmir is a State of the Indian Union, an autonomous State as other

[Shri Krishan Dutt]

States and something more than that and any attempt to alter this, to change this situation would I think, be very bad for us. Of course, there are limits to which we can go in settling the question and we went far enough, but, here again, we cannot do anything, whatever the consequences. This must be realised by all concerned. Some of our people, who are friends in India, talk loosely as if Kashmir could be put in a plate and handed over to Pakistan. Well, they may do anything they like but that will be the death of India, ruin of India and the ruin of Kashmir. The whole attitude, if you put it that way, may mean that we may also hand over a good deal of India to China. Either the whole thing goes to the other, either you have the mentality to fight and to preserve your independence or you lose all strength and rely on others and to please them you do this or that. I do not think India will be worth living in if it loses that sense of freedom and independence."

After this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I wish to say a few words about the efforts of people like Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan and Sheikh Abdullah, who are making efforts at achieving Indo-Pak amity. I wish well of them; this is a very auspicious move. I am wholeheartedly for it but to drag in Kashmir in trying to secure Indo-Pak amity is something that I think is unpardonable. To do that, Sir, is throwing the Constitution of India, the whole constitutional apparatus of the Government of India, the whole Parliament, to the winds and the decision of the Indian nation to the winds. That, I think, no patriotic Indian should even consider. Therefore, I am totally opposed to the efforts which Sheikh Abdullah or, for that matter, Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan and his associates are making for causing or bringing about a change in the status of Kashmir to please Pakistan. That, I am sure, Mr. Vice-Chairman, no single Indian who is

patriotic and who has any sense of reason can tolerate. Therefore, I wholeheartedly endorse the amendment which Shri G. S. Pathak has moved.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh). Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is the first occasion when we are having the debate on external affairs without our dear and respected leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I join others in paying my humble and respectful homage to his memory. The policy that he laid down as the architect of foreign policy in India, nay as the architect of modern India is one which is always substantially approved and appreciated by both Houses of Parliament and by the country at large. Sir, every one is aware that in the beginning there was great opposition from the Western countries, particularly from the United States of America, but as days passed, they also came to recognise the utility and advantage of the non-alignment policy and President Kennedy and President Johnson on different occasions have given expression to the view that the stand that India had taken on the basis of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence was the right one. So, we have got that heritage and I have no doubt the present Government, our Prime Minister and our new External Affairs Minister, will follow that policy. It is a big responsibility that has fallen on Sardar Swaran Singh. I think the Prime Minister has selected the right man for this purpose and I assure him of the best wishes of this House and the country which are always with him and the Prime Minister in the difficult task ahead, to solve many matters in regard to our foreign policy, our relations with foreign countries and particularly with Pakistan and China. Sir, I would refer to Nagaland and the efforts that are being made there. I think it has been pending long and as advocated just now by the representative of Nagaland. I have full sympathy with the efforts that are being made to settle this affair and I do hope the sacrifice of the Indian

people and the people of Nagaland will result in a very honourable and amicable settlement within the framework of our Constitution with the greatest liberty that could be given to that area.

3 P.M.

Sir, notwithstanding several difficulties I think there are certain moves regarding China and Pakistan and I consider that in a way they give some hope in the future of better understanding with these two great neighbours. Some information came through the Ceylon Parliament where it was mentioned that the Colombo proposals will be accepted although it was not clearly approved by the Chinese agency. But I hope when our Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister meet Mrs. Bandaranaike in Cairo they will further thrash out the matter. I agree that this should be solved as a political problem and not as a military problem as mentioned by Mr. Ramamurti. But I do not agree to the extent that Mr. Ramamurti has gone. Mr. Ramamurti has said that we should initiate. What should be the initiative on behalf of India? Is it not recognised by Mr. Ramamurti and his colleagues that China is an aggressor? Still when certain friendly countries came to intercede and brought out certain proposals notwithstanding certain matters with which we did not agree, we decided to accept those proposals and there we stand. The moment the Chinese Government will accept those proposals they will not find India in any way indifferent to negotiate and settle this matter.

While referring to the non-alignment policy, Mr. Ramamurti and my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, accused the present Government that they were not following this policy and they referred to the situation in South East Asia, particularly in Viet Nam and Laos. Well, I would ask these hon. Members, are we to take cognisance only of outward

interference or also the underground and subterfuge interference?

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Both are equal.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: When they say that we have not protested against the Americans using force, was it not the duty of these learned friends also to say that we should protest against the Chinese machinations and their subterfuge activities as well which has really made the situation extremely bitter and to counteract this position America is also taking a certain measure?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: A welcome measure.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN. If we condemn America we also condemn China for interfering in the local affairs of these two countries and I think the attitude that our Government took in these two matters—whether it is Laos or whether it is Viet Nam—is perfectly in keeping with the declared policy of our respected leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, that is, to keep absolutely non-aligned when both China and America are trying to interfere. We feel concerned that there should be no interference neither from the United States nor from China but we all know—and I am sure the Foreign Minister knows better than I do and he will know more when he goes to Cairo—of the subtle activities of China which are not confined to South East Asia alone but are spread out to Africa and other countries also. Sir, when we went to Algeria for a conference we found that in many countries they have got their cells but those countries, though officially non-aligned were working for China in such a way as to condemn all the constructive activities that the Asian and African friends were doing to improve the conditions of those countries. For instance, you know that China has not only taken a very

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan]
 unreasonable stand against India but even against a country like Russia which had helped China to grow economically, militarily and in all possible ways. When Mr. Pathak said that China has betrayed us Mr. Sen Gupta asked when he came to know that. Well, the same could be asked of Soviet Russia also. The Soviet Union also did not fully realise and recognise what China's expansionist policy is. We tried from 1948 onwards to befriend China—and I say quite rightly because she is a big country and we should try to befriend her—and there was not a single occasion in the United Nations when with as much as enthusiasm as Soviet Russia and I should say with even greater enthusiasm we did not fight for the cause of China. We thought that a big country like China should be a member of the United Nations. With all that cordiality that our late Prime Minister and our country showed, with all the cultural delegations, if the Rulers of China—I would not blame the Chinese people—think that they can serve their country and the world by violence and by subterfuge activities, well, it is for them, but we certainly condemn these activities.

So far as the question of Pakistan is concerned, Mr. Sengupta referred to the question of refugees. I entirely agree it is a humanitarian question. It is a matter of shame and disgrace for any country that the people of that country should leave that country, thinking that they may not get safety, security and all the other amenities which every citizen is entitled to in a country and I want in the coming negotiations between the two Home Ministers or the Foreign Ministers, this humanitarian question should be given precedence and we should see that such an atmosphere is created, an environment is created, such cordiality is brought about that the people do not leave that country. Nobody normally leaves one's own motherland. If people go out of any country,

it is a great condemnation of the policy of that country and government. I agree with Mr. Sen Gupta that minorities should be protected in these days of democracy, although Pakistan has no democracy, there is going to be an election soon. Well, we wish them best so far as democracy is concerned. Our good wishes will be with the democratic forces there. That is a different thing. But I want to bring this to the notice of the Government that unless among the people of the two countries cordial relations are developed, it will be very difficult to solve any big problem. So far as this is concerned, I entirely agree with the attempt of Jayaprakashji to bring about cordiality to the extent possible. I support the view that there should be more delegations coming from both countries, especially from the Bengal side, so that we may try to bring about amity and good relations among the people themselves.

Now, very recently we had a communique, a joint statement, issued by our President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, and the President of the USSR and Mr. Khrushchev. I respectfully welcome and support that statement. That has further strengthened the relations between our country and the Soviet Union. I do hope that in the coming conference, which is a very important conference from the point of view of the Middle East, Asia and Africa, the prestige that had been built up by our late Prime Minister, will be kept up in regard to matters not only relating to us but also relating to Asia and Africa, that is, to see that the people who are still under the colonial regime are free and that no new method of colonialism is furthered, either economically or politically. I hope that the trust between the non-aligned countries will grow more and more in the interests of world peace. I hope the interests of economic and human development will be further strengthened at this conference. Our Prime Minister goes there with our best wishes and we do hope that their efforts will succeed in

bringing about more stability, world peace and disarmament.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, speaking on foreign affairs is always a matter of extreme delicacy, for even unconsciously one may say something which might offend a foreign nation with which our Government and we, as a people, would like to be on good relations. It is on this ground that I felt extremely unhappy when I listened to the tirade by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, against the communique which was issued after the Commonwealth Conference. It struck me as a storm in the tea cup in a very literal sense for the simple reason that the communique expresses nothing but the goodwill of the Prime Minister of England, as a representative of all the Commonwealth countries, that our two countries—India and Pakistan—should live in peace and harmony. That is our wish. I am perfectly certain it is the wish of the vast majority of Indians to live in peace with Pakistan and I have no hesitation in saying that it is also the wish of the vast majority of Pakistanis to live in peace with India. It was just an expression of a simple, good wish. Now, it seems to me that carrying on an agitation against that type of communique expressing a simple wish, gives rise to the impression that we in India do not want to live in peace with Pakistan. I know there are many Pakistanis who believe that Indians do not want to live in peace with Pakistan. It is false. But an agitation of this type gives a false colouring to a simple statement of good wish on the part of the Prime Minister of England and our own representative. I think on the whole they did their work very well and we owe our thanks to them.

So far as the policy of non-alignment is concerned, it is too late in the day to say anything against it. We have accepted it for years and years and I think on the whole it has paid us very good dividends. We have

had the benefit of the friendship of both the blocs without suffering from any of the disadvantages which would have accrued if we had aligned ourselves with one or the other bloc. I feel very grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for having refreshed our memory by quoting in the other House from a very memorable speech of our late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru:

"We believe also that the great cause of human progress cannot be served through violence and hatred and that it is only through friendly, co-operative endeavour that the problems of the world can be solved. Hence our hand of friendship is stretched to every nation and to every people. We are in no camp and in no military alliance. The only camp we like to be in is the camp of peace and goodwill which would include as many countries as possible."

That is a sentiment to which every man, to whatever nation he may belong, would very much like to subscribe, because we have had enough of wars. We have grown sick of them and we want peace. I was also very glad as I listened to the speech of the hon. Minister of External Affairs when he said that he would continue that policy of living in peace without any likes or dislikes and be a friend of every country and every nation possible. I think it is a good sentiment. But may I venture to point out that, although we have carried out the broad spirit of non-alignment, we have not lived up to it cent per cent? I should like to mention two small instances of that.

Take, for example, the case of Taiwan. It is a small country which can be swallowed up by China but for the mighty assistance of America that stands behind Taiwan. Now, let us not forget that the leadership of Taiwan was always very friendly to India. Generalissimo Chiang-Kai-Shek, when he had power in the whole of China, raised his voice in favour of Indian independence at a

[Prof. A. R. Wadia]

time when the powers that were like Sir Winston Churchill were not very well inclined towards giving us freedom. He had done a lot and so did his very gracious wife and I am perfectly certain that even today both of them cherish the same kindly, friendly feelings for India that they had in their better days of glory. Now, I can understand that in the beginning, when communist China came into existence As a matter of fact, when we had to recognise that a new China had come into being, we might have had a feeling that the recognition of Taiwan would offend China. So, we might have held back our hands That is why we said that we had nothing to do with Taiwan, even though we sit with Taiwan in the Security Council and in the General Assembly of the United Nations. But things have changed. China can no more pretend to be our friend. In fact, China has done its level best to humiliate us, to defeat us even and, therefore, we ought not to have any such extra sensibility as to what China would say if we recognised Taiwan I think the time has come for us to do justice to a small nation for this reason that Taiwan in the few years that she has been in existence as an independent entity has been very prosperous, has developed well, has meant well by us and by the peaceful world generally. I do hope that our Foreign Minister will give his close attention to this problem and do good justice to Taiwan. The other day in this House there was a little commotion over a book which was brought from Taiwan by my friend, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. It was argued that it was banned and therefore Mr. Patel had no right to bring it into India. It was a very innocent book on agriculture. Why should it have been banned? Why should there be a general ban that anything published in Taiwan should not be imported into India? It is an unreasonable ban. It does no harm to Taiwan but it does a lot of harm to us if we are prevented from learning something from these books.

Another small country to which I would like to refer is Israel. We have recognised Israel but unfortunately we have not given full diplomatic representation to this wonderful country of Israel. I remember that some years ago a colleague of mine drew my attention to a little book on Israel which showed what wonderful progress Israel had made in the few years that it had come into existence. Israel drew the Jews not by its wealth, not by its fertility, but merely by the old historical ties, by the old historical sentiment, and the Jews have converted this arid land into a garden, into a land of promise. Since that time Israel has progressed even much more, and it has now come to be recognised as a wonderful historical miracle that a few people scattered over all the continents, speaking different languages, should have been drawn to their own homeland, revived almost a dead language, made it into a living language, and used all the instruments of science and their intellect and their wealth to create a fine country. Israel is very friendly to India. I know that a number of Indians have gone there from all parties, and they have been welcomed there, and they have learnt a good deal from there. I know that it hurts them a bit when they find that their importance has not been fully recognised. It came out as an ugly incident, I believe, last year when the Israeli Consul in Bombay wanted to celebrate the Israeli Independence Day in Delhi, and he was prevented from doing it. It was rather an ungracious act on the part of our Government. It should not have been done after all to a very small, friendly country. They mean well by us and we should mean well by them. Especially let us not forget the old historical ties between India and the Jewish people. Let us not forget the small but quite important community in its own way of white Jews which has lived for hundreds of years in Cochin, and we owe something to their friendship. Therefore, I venture to appeal to the hon. Minister of

Foreign Affairs that he would take a generous view and he would not be cowed down by what a bigger power might say or whom we might offend if we gave due recognition to small countries like Israel and Taiwan.

SHRI S. N. MISRA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the new Minister of External Affairs, I have no doubt, has a very proud legacy, and as one or two previous speakers pointed out, he has a very difficult legacy at the same time handed down by our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, whose every handiwork in every field, whether internal or external, was a piece of fine art which represented in a way all the hardness of granite and yet all the softness of the morning fog.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.]

In describing the foreign policy of our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and also in suggesting to the new Foreign Minister what he has to be careful about, I can perhaps do no better than refer to what Byron has said about a lady:

A ray the more,
A shade the less,
Would half impair,
The nameless grace.

That is what the new Foreign Minister has always to bear in his mind.

But, Sir, the new Foreign Minister does not require the sympathy of the House in the sense that he is new to the job. That he is not. He had been initiated in this work earlier under the leadership of our great Prime Minister, and he has had the credit or the reputation of having dealt with some of the most difficult affairs and negotiations earlier.

After having said that, I would like to join other friends in expressing high appreciation of the personal efforts made by the new Foreign Minister in strengthening our ties with the neighbouring countries. We

came to know from the statement which he made that very sensitive grounds have been covered during the course of the discussions he has had with the foreign Heads of Government or the Foreign Ministers. And, therefore, we have every hope that the first crust of the problem had been broken and perhaps the road will be easy for the solution of the problems which have baffled us all these years. But at the same time, I have to confess to a feeling that our relationship with these neighbouring countries is bound to remain incomplete or at least less than most intimate unless it is reinforced by more meaningful and more fruitful economic relations. You must have observed during the course of the last two years that our trade with some of these neighbouring countries has considerably declined. That situation has to be improved, but that cannot be improved on the basis of any economic calculus alone. That has to be improved on the basis of broader considerations of neighbourliness and closer fraternity that we have with these countries.

Then, Sir, what I would like to deal with—and that would be the main point on which I would like to dwell at some length—is the last Commonwealth Conference which, as you know, has evoked a good deal of controversy in this country. Some hon. friends have referred to certain aspect of the last Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting; I would rather not call it a conference because it is incorrect in a way to call it so; they have always avoided using the word "conference" because they do not think it is a formal body; it is therefore, simply called the Prime Minister's meeting.

Certain other friends, as I was telling you, have referred to some of the broad and popular issues associated with the last Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting. But, what I want to stress is that on deeper analysis, the issues that arise out of the last Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meet-

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

ing are not exclusively Indian issues. They are issues which affect the Commonwealth as a whole. Here probably we would like to sound a note of warning that if the trends which have been set in motion by the last Prime Minister's meeting continued, then they are bound to be ruinous to the future of the Commonwealth. That is the important point that has got to be borne in mind. Therefore, to my mind, the point for an objective enquiry is plainly this: whether or not the new trends set in motion by the last meeting of the Prime Ministers were in keeping with the ethos of the Commonwealth or the law of the being of the Commonwealth. I would like to point out in this connection, particularly, the three points which are contained in the 'communique' of the last Prime Ministers' meeting. To my mind, they indicate very clearly that there is in motion a process for the radical transformation of the Commonwealth association. And these three points are—

- (i) The concept of a Commonwealth Secretariat;
- (ii) The inclusion of a reference to an intra-Commonwealth dispute to which my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, referred at great length yesterday, and
- (iii) The concept that the Commonwealth countries could play a role of liaison and use their good offices to settle disputes between member nations.

On the face of it, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it would appear as if they are very innocuous. They are not. That is going to be my submission.

There are some other straws in the wind which, if you collect together, would clearly indicate which way the wind is blowing. I would first like to get out of my way those minor indications. In this respect, what I would like to mention is about the Commonwealth Court of Appeal. That

idea also seems to have been mooted recently by some persons, and on July 16, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, in replying to a question in the House of Commons, said:

"I have often been attracted by this idea myself, and this is a matter we shall pursue in correspondence."

This is with regard to the Commonwealth Court of Appeal. And you will remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that earlier, in 1960, Senator Coorey of Ceylon had put forward proposals for a Commonwealth Court. Even this year, the Prime Minister of Ceylon mooted the idea of a Commonwealth Conciliation Commission. At least, that is what some reports say about the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' deliberations. Now, in view of this, there seems to be a definite idea to institute a Commonwealth Court of Appeal.

And further, there is also some talk about the constitution of a Joint Military Force for taking part in the U.N. peace-keeping operations. A Canadian proposal, we are told, was discussed at the last Prime Ministers' meeting on this very subject, and recently 'The Times' of London reported that the Commonwealth Chiefs of Staff were going to explore avenues for giving formal shape to this idea. Earlier, the British Prime Minister had hinted in the House of Commons in reply to a question by a Labour Member that this subject also might come up for consideration at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting. So, we have another idea about the institution of a Joint Military Force—maybe only for taking part in the United Nations' peace-keeping operations.

Thirdly—a very small matter it might seem but it is not—it was pointed out by Lord Attlee in the House of Lords that it was for the first time in the history of the Commonwealth that it was mentioned as to who presided over the Prime Ministers' meeting. It was never mentioned at any time

earlier. You might think that it is probably the host country which has got the privilege of presiding over the meeting. But it is a fact that it was never mentioned earlier as to who presided over the Prime Ministers' meeting. So, the custom was broken, in regard to this also.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would ask you to consider whether all these do not indicate and add up to an impression that the Commonwealth is trying to acquire characteristics which are not quite akin to it, to the laws of its being, which are not quite akin to the basic impulse or conception of the Commonwealth. Do they not, in particular, indicate that this "unorganised association" is acquiring formal characteristics? And at this rate, if we go on, probably, it would acquire the features of a super-States or of a bloc. That may be the apprehension. So, when I am criticising this or discussing this, I am only speaking from the higher plane of what is in the interest of the Commonwealth itself.

Then, Sir, I would like to say that the most important evidence of its deviating into a formal institution is the decision to set up a Secretariat to which I made a reference earlier. Sir, the communique said that they—meaning the Prime Ministers—were anxious for some permanent expression of their desire for clear, closer and more informed understanding between their Governments on the many issues which engaged their attention—mark the words 'on the many issues which engaged their attention'—and for some continuing machinery for this purpose. As you know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the British Prime Minister pointed out that in the past this idea was discussed so many times and rejected out of hand. What has happened during the year of grace 1964 that they have come down to that idea and it is being given a formal shape? Sir, when I told you to mark the words 'on the many issues which engaged their attention', I want

ed to point out to the House that it is not only cultural, technical, educational or any such matter which is going to be the concern of this Secretariat. Really, for these purposes there are already other bodies in existence. So, this Commonwealth Secretariat is going to deal largely with the political matters. I would also like to point out that according to this scheme, it is going to deal with the preparations for the future meetings of the Heads of Governments. Now, here also, Mr. Vice-Chairman, probably you might think that it is a very innocent idea, that this Secretariat would prepare the ground for the future meetings of the Prime Ministers. But that does lead us to the conclusion that the Commonwealth Secretariat is going to prepare the agenda for the Prime Ministers' meetings and is going to set the tone for the Prime Ministers' meetings. That being so, I think it is going much too far, which had not been imagined earlier.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You have three minutes more.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Only there minutes?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You have been given 20 minutes.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I was told that I would get twenty minutes but probably I have taken only ten minutes or so, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): It is noted here that you began at 3.24.

SHRI S. N. MISRA: You will please be a little indulgent. I am on this subject of the Commonwealth which has engaged a good deal of attention of the people of this country.

Here I would like to point to a very significant statement of the Foreign Minister of Nigeria, Mr. Jaja Wachuku, who said after the meeting—

[Shri S N Mishra]

"Nigeria feels very strongly that the time has come for setting up a Secretariat"

Mark the following words and I would like the hon Members to bear them in their mind

"The old idea of a Club, with unwritten rules, is dead. That implies something too loose and informal"

"The old idea of a Club with unwritten rules is dead"—that is what we object to

The representative of India, Mr T. T Krishnamachari—it was probably in Delhi—made this statement that this Commonwealth might become a well-knit body, if the spirit that dominated the latter part of the meeting continued, was maintained. Thus the stress now seems to be on the Commonwealth being "well-knit" as against its present "loose-knit" character. And what did the main architect of the present Commonwealth say earlier? By the main architect, I mean, the great leader, Pt Jawaharlal Nehru. He always laid stress on the informality and the looseness of the Commonwealth. What he meant by Commonwealth was "one or two meetings during the course of a year and a few references and consultations." That is what he said in so many words during the course of a debate. Earlier also, in 1946, in a statement the Prime Ministers had said that "a centralised machinery would not be in the interest of the Commonwealth"

So, I would like to submit that, all in all, this Secretariat is going to come in the way of the normal functioning of the Commonwealth countries

And, therefore, I would strongly recommend to the Government to oppose this idea even at this stage. Nothing much has been done with regard to that. And if the Government says that having given further

thought to this matter, they have come to the conclusion that the institution of a Commonwealth Secretariat is not in the interest of the Commonwealth itself, I think this would work. And, therefore, I would like the Government to take this line

Now, Sir, since it seems that I have already taken about 12-13 minutes of my time or 14 minutes, I would like to make only a brief reference with regard to the inclusion of the reference to an intra-Commonwealth dispute. Some hon friends, who preceded me, said that this reference was, again, a very simple thing, it was an expression of goodwill. I say if it is an expression of goodwill, why did they hold it back at the time of the settlement of the Indus Waters Dispute? A great problem was solved at that time of the Indus Waters Dispute. But no reference was made to that at that time. But at this time, if they make a reference to an intra-Commonwealth dispute, I think it is completely irrelevant. The parties were present there and nobody required to be told about it. The world had absolutely nothing to be told about it, and so it was a completely irrelevant reference. If at this time they made a reference to an improvement in the situation, then with greater justification they would refer to deterioration in relations in future. Then as a result of the newly found role of liaison many of these gentlemen would come forward with their good offices for mediating in this matter.

So I wanted to mention about this Commonwealth Conference at some length only to point out about the basic trends that seem to be at work

While I am on this subject, I would like to say that it has disappointed not only this country, but maybe, many other democratic countries that the *raison d'être* of the Commonwealth, as it was pointed out to us earlier—the sharing in the common ideals of democracy—has not been fulfilled. If that is so, there are

dangerous signs in the field of values also—not only in regard to the formal characteristic to which I have pointed. The Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting, in fact, maintained a stony silence about the aggression committed against a democratic country, an important member of the Commonwealth. On the other hand, they referred to the great significance and importance of the aggressor country, China. So this is another dangerous sign so far as the future of the Commonwealth is concerned. But I must say that to some extent this has been relieved by critical references to Portugal and also expressions of sympathy and support to Malaysia.

I would not now dwell on this subject any further but I would mention one or two things briefly before I sit down.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to come nearer home and say a few words about the situation that we are facing with regard to Kashmir and Pakistan.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I would like to warn the Government that there are some mischievous and sinister moves in certain quarters of late. They seem to be mounting their efforts to create an impression that if we accommodate a little, adjust a little, shrink a little, there would be settlement and peace all round. That is the impression that is being created by certain quarters. This is reflected indirectly, as I tried to suggest in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Communique, and that is also reflected in a sense, in the goodwill mission which was recently conducted by some of our eminent countrymen. This has tended, Madam Deputy Chairman, to encourage our opponents to maintain rigid and inflexible postures and blur the justice and soundness of our stand. Moreover, it has slowly and steadily fostered the impression that you have only to put a little more pressure on India and the

settlement is there. I may not appear as fine as some hon. Members tried to be. But this is the general impression that is being created by certain interested quarters. In view of this I consider it eminently desirable that the Government should not show any excessive anxiety for negotiation with those who continue to be intransigent or impervious to reason.

It is no use speaking in the idioms and styles of domestic life. I must say, Madam Deputy Chairman, that it did not impress me very much when some time back our new Foreign Minister said that the contribution of this country at a certain conference was going to be humble. Although this humbleness is all very good, I want to suggest to him that the style and idiom of domestic life should not be carried on to the international plane or into the negotiations with regard to these countries.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We should say that it would be very grand.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Humility is different from humbleness. These are the styles and idioms. They might be exploited by certain countries in different ways.

In this connection, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to remind the House that China still pretends—that has to be borne in mind—to maintain a posture of strength and rigidity even while fighting on three fronts. The hon. Member Mr. Sapru said that we could not fight on so many fronts. At one and the same time we could not fight China, we could not fight Pakistan and we could not fight poverty. But what is China doing at the present moment? China is fighting not only against India, it is fighting against Russia, may be ideologically it is also fighting against America, ideologically maybe. So China is fighting on three fronts, in addition, it is fighting like us on a further front, namely poverty. If China can afford to do that, I have

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

no doubt that the people of this country can also afford to do that. Therefore, let us not demoralise our people in this way. That is not good for morale internally, or for prestige externally.

So, I would like the hon. Minister not to follow the line advocated by some hon. Members. My concrete suggestion would be that, so far as China is concerned, let us wait for the initiative to come from China, and let there be no doubt in our mind that China is not going to negotiate unless she is compelled to think that it is her national interest to negotiate.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Do you want cold war to continue?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Whatever the case. The other party is not seeing reason. I do not think that anything that you say here is going to bring them to senses. So it would be utterly wrong to create an impression in this country—and that I would like to emphasise particularly—that a negotiated settlement with China is within reach. That is a very great mistake that some of our countrymen are committing. Madam, if we commit that mistake, we would be creating another artificial world about which the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, our great Prime Minister spoke. And this time the people are not going to excuse us if we shut ourselves in another artificial world. Then I would also like . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. You had asked for two or three minutes only.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Only two more minutes. I would like to remind the House that China, even in this situation, has claimed a million and a half square kilometres of territory from such a powerful country as Russia. It has not hesitated to do that. I do not ask them to emulate China but I would only like them to take note of the present posture of China.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, we would like the best of relations to be restored with that country, but we must be very careful in our diplomacy with her at the same time. I hope the Government realises that the goodwill mission which was conducted recently has not done much good to us. In fact it might have created some problems which we will have to sort out a little later. You know that these genuine men who manned this delegation, say things or make statements which have been exploited in the past by the Pakistan authorities for propaganda purposes abroad and also in the forum of the United Nations. I have no doubt that the noble efforts they have made are going to be exploited by the Pakistan authorities. So, I would like, in this view of the matter, that we must be very careful in our diplomacy with these countries. When our Foreign Minister goes with the Prime Minister to the non-aligned Conference, I would like him not only to take up the issue of Chinese aggression which this House probably unitedly demands—and in the other House also the demand was made by all sections of the House—but he should also attempt to put into some shape a kind of a conciliation machinery and a Standing Committee of the Foreign Ministers which might meet once or twice a year and report to their respective Governments.

With these words, I thank you very much for showing indulgence to me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Sudhir Ghosh. Shri Sri Rama Reddy. Shri T. S. Pattabiraman. Shri Jagat Narain.

श्री जगत नारायण (पंजाब) : मैडम डिपुटी चेयरमैन, मुझे बतौर एक भारतीय के बड़ी खुशी है कि इतना अहम महकमा सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह जी के सुपुर्द किया गया है। मुझे बतौर पंजाबी इससे भी ज्यादा खुशी है कि पहली दफा एक पंजाबी के सुपुर्द यह महकमा किया गया है। महकमा बहुत अहम है,

बहुत जिम्मेदारी का है और मैं समझता हूँ कि मेरे भाई सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह अपनी काबलीयत से, अहलियत से, मीठी जबान से और जो महजाबी मैं एक "डैश" होता हूँ उसको काम में लाते हुए पूरी सफलता हासिल करेंगे। मगर मैं उनके सामने वह तसवीर रखना चाहता हूँ जब कि भारतवर्ष आजाद हुआ था। उस वक्त हमारी इतनी कद्र व कीमत थी, इतनी कद्र व मंजिलत थी बाहर के मुल्कों में कि कुछ कहा नहीं जा सकता। जब हमारे देश को आजादी मिली उस वक्त तिब्बत एक बफर स्टेट था, तिब्बत में हमारे शकखाने थे, तारघर थे, हमारी फौज थी, सिफारतखाना था, कारोबार था। खास तौर पर लाहौल और स्पिती का लाखों रुपये का कारोबार तिब्बत के साथ होता था। लेकिन आज यह हालत है कि वह बफर स्टेट खत्म हो गया, चीन ने उस पर कब्जा कर लिया, आज हिन्दुस्तान का उम देश से कोई कारोबार नहीं, वहाँ हमारा कोई डाकखाना नहीं, तारघर नहीं, सिफारतखाना नहीं। लाहौल और स्पिती जो कि छः महीने बर्फ से ढका रहता है, वहाँ के लोगों का कारोबार और व्यापार ही तिब्बत के साथ हुआ करता था। वह आज बिलकुल खत्म हो गया है।

उसके बाद नेपाल आता है। नेपाल वह देश है जिसको हिन्दुस्तान ने मदद उस वक्त दी जब कि वहाँ राणाओं के राज में बहुत भुशकिलात थी। इस वक्त वहाँ के जो मौजूदा महाराजा है उनके पिता ने हमारे सिफातरखाने में पनाह ली और उनको हिन्दुस्तान ने नेपाल का बादशाह बनाया और वहाँ पर जो हिन्दुस्तानी रहते हैं उनकी बड़ी कद्रो मंजिलत थी, बहुत उनकी इज्जत थी, कारोबार था। मैं जानता हूँ, मेरे भी कुछ संबंधी वहाँ पर रहते हैं जिनकी बड़ी कद्रो मंजिलत थी। तो आजादी मिलने के बाद हिन्दुस्तानियों को बड़ी कद्रो मंजिलत ने पाल में मिलती थी बल्कि यहाँ तक कि हमारे

लेट लेमेन्ड प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक तकरीर में कहा था कि नेपाल हमारा छोटा भाई है, अगर उसकी तरफ किसी ने आंख उठा कर देखा तो हम उसकी आंख निकाल लेंगे। मगर आज वह हालत नहीं है। नेपाल के महाराजा इस तरह नहीं सोचते हैं जिस तरह हमारे लेट लेमेन्ड प्रधान मंत्री सोचा करते थे।

बर्मा कभी हिन्दुस्तान का एक सूबा हुआ करता था। जिस वक्त आजादी मिली थी वहाँ हिन्दुस्तानियों को बहुत इज्जत मिला करती थी, किसी के ख्वाबो खयाल में नहीं आता था कि एक दिन हिन्दुस्तानियों को वहाँ से निकलना पड़ेगा। मेरे भाई सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह बर्मा तशरीफ ले कर यहाँ वापिस आ गए हैं। उन्होंने कहा, वहाँ तो तमाम नेशनल्स के साथ एक जैसा सलूक होता है। मैं बड़े अदब से उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग बर्मा से आए हैं—मैं तो वहाँ से होकर नहीं आया हूँ—लेकिन उनका यह कहना है कि वहाँ पर पाकिस्तानियों के साथ ऐसा सलूक नहीं किया गया, दूसरे देशों के लोगों के साथ ऐसा सलूक नहीं किया गया जिस तरह का सलूक हिन्दुस्तानियों के साथ किया गया है। उनका तमाम कारोबार बंद कर दिया गया, बैंक बन्द कर दिये गये हैं और जब वे हिन्दुस्तान वापस आने लगे तो उनकी उंगलियों पर एक छल्ला भी नहीं रहने दिया और उनका जो हिसाब बैंको वगैरह में जमा है वह भी उनको मिलेगा या नहीं यह मालूम नहीं है। बर्मा का यह हाल है जो कभी हिन्दुस्तान का एक सूबा हुआ करता था।

सीलोन यानी लंका में भी मेरे भाई गए वहाँ से भी कोई प्रामिस नहीं मिला कि जो छः लाख हिन्दुस्तानी वहाँ रहते हैं, जिनकी कोई नेशनलिटी नहीं है—न उनकी नेशनलिटी हिन्दुस्तानी है न लंका की है और न उनको इसके बारे में कुछ पता है—और छः लाख में ५ लाख वे भाई बहन हैं जिन्होंने कभी हिन्दुस्तान की शकल नहीं देखी,

[श्री जगत नारायण]

हिन्दुस्तान में उनके बाप दादा पैदा हुए जो सका गए, जिन्होंने लंका को बसाया और आज उनकी हालत यह है कि उनको निकाला जा रहा है और पता नहीं वे यहां हिन्दुस्तान में आकर कहाँ बसेंगे, कैसे बसेंगे।

पुर्तगाल एक छोटा सा मुल्क है, वहाँ पर मोजम्बीक में २,००० के करीब हिन्दुस्तानी रहते थे उनको कै.पो में डाल दिया और जब उनको वहाँ से मजबूर होकर निकलना पड़ा तो वे अपने साथ कोई सामान नहीं ला सके। पहले तो वे कैम्प में रहे फिर बाद को जब वे वहाँ से निकल आए तो हिन्दुस्तान की गवर्नमेंट ने उनकी कोई मदद नहीं की, उनको बसाने की कोई कोशिश नहीं की और वहाँ पर जो कुछ भी उनका माल भत्ता था उसका कोई हर्जाना उनको नहीं मिला। यह एक मोजम्बीक जैसे छोटे से, आर्डिनरी, शहर का वाकया है।

तो मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि जब हमें आजादी मिली तब हिन्दुस्तान का बड़ा दबदबा था। दुनिया के लोग हैरान थे कि एक लंगोट-बन्द सन्यासी ने जो विलायत का पढ़ा हुआ है उसने नानवायलेन्स के जरिये कैसे हिन्दुस्तान को आजादी दिलाई, माइटी ब्रिटिश इम्पायर को कैसे हिला दिया। लोग डरते थे, हैरान भी थे, लोग प्यार भी हम को करते थे। डरते इसलिए मैं कि वे कहते थे कि उन्होंने बगैर हथियार चलाए हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद किया, वे कितने बहादुर हैं इसका अन्दाजा नहीं किया जा सकता। हैरान इसलिए थे कि एक माइटी पावर को जिसके राज में सूरज नहीं डूबा उसको कैसे हिला दिया। प्यार इसलिए करते थे कि हिन्दुस्तानीयो ने कितनी मुश्किलता के बाद आजादी हासिल की है, वे फांसी के तह्ते पर चढ़े, लाखों की तादाद में कैद हुए और सिर्फ नान वायलेन्स से अपने देश को आजाद कराया। तो मैं उन के सामने एक तसवीर रख रहा हूँ कि जब हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ था तो हिन्दुस्तान की

क्या पोजीशन थी। मैं यह तसवीर इसलिये रख रहा हूँ कि मेरे भाई को यह बड़ा ओहदा मिला है फारेन मिनिस्ट्री का और मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे बतौर फारेन मिनिस्टर इतने कामयाब हों कि जिस शकल में हिन्दुस्तान को महात्मा गांधी कांग्रेस के नेताओं के सुपुर्दे करके गए थे, उन के एम् को वे पूरा करें और हिन्दुस्तान को वे उस पहली शान में ले आए जिस शान में महात्मा गांधी उन के सुपुर्दे कर के गए थे। मेरे भाई के यह काम सुपुर्दे हुआ है और मैं उन के शहर का ही रहने वाला हूँ—पंजाब के गुरु का रहने वाला हूँ यह तसवीर उन के सामने इस लिये रखे रहा हूँ कि जिस से वे देखें कि पहले हम क्या थे जब हमें आजादी मिली थी और आज हमारी हालत क्या है? छोटा सा लंका जैसा मुल्क है जहाँ हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं रह सकते और एक छोटा सा मोजम्बीक जैसा शहर है जहाँ हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं रह सकते। तिव्वत का तो मामला ही खत्म हो गया, वहाँ तो कोई हिन्दुस्तानी रह ही नहीं सकता। एक हमारा पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान है जो हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा हुआ करता था। मैं पाकिस्तान का रहने वाला हूँ क्योंकि मैं पैदा हुआ वजीराबाद में, लायलपुर में पाला, पोसा गया और लाहौर में मैं पढ़ा हूँ। तीनों शहर पाकिस्तान में रह गए। आज हालत यह है कि हर रोज वहाँ से हमको धमकियाँ मिलती हैं।

और हमारी जो सरकार है वह हर रोज 4 P.M. प्रोटैस्ट करती है। अगर हम अपनी सरकार के प्रोटैस्टों को गिने तो मेरा खयाल है कि उनकी संख्या हजारों से ऊपर होगी लेकिन मार्शल ग्रुब इन प्रोटैस्टों की बिल्कुल भी परवा नहीं करते हैं। जब कि हम उन के साथ बात चीत करने के लिए हर समय तैयार रहते हैं। इसी तरह चीन का मामला है जिस ने ३० हजार मुरब्बा मील हमारी जमीन ले ली है लेकिन अभी तक एक दफा भी हमारे नेताओं ने कांग्रेस के नेताओं ने जिनकी हुक्मत है

अपने मुंह से यह नहीं कहा कि हम ने इस ३० हजार मुरब्बा मील जमीन को जिसे चीनियों ने जबर्दस्ती हम से छीन लिया है जरूर वापस लेंगे, जरूर वापस लेंगे, जरूर वापस लेंगे । मैं अपने भाई से यह चाहूंगा कि जब व इस हाउस में बहस का जवाब दे तो इस बात का जरूर एलान करे कि हम इस जमीन को जरूर वापस लेंगे, हिन्दुस्तान की ३० हजार मुरब्बा मील जमीन को जिसे चीनियों ने अपने कब्जे में कर लिया है जरूर वापस लेंगे । हमारा पहला अहद यह होना चाहिये कि हम उस जमीन को वापस लेंगे और मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस बात का एलान करे ।

मैडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन, मैं एक बात और भी शर्ज करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि मैं अखबारनवीस हूँ और जब मैं जलन्धर में था तो मुझे एक अखबार मिला जो कि हमारी एम्बेसी की ओर से अमेरिका में छपता है यह अखबार हफ्तेवार है और दो सफे का है । यह अखबार वहाँ पर प्रोपेगन्डा के तौर पर छापा जाता है और इतने बड़े मुल्क अमेरिका के लिए केवल २ सफे का पर्चा छापा जाना मुनासिब मालूम नहीं देता है । अमेरिका जैसे देश में जिस तरह से हमारी सरकार को प्रोपेगन्डा करना चाहिये या उससे वह पीछे रह गई है । मैं रूस गया, स्वीडन गया और अफगानिस्तान भी गया और मैं सच कहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक प्रोपेगन्डा का ताल्लूक है, हिन्दुस्तान का जो प्रोपेगन्डा है वह नफी के बराबर है जब कि प्रोपेगन्डा ही दुनिया में अपनी एक बड़ी अहमियत रखता है । मैं चाहूंगा कि हमारे भाई इस काम को अपने हाथ में ले और देखे कि हमारा जो प्रोपेगन्डा दूसरे मुल्कों में होता है वह किस तरह से होना चाहिये, किस अहमियत में होना चाहिये और किस शान में वह बढ़ सकता है । यह साग काम उनके देखने का है और मुझे उम्मीद है कि अगर वे इस ओर

ध्यान देंगे तो हमारा जो प्रोपेगन्डा का काम है वह दूसरे मुल्कों में ज्यादा तेजी के साथ फैलेगा ।

एक बात कह कर मैं अपनी स्पीच खत्म करना चाहता हूँ । मुझे दुनिया के चार पाँच देशों में जाने का मौका मिला और वहाँ के एम्बेसीज में भी जाने का मौका मिला । मैं आप से सच कहता हूँ कि हमारे जो एम्बेसेडर हैं वे बहुत ही रूखे होते हैं और उन्हें इस बात का ख्याल नहीं होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में आदमी आये है और उनके साथ हमें किस तरह से प्यार करना है और किस तरह से देश दिखलाना है । हम लोग तीन चार आदमी थे जिनमें से एक एक्स मिनिस्टर था और एक एक्स चीफ मिनिस्टर था लेकिन एम्बेसी के किसी भी आदमी ने हमसे यह नहीं पूछा कि तुम क्या देखना चाहते हो और हम किस तरह से तुम्हारी मदद कर सकते हैं । मैं सच कहता हूँ कि उनके रूखेपन में हम लोगों को बहुत दुख पड़ता और मैं चाहूंगा कि अगर सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह एक साधारण आदमी की हैसियत से इन एम्बेसीज में जाये तो उन्हें पता चल जायेगा कि किस तरह का व्यवहार ये लोग अपने भारतवर्ष के लोगों के साथ करते हैं । यहाँ से जो लोग जाते हैं उन्हें वहाँ दिखलाने का कोई इतजाम नहीं होता है न किसी तरह की आवश्यकत की जाती है और न प्यार ही किया जाता है । उस मुल्क में जो अच्छी अच्छी चीजें हैं उन्हें वे दिखलाने की कोई कोशिश नहीं करते हैं । इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान से जो लोग दूसरे मुल्कों में जाते हैं तो वहाँ की एम्बेसीज वालों को उनके साथ अच्छा मलूक करना चाहिये, उस देश में जो अच्छी अच्छी चीजें हैं उन्हें दिखलाना चाहिये ताकि वे लोग जब अपने देश लौटकर आये तो उन गुणों को जो वे वहाँ देखकर आये हैं यहाँ के लोगों को बतला सकें ।

मैडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन मैं तीन चार बातें आपके सामने रखी हैं और मैं यह चाहता

[श्री जगत नारायण]

हूँ कि मेरे भाई इन बातों की ओर जरूर तवज्जो देंगे क्योंकि जो महकमा उन्होंने अपने हाथ में लिया है वह एक जवर्दस्त महकमा है, बहुत ही अहम और जिम्मेदारी का महकमा है जिस पर सारे देश का इनहसार है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि वे मजबूती से काम करें, घबराये नहीं और मजबूती से अपने हाथ में इस काम को ले लें और उस हद तक इसको ले जायें जिस हद तक महात्मा गांधी जी हमारी इस सरकार को सौंप गये थे।

एक बात और कह कर मैं बैठ जाऊंगा और वह यह है कि विदेशों से जो हमारे भाई भाग कर आ रहे हैं वह एक बहुत ही अहम मसला है और मैं चाहूंगा कि वजीर साहब इसकी ओर खास ध्यान दें। जैसा कि मैंने जिक्र किया कि आज हालत क्या है? आज टांगानिका से लोग यहां आ रहे हैं, केनिया से आ रहे हैं, मेरी लड़की भी वहां से आ रही है और वहां पर हालात इतने खराब हो गये हैं कि बाहर के देशों के जो लोग वहां पर रह रहे हैं उन्हें भागना पड़ रहा है। मैं तो वहां नहीं गया लेकिन अखबारों को पढ़ने से मालूम होता है और जो लोग वहां से आ रहे हैं उनसे पता चलता है कि अफ्रीका में रहना अब मुश्किल हो गया है, अफ्रीका के देशों में रहना मुश्किल हो गया है। हालत इसलिए भी वहां बुरी हो गई है कि हमारी सरकार के जो राजदूत वहां पर हैं वे वहां की सरकार पर दबाव नहीं डालते कि हिन्दुस्तानियों के साथ अच्छा सलूक किया जाये। मैं चाहूंगा कि वजीर साहब इस मामले पर पूरा ध्यान देंगे और इन मुमकिनों में हमारे जो हिन्दुस्तानी भाई बहिन बसते हैं सिर्फ वे ही न बसें बल्कि और लोगों को भी उत्साह मिले इन मुश्कों में जाने का ताकि वे लोग हमारी तहजीब को फैंला सके। मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH):
Madam, I am extremely grateful to

the hon. Members who have given such careful thought to the various aspects of our foreign policy in the course of this debate. If I am right, depending as I do on my memory, I think, for the first time, in this august House, the debate on foreign affairs has lasted for the number of hours that it has lasted on this occasion. I am also very happy to say, if I may with all respect, that the general level of debate has been very high. Hon. Members have examined various aspects of our foreign policy. They have commented upon certain general and guiding principles that govern our relations with other countries, and they have also given valuable comments upon some of the immediate problems of more or less national interest in relation to some of the other countries.

Madam, it is not my intention to go over the entire ground which I ventured to place before this august House in my opening speech. I attempted to cover in the opening speech, in a very objective manner, the international situation, and also the Government of India's stand on some of the more important problems that face the world today. There is one aspect about which there appears to be near unanimity in this House; that is the policy of non-alignment. I wish I could omit the word 'near' in the expression 'near unanimity' that I used, and the only discordant voice in this respect was that of the distinguished Member who spoke on behalf of the Swatantra Party. The way he had started, when he tried to distinguish the policy of non-alignment and tried to say that contra non-alignment is not necessarily alignment, I thought we had succeeded in winning universal support for the policy of non-alignment. But as has been pointed out by some hon. Members, he started well and I thought that he was going to put forward some suggestions whereby this policy of non-alignment, without being abandoned,

could be projected in a form which might meet his yardstick also. But unfortunately, he landed us again in alignment. But the fact is he himself saw virtue in sticking to a policy which, according to his own concept, could give us independence of action, could give us the right to function in our best interests, uninhibited by any pacts or understandings with others, and that is really the essence of a policy of non-alignment and I wish he had stopped there and not later on stated that we should enter into alliances of a military character or any other character with certain other countries. I can well appreciate that a sense of that feeling, of that type, can arise when one gets worried and overwhelmed by some immediate problems. But let us not forget that immediate and pressing problems even cannot be satisfactorily tackled unless we stick to correct policies. And the more I think of it both in the short run as well as in the long-term period, there is no doubt in my mind that the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence that our country has pursued over the years under the inspiring guidance of our leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, is the only correct policy, both from our national point of view as also for preserving peace in the world and for lowering tensions, both of which are very desirable objectives. In the pursuit of this policy, occasions can arise when there might be seeming conflict, there might be apparent difficulties, when we look to a problem that might be immediately in our hands. I am conscious of that fact and India has had to face such situations on many occasions. But it is a happy thought that undeterred by certain immediate difficulties or complications, India stuck to this policy resolutely and in retrospect one can say with confidence that the pursuit of this policy has yielded rich dividends both from the point of view of national prestige as also from the point of view of strengthening the forces of peace in the world and on

many occasions India's voice did succeed in preventing the escalation of conflicts and had prevented a conflagration which might have engulfed the world and might have created such a bad situation as would have not only endangered peace amongst the immediate disputants, but could have really taken in its lap the entire world. This, Madam, is something about which we should be happy.

Let us not forget that it is not merely a satisfaction that the world is saved the rigours and pangs of the tragedy of armed conflicts, though that by itself is a rewarding thought, a rewarding thing, but it is more real from our own point of view, engaged as we are in this task of advancing our country, economically, engaged as we are in the mighty task of raising the living standards of our people. For us the preservation of peace, the prevention of war, are not merely laudable objectives, but in our own national interests, it is very very necessary that there should be peace in the world so that an underdeveloped country like India may be able to pursue its efforts for economic and industrial advancement and may be able to raise the living standard of our people. All of us, and very much so, this House, Madam, are conscious of the great and heavy burdens we have to carry in this development and progress of the millions of people whom we have the responsibility and the privilege of serving. It is therefore of immediate interest to us to see that there is peace in the world and that armed conflict is avoided so that the underdeveloped countries might be able to make progress and might be able to serve their people and might be able to meet some of the very pressing demands of the millions of people living in those areas, which is possible only if there is progress in the economic field. It is therefore much more than the immediate complication or immediate conflict that we might even sometimes have

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]
mentally in our minds that we should stick on to this policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence.

It is quite interesting that there is criticism of a mild character of this policy which, by and large, is accepted by all sections of the House. And if I may venture a suggestion, some of these mild criticisms from either side have the result of mutually cancelling each other and we are left with the hard core and the substance of the proposition that there is almost complete agreement that this is the policy that we should pursue.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: The golden mean is left.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH Hon. Members with their experience and with their familiarity with the different pulls to which some of us are liable, can fully appreciate the direction in which these remarks of mine are meant and I need not elaborate this further.

Some of these criticisms mutually answer each other and one gets fortified in the belief that the pursuit of this policy appears to be the correct thing. Having said this, it came to me as a matter of surprise that some hon. Members should have thought it fit to say that the policy appears to be the correct one, but somehow or other, in the implementation of this policy we are lagging behind or that we are not coming up to the critics' or commentators' expectations. I was hoping really to find some concrete mention about where the implementation of that policy did yield results which were not up to the mark. My esteemed friend opposite, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, started his comment somewhat on those lines and the points that he mentioned really are important points which I can separately answer; for instance, the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was mentioned by him. There are one or two other points

also mentioned by him. One may have a difference of opinion about the outcome of the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference or one or two other matters but I fail to see the connection between the result of the Conference or one or two other matters and the policy of non-alignment. Then he said that we should pursue it more vigorously and he also was good enough to assume the role of an examiner and he thought that my paper would entitle me hardly to a third class pass. This was his comment. I have also examined answer books. I do not know whether Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has ever done so but if one examines the answer books of the examinees, one is supposed to be very very impartial and we never bring about our own predilections in judging the answers that are given. So, I would have gladly accepted his verdict if he had really come forward as a really independent examiner but if the examiner himself has prejudices, then howsoever good may be the reply I can well imagine that I will not get the number of marks that I deserve.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: You deserve seventy-five per cent.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I do not know but it is some satisfaction that he did not decide to actually 'fail' me. So, that again is something which is good. Even if a prejudiced examiner can give me pass marks, then I am sure that an unprejudiced examiner, when he sits down and sees the answer paper with the dispassionate approach that normally an examiner is expected to bring to bear I am sure a few marks will be ungrudgingly given. In this matter . . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: In this case, there is another aspect. The examiner must possess superior knowledge which the hon. Member in this case does not.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That, I should say, is a little controversial ground because intellectually I have no doubt that he has got that capacity; only if he could bring about a little more objectivity, then I am sure the result would be somewhat different.

It is true, and I am fully conscious of the fact, that we have in this House always had the great privilege of hearing the exposition on international aspects from such a great leader and such a great authority as late Jawaharlal Nehru. For anyone on this side, on these benches or on the opposition benches or, if I may add, almost anywhere in the world, to find a statesman, to find a leader and to find a person of that inimitable charm that Jawaharlalji possessed is something which we cannot easily hope for. It is only once in a generation that a person of Jawaharlal's stature is available in any part of the world and all of us have been accustomed to hear from him extempore pronouncements on the most intricate of the world problems. He had lived with most of those problems. He had shaped some of those problems. He had the unique opportunity of coming into contact with the most diverse cross-sections of opinions in the world, in Government and outside the Government. Even before he became the Prime Minister, he threw light on the international situation in the Congress sessions, elsewhere. In fact, the policy that he gave to the country after we became independent was the continuation of his philosophy and his thoughts which really had been with him for twenty-five or thirty years when he led the country in the struggle for independence against the British. Therefore, for any man to pretend that any person can express, with the same lucidity, with the same earnestness and with the same authority and confidence, opinions on world issues will be a futile task. It will be idle

for any man to talk like that and futile to pretend that. Therefore, if that is the criticism and if that is the basis on which I was given a third class pass I plead that it will never be my pretension that I can do anything which might even come remotely near that inimitable way in which our late revered leader used to put across these ideas. I have myself watched him here, sometimes sitting on these benches and sometimes even quietly watching from behind the way that he expounded these ideas and it was a pleasure because there was vigour, there was freshness of approach and in almost every speech he broke new ground. It is for the first time that we are having this debate without that great light which illumined some of the darkest corners and which gave us cheer even when there was depression all round. Let us, however, try to adjust our minds to the hard reality and the cruel reality that he is no longer with us. We should, therefore, try to get maximum guidance and advantage from the guide lines that he had chalked out for us and try to steer a course which keeps us well within the broad policies that he had laid down and should try to pursue them in the best possible manner in our own national interest and also in pursuit of the highest ideals that always prompted late Jawaharlal Nehru.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like the House to be clear on one point; whether there can be an expression like the "late Prime Minister". Since this may gain further currency, we would rather like to make sure about it. The point is whether the Prime Minister can be dead. The Prime Minister is never dead; a person is dead so that this . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Foreign Minister is quite clear and the House has understood what he means. You may continue, Mr. Swaran Singh.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I will accept any amendment that the hon. Member might suggest.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: (West Bengal): You say late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: That is what I thought I said and I would request the Reporters to make corrections accordingly.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): On a point of information, Madam, when a person passes into history, the word 'Mr.' is dropped. 'The late Jawaharlal Nehru' is the proper way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You just say Jawaharlal Nehru. I think historical figures are mentioned that way. We do not say the late Mahatma Gandhi.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I think that is the best. Wherever I have used other forms, in the reporting it could be like that.

I was saying, Madam, that this suggestion that we should pursue this policy vigorously was put forward by different sections with perhaps different emphasis on certain aspects. I would not like to go into details but I owe it to the House to explain some points that have been mentioned in this connection. The Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was mentioned by hon. Members from the Opposition benches and also by my colleagues on this side. I thought that after the very detailed statement that our Prime Minister made on this point there would be no room for any further comment or controversy. And we should not be unnecessarily touchy about things and should not read into the communique any concept which is not really not there. Our participation in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference

was, I feel, quite effective. Our representative made a full and effective contribution in the discussions in accordance with the policies and programmes of the Government of India. In the review of the world situation, for example, our Delegation stressed the significance of developments in the world situation in favour of peace, the relaxation of tension between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R., maintenance of world peace and general and complete disarmament as distinguished from the bellicose and aggressive attitude and activities of China. As references have been made by some Prime Ministers in the context of the latter to tensions in South and South East Asia and the need for greater co-operation and understanding between the countries in South and South East Asia including India and Pakistan, the Indian Finance Minister while pointing out in the discussions the importance of maintaining the convention that inter-Commonwealth differences should not be discussed stressed India's need for necessary defence preparedness to contain the Chinese threat along India's borders. The Indian Delegation fully supported measures to end the apartheid policies of South Africa, early liquidation of Portuguese colonial domination in African territories, speedy evolution of British colonial territories to independence on the basis of majority rule in Southern Rhodesia as well as in other areas like British Guinea. On this question the Leader of the Indian Delegation Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, made a very clear statement on his return to India that the Indo-Pakistan differences were not discussed and that Kashmir was not discussed. It has been pointed out by some hon. Members that some Press representative from the Pakistan Delegation made a statement to the Press coming out of the Conference room where he said that Kashmir had been discussed and that the Kashmir dispute was going to be included in the communique and the objection that is raised is that this remained uncontradicted for three hours.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): That is a fact.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: We must remember that people who want to use a forum for spreading incorrect news can always choose either a forum or a point of time which may not be known to the other party. Now it is not suggested that there was any Indian present in that gathering who was familiar with what was happening inside and that he did not contradict this then and there. It is not as if this thing was said in the presence of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari or any member of the Delegation and that he failed to contradict that. Now we are sitting here and discussing and if someone from the Press gallery or the visitors' gallery goes out and makes a statement and tries to spread a rumour, I know it is not a desirable thing and it should not be done. And as soon as it is known it should be contradicted and it will be contradicted as this was actually contradicted. And it was actually not included in the communique which was issued later.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not merely the representative of Pakistan who said that. The Public Relations Officer who was the spokesman of the Commonwealth Conference—he is an Englishman—did it and after that the other gentleman, Secretary to President Ayub Khan also did that. Two of them did that.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Was Mr. Krishnamachari there then?

SHRI A. D. MANI: If I may mention, it had been stated in the Press that an official of the Commonwealth Relations Office made this statement that Kashmir was discussed. What was the Press Attache or the members of the staff of the Indian High Commission doing in London? It is not fair to say that they were not aware, that they were not familiar with the proceedings of the Conference; especially when the Commonwealth Press Relations Officer briefs

the Press they should correct any statement which may not be true.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The point is a simple one. It is true that an incorrect statement of that nature which in the very nature of the circumstances is a catchy one is likely to spread soon unless the other person is present and is able to contradict it there and then if it is not to do any mischief as in this case it has created mischief and we are facing the music every day, simply because this was not contradicted within five or ten minutes but that it took three hours to contradict it. But let us view this in its proper perspective and let us not ignore the sheer mechanics of the thing. If someone taking advantage of the non-presence of the members of the Indian Delegation tries to spread something, what will happen? You can say that the Indian Delegation's representative should have shadowed the Commonwealth spokesman and also the Pakistan spokesman so that whenever anyone of them makes any statement he could then and there say...

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): He could have issued a contradiction.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: You yourself say that the whole thing was contradicted within three hours. The graveman of the charge is not that it was not contradicted but that it was not contradicted within ten or fifteen minutes; why it should have taken three hours.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: The point is the Indian Delegation could have been in close contact with the members of the Press, particularly the Indian Press. They knew that Pakistan was out for carrying on propaganda.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The contradiction could have been got through the Commonwealth Relations Office and . . . (Interruptions)

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I have followed the point and I have already attempted to answer it. The main point is that the representative of our Delegation should normally be present everywhere but most of us who are familiar with conferences of this nature . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They want to know why he was not present. That is what they want to know.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Actually the statement was made at a particular time. It can be asked, when I am speaking here why is not my Press Attache present in the Central Hall all the time because somebody can make a statement that I am saying this or that. It is a very desirable thing that we should take every step to see that any incorrect news spread by others is scotched at the very beginning. That is the essence of the charge. Now we cannot prevent others from making incorrect statements. We should definitely take steps to scotch it as early as possible. In this case some mischief was done before it could be scotched, but let us not really warp our judgment and try to build up an image. Merely because some pressman was not there or some other representative was not there when another man chose to make an incorrect statement, you should not say that there is any basic departure from our policy. It is not that lack of vigilance, for which this point should be raised again and again. Shortly after, the whole thing had been clarified in a very clear statement that had been made by the Prime Minister. Now, Madam, in substance it has been well established that bilateral disputes between two members of the Commonwealth should not be discussed. The Finance Minister, who was the leader of the Indian Delegation, had made the position absolutely clear and this position was accepted. It is a fact that it was not discussed and let us not try to hammer it again and again. Let us not try to read in the communique all

things which do not exist therein and, if I may add, let us not weaken our stand by trying to give an interpretation to it when the authors of the communique themselves say that it is not meant really to convey an impression that Kashmir was discussed there. It is admitted on all hands that it was not discussed. Let us, at the same time, remember that in all these conferences there is a little distinction between discussion and reference. For instance, the Prime Minister or the leader of the delegation of any country in his speech on the world situation or other situation can raise many points, just as India did raise many points. Now, all the points that are raised in a speech do not become items for discussion.

SHRI A. D. MANI: They do.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: They do not.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Once a matter is raised in a discussion, it is an item.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: When a person is speaking there he can always say that this is indirectly or directly related to an item on the agenda. In the general speeches many points are said which cannot be strictly in accordance with the items on the agenda. These things are mentioned, just as India mentioned many things, which may not all be concerning the items on the agenda. Similarly other Prime Ministers mentioned many things, which did not come within the purview of the agenda and it is only the items on the agenda that are considered.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did Ayub Khan raise Kashmir?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Please. I did not at all interrupt you when you spoke, although you gave me third class marks, never did I interrupt you. Madam, what I am urging is that the point has been amply met and clarified that bilateral disputes are outside the purview of the dis-

ussion. We have clarified our position. Now, I would venture to submit to hon. Members, who may differ from us on many scores, that in a matter like this let us not, by raising these arguments, weaken our stand. Let us not try by implication to allow even a suspicion to creep in that we have ever placed an interpretation on the course or the trend of these discussions or on the communique as having acquiesced in either the discussion of Kashmir or even a remote mention of it. If we have made our position absolutely clear on that issue, we should not place that construction now. We should not, therefore, go on hammering a point, because by doing that we are weakening our stand and not strengthening it. Let us be quite clear on that issue and let us bury this controversy for all time to come. Madam, I am sorry I have taken a little more time on this issue than I wished to do. Now, I will rapidly mention some of the other points that have been referred to by hon. members.

I am extremely grateful to all sections of the House which have noted with satisfaction the efforts that were made to establish direct contact with our neighbouring countries. I shall be quite frank that I myself was not quite sure that the results that would flow from these visits would be as encouraging as they have turned out to be. Our relations with these countries have always been friendly, but for some time with some of these countries we did not have very direct and intimate touch. I think it has been a very useful experience and the results have been quite encouraging.

Now, with regard to two countries, namely, Burma and Ceylon, some mention has been made. I would like to give very briefly my appreciation of the situation. Now, in regard to Burma I have come back fully convinced that the policies that are being pursued are non-discriminatory. If they have taken any action for socialisation of trade whether it is an

Indian shop or a Pakistani shop or a Burmese shop or a Chinese shop, every shop has been treated in the same manner. There is no discrimination based on the nationality of the owner of any shop. Secondly, I have assurance from the highest level that those Indians or, in fact, those foreigners who would like to stay on in Burma and would like to play their role in the new social order they are trying to establish, would be most welcome. In fact I would like to recall the sentences that are contained in the joint communique that was issued. It is clearly mentioned that the Burmese Government would welcome particularly the working class and they would like them to remain there and function there under normal circumstances. I was assured that they would have not only assurance of safety but also equality of treatment in every way. Sometimes we may be overwhelmed by people who may have better means or who may be well off, but even in Burma I think 90 per cent of the people there are of the working class. There are a large number of families who own land and who are working on land. There are several others who are of the working class category. And it might interest you to know that their interpretation of the expression 'working class' is not so restricted as that of some of my friends opposite. For instance, General Ne Win, President of Burma in one of his remarks is reported to have said that he also is a member of the working class. So, it is not that narrow interpretation which some of us are likely to put on this expression 'working class'. Now, I am fully conscious of the fact that there are some difficulties which are being experienced by those who are leaving Burma.

It was agreed that we should appreciate each other's difficulties in this respect and should try to devise a formula which should take note of the mutual difficulties of the two countries in the matter of exchange and should also take note of the difficulties which might be experienced by

[Sardar Swaran Singh.]
individuals. So, steps will be taken at the official level to find out a satisfactory way of dealing with this problem.

In Ceylon I had the opportunity of meeting and discussing this question of Stateless persons, persons of Indian origin, who have not yet got the Ceylonese citizenship. I hope that the House is fully aware that a very vast majority of these persons are in the plantations. They are workers. They have been there for long years and they have played a very important role in the economic development of Ceylon, and they are very useful members of the Ceylonese life. They are by and large not unwelcome people. We can sometimes get an exaggerated notion of the state of affairs by reading certain press reports. There are many many difficulties, there are many complexities in the situation, and some sort of correspondence and discussion has been going on between India and Ceylon for quite some time. It is India's earnest desire to see the view-point of Ceylon in this respect, to try to understand what are their difficulties; I am sure that the Government of Ceylon also is moved by similar consideration, and at the next meeting of the two Prime Ministers when Her Excellency the Prime Minister of Ceylon would be coming to Delhi during the fourth week of October, this matter will be discussed further in a spirit of mutual understanding and the difficulties faced by either country, and a solution which might be equitable and honourable, which might be acceptable to the two countries and which would also be broadly acceptable to the persons concerned, should be evolved. That is the only way how we can try to settle things of this nature where two countries are involved, and let us therefore try to create a proper atmosphere of understanding and cordiality so that the meeting of the two Prime Ministers scheduled to take place during the fourth week of October might yield fruitful results.

Hon. Members have said many things about the forthcoming Non-aligned Conference. There is general support for India's participation in an effective manner in the forthcoming Non-aligned Conference. As I said yesterday, it is a source of great satisfaction for us to remember that the number of non-aligned countries has over the year increased, and a very large number of countries would be participating in the forthcoming Non-aligned Conference to be held in Cairo. The support that the House has unanimously given and the many points that have been urged will be kept in view when we participate in the Conference. There can be a temptation to raise points that might concern us immediately. That is understandable. But in conferences where such a large number of countries attend, we have to give greater attention to bigger issues of international peace and understanding, and there will be many occasions both inside the conference room and outside the conference room where many other issues would be discussed informally. Opportunity would be taken of the presence of the Heads of States and Heads of Governments of many countries to exchange views on many important international issues even of a bilateral character, and this will be a useful opportunity when not only we can concentrate on the items of the agenda which are very important and which are very far-reaching, but we have to give a real content to this concept of non-alignment and we have to give a good look at the various stresses and strains that have developed so that non-alignment may emerge as a force which might be the guiding principle notwithstanding the various complications or the stresses and strains that might be generated in view of the constantly changing international situation.

About China many hon. Members have made suggestions. I am particularly unhappy that Mr. Ramamurti from the opposition benches in his speech, which in parts I must say was admirable, tried to create an impres-

sion that while dealing with China we are adopting a posture or that we are taking a line which has created a misunderstanding in the minds of certain Afro-Asian countries. It is a pity that Mr. Ramamurti should have entertained that feeling. I cannot help him if this has caused a feeling in his mind or in the mind of some of the microscopic minority that he represents in the country, but we are in touch with the Afro-Asian countries and we are in touch even with the authors of the Colombo Proposals and I think that there is no doubt left in the minds of these persons all of whom are not like-minded with us—you know who are the members of these Colombo Powers who evolved these proposals—and it is felt that India has gone to the farthest limit to accept the Colombo Proposals. The last move which was initiated by late Jawaharlal Nehru that he was prepared to go to the negotiating table if the Chinese withdrew their posts from the demilitarised zone was a concession which, if I may add, is a concession in partial modification even of the Colombo Proposals which had envisaged the establishment of an equal number of posts by both sides. At any rate that was the stand which we took. In spite of all that, for any person to say, much less for any Indian to say that India is adopting an attitude which is not conciliatory or is intransigent is to say the least not justified at all and he should not really try to put that onus on us. Now, we have

SP.M. taken a number of initiatives.

If Mr. Ramamurti has the confidence of the Chinese Government, may I ask him what initiative the Chinese have taken in this respect? If they have taken none, then the onus is cast upon them to take the initiative. (Interruptions.) It is not always for me to take the initiative. We have taken all the initiative, and let us be quite clear in our mind that the honour and integrity of our country is a very, very dear thing to us and, no matter what happens, we cannot compromise on that issue. (Interruptions.) I would appeal to hon. Mem-

bers, from whatever political parties they might come, that on this issue let us try to hold on . . . (Interruptions)

AN. HON. MEMBER: Mr. Ramamurti is a leftist Communist.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister finish . . .

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Whether he is a leftist or rightist or centrist Communist, he is an Indian and he is a patriot. And I appeal to his sense of patriotism that on these issues we should take a view which does not embarrass us. May I remind him and certain other critics that their reaction is rather violent if something is said in relation to another country by people whom they do not like? Now, there can be really no strong reaction in such a thing and I am conscious of the fact that the Government's stand is not weakened by these pulls. I am not one of those who are worried whether all these have come from Mr. Ramamurti or from others in relation to Pakistan. Our policy in this respect is clear. I would appeal to them to revolve in their minds, not in the heat of controversy, not because of the temptation to score a debating point, as to what they are doing is in the national interest or not. I am sure that when they give dispassionate thought in a calm moment, they will agree with me that on issues like this we should adopt an attitude which should be above our party considerations and should have the national interest. It is also, I venture to add, in the overall international interest that we should not adopt an attitude which unnecessarily embarrasses us, although I want to make it absolutely clear that our stand will not be weakened by these pulls, whether they are in one or the other direction. That does not mean that our effort to strive for finding a satisfactory solution will not continue. Even Mr. Vajpayee has said that the Chinese people are our friends as people in other countries. There should be a feeling of friendship between countries. There are these differences in which we feel that

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

China is very much in the wrong and therefore we have to safeguard our national prestige.

In relation to Pakistan, I have not got much to add to what I have already said. It is our earnest desire to develop friendly relations so that the people of the two countries might be able to live in a friendly and neighbourly atmosphere. Unfortunately, we have not succeeded in our endeavours to develop the type of relationship that we have always been striving for ever after independence. We will continue to follow the policy of setting, whatever may be the irritants between the two countries whatever may be the points of difference between the two countries, by peaceful means. I know that this is a task which is not very easy but Indo-Pakistan amity is such a desirable objective that the undertaking of even the difficult task which requires all the patience to straighten out the complications that have arisen and the striving for a settlement of whatever may be the points of difference, will continue to be the guiding principal of our policy.

The House may recall that in the course of my talks with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, I had made an offer that India is prepared to enter into a No-War Pact. We have to remember that on many occasions Pakistan has been trying to point India as a country which is arming itself and it is made out as if we have any aggressive designs against anybody. Sometimes I feel amused when such insinuations are made. We have no design against any country. Our relations with most of our neighbours are so cordial and friendly. Even for Pakistan, when we had made this sincere offer that we were prepared to enter into a No-War Pact and we were prepared to settle all our differences, whatever they might be, by peaceful means, well, that should really be a complete answer.

But any suggestion or insinuation that India is trying to strengthen herself to do harm to any country is completely untrue. Well, that is a necessity and that is a responsibility which we cannot shirk because we have already suffered when the Chinese aggression took place. Therefore, it is very necessary that internally we should be strong economically and to the best of our capacity, militarily so that we might be able to defend our country. But that any country should have the slightest suspicion about our attitude is something which is wholly unjustified and which is not called for and not warranted by the circumstances.

Madam there are several points to which I wish I could devote some time. But in the brief reply that I have made, I have ventured to touch upon some of the points that have been raised. I am grateful to the hon Members who have generally supported the policy that is being pursued by the Government. Thank you.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI. Madam Deputy Chairman, I think the hon Minister while referring to me unfortunately said—I am not now considering his suggestion to me about my behaviour and all that—but what I am distressed to find was that he said, "if he is in the confidence of the Chinese Government". I take exception to that sentence because whatever proposals I made, whatever suggestions I threw out, they were as a result of my assessment of the situation and they were in the best interests of the country. (Interruptions) You may not agree with it, you are entitled to have a difference of opinion. At least there must be a certain amount of respect when I make any suggestion—you may agree. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Let him speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: He should be allowed to speak.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I will clarify it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish it first.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Therefore, when I made the suggestion, I felt it to be in the best interests of our country. I made it very clear that we were the sufferers there, that we have got to take some initiative. I did not say that we should do this or that. What I said was, "You should take some initiative, we should ourselves take some initiative without loss of prestige." That is my reading of the situation. You might disagree with it. But you should not insinuate, the Minister should not in any way insinuate. That is all.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Madam, I only like to clarify because I am the last person to leave any impression in the mind of any hon. Member which might hurt him personally. I would recall that the hon. Member had said that just as we are prepared to enter into negotiations with Pakistan without any pre-conditions we should be willing to start negotiations without pre-conditions . . .

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I did not say that.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: I see. Then I am glad that he is not suggesting that we should enter into talks with China without the fulfilment of certain conditions. Now that is a minor matter and I am glad that you have clarified it because that was the impression in my mind. On the other thing, I would like to clarify that I do not want to suggest and I do not mean to suggest that he was in the confidence of the Chinese in the factual sense. What I meant was that according to his assessment of the situation, if as a result of his assessment of the

Chinese position, if he can put forward his idea that this will be acceptable to the Chinese, then perhaps that might be of some help to many other countries who are striving to do certain things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Perhaps the hon. Minister had no time to touch some of the points raised by us. With regard to the situation in Vietnam, I should like to know from the hon. Minister as to why the Government is not agreeable to the suggestion that the International Control Commission should go into the allegations that have been made against Americans and others for violating the Geneva Agreement, as I pointed out, under its Article 12; it is quite within the ambit of the International Control Commission to go into this question.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Madam, I will answer that very briefly. The International Control Commission is a creature of certain agreements. I will broadly call it a statute of nations, and it functions under those conditions. Now whatever comes within the purview of those agreements and according to the clauses of those agreements will be a matter which will be gone into by the International Control Commission. So it is not for me to give an interpretation as to whether a particular allegation or a particular complaint that is put forward before the Commission by one party or the other is within the purview of the International Control Commission or not. I have no doubt in my mind that undaunted by the conflict of views on this issue, the International Control Commission will continue to function in a very dispassionate manner, and whatever comes within its purview, it will certainly go into it and express its opinion in accordance with the proved facts when they come to light.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: The hon. Minister has not said anything about

[Sardar Swaran Singh]
the objection to the establishment of a Commonwealth Secretariat. Would he kindly say something about that?

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: The Commonwealth Secretariat is a matter which was discussed and I would be quite frank that the African countries particularly were very much in support of having some sort of Secretariat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Some.

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH: Really a large number of them. That is the position. We are in a very, very preliminary stage. At official level some discussion will take place as to what should be the nature of that Secretariat. But I would like to clarify our own position that we will not like any Secretariat to function in any manner which might create a type of situation which was feared by my esteemed colleague, Shri Mishra. It will not function in any way either to provide any guide lines or any such thing in relation to this Mr. Mishra also expressed the fear that it might emerge as a bloc. We will see that the Secretariat, if and when it is set up, does not create a situation about which fears have been expressed. We are quite clear in our mind that this is an informal association, a loose-knit Commonwealth, and any attempt to formalise the relationship will not really be, in the long run, even in the interest of the cohesion in the Commonwealth. So we have taken note of the points that were urged and if and when any structure of the Commonwealth Secretariat emerges, we will keep in view the very valuable points that have been urged.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall first put the amendments to the vote. The question is:

2. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion

that all effective steps should be taken by Government to end, without any further delay, the cold war with Pakistan in the interests of both India and Pakistan'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government has absolutely no positive policy in regard to China, the aggressors, and regrets that no effective steps have yet been taken to recover the areas forcibly occupied by Chinese forces'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

4. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that on account of the present foreign policy of Government, India is fast losing the friendship of Asian countries'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House deplors and repudiates the reference to India-Pakistan relations in the communique issued at the end of the recently held Commonwealth Premiers' Conference'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

6 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

and having considered the same this House is of opinion that certain public statements of the Indian representative, the Minister of Finance, in London on the occasion of the Commonwealth Premiers' Conference marked a clear departure from the position the late Prime Minister used to take on such occasions and have lowered the prestige of India in the eyes of the world"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

7 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House records its disappointment and concern at the failure of Government to condemn the US violations of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and, in particular the strafing by the US bombers of the territories of that Republic'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

8 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same this House is of opinion that Government should have taken a firm stand against the deployment of the units of the US Seventh Fleet against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam thereby enlarging the area of conflict' in that region'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

9 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that Government have not taken adequate note of the recent movements of the US Seventh Fleet, including atomic submarines in South East Asia and the Fleet's entry into the Indian Ocean'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, The question is

10 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House notes with concern the failure of Government to raise objection to the use of Karachi Port by the units of the Seventh Fleet as well as the use of Japanese Ports by US submarines equipped with nuclear weapons'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

11 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House notes with concern the present policy of Government in support of Malaysia and, in particular its failure to protest against the military operations of the British and New Zealand armed forces in Malaysia'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

12 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely —

'and having considered the same, this House deplores the statements of the Finance Minister, made during his recent visit to Malaya in support of Malaysia'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

13 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government's policy with regard to Malaysia should be revised to bring it in line with India's basic policy of anti-colonialism and opposition to such military alliances as SEATO'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is:

14 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House notes with perturbations that India's stand in world affairs in favour of peace and against imperialism and colonialism is being weakened on account of certain acts of commission and omission on the part of the present Government'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

15 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should reiterate that the status of Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of the Indian Union is not negotiable under any circumstances'"

The motion was negatived

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

16 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same this House is of opinion that the voice of India should be powerfully raised in support of the defence of independence and sovereignty of Cuba and against the US moves and actions directed against that country'"

The motion was negatived

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

17 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely —

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the International Control Commission under the Geneva Agreement, 1954, on Vietnam should be called upon by Government to probe into the violations of the Geneva Agreement and other international commitments by the USA'"

The motion was negatived

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

18 "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely —

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that any delay in the ICC investigating into the violations of the Geneva Agreement by the USA armed forces in fraught with serious dangers to the cause of peace and security of that region as well as to the implementation of the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

19. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should take a firm stand against the British Government for its support to the military actions against Cyprus'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

20. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should take all diplomatic and political steps so that the Governments of the U.S.A. and Britain are obliged to stop all supplies of weapons to South Africa and economically boycott that country'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

21. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same this House is of opinion that Government should raise its voice in favour of withdrawal of all foreign troops and foreign military personnel from the Congo'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

22. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House notes with regret the failure on the part of Government to correctly appraise

the stand of Indonesia, against the formation of Malaysia as a *place d' arms* for Western imperialism'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

23. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of the view that Indias involvement in any manner in support of Malaysia would seriously compromise India's position and encourage the aggressive moves of the SEATO'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

24. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets that the Indian representatives should have agreed to the setting up of a Commonwealth Secretariat'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

25. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House notes with disappointment that the Indian representative did not take the initiative in championing the cause of the African peoples at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

26. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that effective steps should be taken by Government to ensure that the Government of Burma treats Indian nationals who may be resident there or forced to leave the country, with that consideration for human rights which international opinion expects from a member of the United Nations'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

27. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that no further talks should be initiated at the official level with the Government of Pakistan as long as Pakistan maintains its persistent hostility towards India'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

28. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Government of India should take active steps to promote among the members of the U.N. an amicable settlement of the present dispute between Malaysia and Indonesia which will take note of the just as-

pirations of Malaysia for maintaining its territorial integrity'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

29. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that Government should take steps to accord full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic'."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the Motion, as amended, to moved by Shri G. S. Pathak. The question is:

1. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy'."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the Motion, as amended, to the vote. The question is:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House approves of the said policy'."

The motion was adopted.

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

The House adjourned at sixteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 24th September 1964.