

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo.] these problems. If we had the policy in our hands to mould, we would not hesitate to tell the House what that policy should be and how we intend to keep our prestige intact but as we are not in that coveted or uncoveted position, as you may call it; hence it is up to those who are in that position to explain to us how that problem should be faced, in keeping with the principles enunciated in this House by themselves.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): The hon. Member can place his suggestions before the House.

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI (Bombay) : Why can't the hon. Member place before the nation the solution for solving this problem in Goa if he thinks that he has any solution?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I say this, Sir? The Goa Liberation Committee started a movement to liberate Goa. That was a suggestion which could have been considered but that was banned.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Then, Sir, there is Kashmir. There is naked aggression there as everyone knows and I need not emphasise that point too much here but today I was very glad to hear from the lips of the Prime Minister himself a positive statement on this matter that if further aggression is committed on the territory of Kashmir, it will be Considered by the Government as an act of war on the whole of the Indian Republic. That is the right attitude to take and it should have been taken long ago.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): Oh, but it was taken long ago.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: But it was not declared in this way.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: It was declared.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: It was positively declared.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I draw your attention to the fact that the Foreign Affairs debate is going on but neither the Foreign Minister nor the Deputy Foreign Minister nor even any Minister is present in the House?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Rajagopalan is here.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh): And he is taking notes.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Very beautifully taking notes.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: It would have been graceful if some Cabinet Minister had been present here. It is for you, Sir, to protect the dignity of this House. That is what we are saying.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I quite appreciate that point of view. I think that courtesy requires that a Minister should be here during the debate.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Then, Sir, there has been encroachment by Pakistan on the borders of this Republic which has been openly acknowledged by everyone to amount to aggression; under such circumstances, it is my request to the Prime Minister to throw more light on this matter as to the concrete steps which are being taken by our Republic in order to counteract this aggression in consonance with the policy declared by the President in his speeches at the openings of Parliament repeatedly every year. It is, as I have made it

clear, Sir, not in a spirit of criticism that I make these utterances but in all deference and with all approval to the trend of our foreign policy which has been so ably placed before the House by the hon. Prime Minister today.

The other point that I am at a loss to understand is regarding our linking up with the British Empire or the British Commonwealth. It is n'o longer the British Commonwealth but it is the Commonwealth as it is fashionably called. I cannot see, under the present circumstances, the logic behind this act on the part of the Government because of recent events which are a contradiction to the very principles and policies we are wedded to uphold and see translated into action in our lives in this Republic. As is quite patent, Britain in our very face has patted Pakistan on the back over the coup which has taken place there. I, for one, cannot reconcile the idea of a Commonwealth based on the rule of law and parliamentary democracy with approval 'of the type of Government that has come about in Pakistan today. Other problems are also patent to everyone; they glare at us in the face. There is South Africa where colour bar is rampant; our own countrymen are persecuted. The great leader of this country, the father of this nation, started his independence jnovement with the blows and insults aimed at him by the people of that land. I, for one, cannot understand why we, who are wedded to the ideals of equality of all classes, creeds and colours, should be in an Organisation that harbours a Government like the South African Government wedded to the principles of *apartheid*, hate of nations and hate of coloured people. So, Sir, on this too, I would like some light from the Government. I would like to know what the justification is for our being so much in love with the British Empire or, perhaps, the British Commonwealth or rather the Commonwealth. Why should we be willing to compromise 'our basic principles in order to

remain in league with an organisation, which has no ideals in actual practice today in common with us. I also fail to see why at all the various Commonwealth Conferences like the Prime Ministers' Conference, etc., etc., have their venues always in London. Now, if the Commonwealth is n'ot a reflection of the old British Empire, I do not see why its centre should lie in England only. The Government, especially the Prime Minister, in my opinion, should bring to bear the force of his personality to influence thoughts in such a way that the various conferences, various meetings 'of the Commonwealth—if it is really a Commonwealth without any bias—are held in the various capitals of the Commonwealth, so that the various Prime Ministers and the various items that they discuss, can come into direct contact with the people of the Commonwealth everywhere. To that end, I would like to know also from the Prime Minister as to how the sovereignty of our President stands in comparison with the sovereignty of Queen Elizabeth as the Head of the Commonwealth. That is a sore point with me, Sir, because I am proud of this Republic. I would like to guard with my lifeblood the prestige and the sovereignty of the President of this Republic. Hence as a matter of information I Would like to know this legal point as to how far our sovereignty, the sovereignty of our President as the head of an independent State . . .

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): The President is not sovereign.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sovereignty, he said.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: I did not say that. The sovereignty of the people lies in the President. **How** is this compatible with our being a member of the British Commonwealth or rather the Commonwealth? If I am satisfied on that matter, I have nothing very much to say.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: You do not intend to be satisfied. It has been repeated so many times and replied to "so many times in the House."

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: And then why do you stick on to it?

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: But the debate has been repeated so many times on the floor of this House. Why is the Member so anxious to say that it should not be repeated again? Mr. Bisht has no answer to that.

Sir, the very powers which have subscribed to the principles of 'Panchsheel' seem today to be flouting those very principles in actual implementation. It is quite plain today that the People's Republic of China, which was one of the first signatories to this salutary principle of live and let live, is showing certain admitted tracts of Indian territory to be within the control of China. The principle of the respect for sovereignty and the upkeep of the territorial integrity of our neighbours lies at the basis of this principle of 'Panch-sheel'. If this has been flouted in this way by the Chinese Republic and other members who have subscribed to those principles, I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister, what we are doing in order to safeguard the principles which we are pledged to defend and which, I believe along with the Prime Minister, are for the good of India and for the benefit of India's greatness in the future.

These are a few observations that I make in all humility and not in a spirit of criticism, to the Prime Minister for whom, as I have said already, I have the greatest admiration and for whose policy I also cherish/great hope and great faith regarding the future greatness of our country. It is not in any spirit of criticism of that policy that I make these utterances, but in order to find out and get further clear information on these various matters, so that we

ourselves can express our views clearly and further enthusiastically support and help to implement that policy, so that India can actually achieve the status, to which she is destined and to which our Prime Minister is leading her, in the near future.

**श्री पा० ना० राजभोज (मुम्बई) :**

उप-प्रधान-मंत्री महोदय, आपने मुझे भारत की विदेश नीति के संबंध में इस प्रस्ताव पर बोलने का जो मौका दिया है, उसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। आजादी के बाद हमारे देश को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न पर कहने का जो मौका मिला है, उसका हम शान्ति तथा दुनिया की प्रगति के कामों के लिए ही उपयोग कर रहे हैं और पिछले आठ साल से जो हमारी विदेश नीति रही है वही अभी भी है, हम उससे थोड़े भी इधर-उधर नहीं हटे। हमारी विदेश नीति एक अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण बात बन चुकी है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की जो नीति है, वह शान्ति की नीति है और इस समय दुनिया में युद्ध की वजह से जो घबराहट फैल रही है, उसमें शांति पैदा करने वाली नीति है। इसीलिये हमने एक साल के अन्दर इस सभागृह में चार बार इस प्रश्न के ऊपर विचार विनिमय किया। आज भी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने तथा अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने जो कुछ कहा है, उसमें मैं कुछ बातें नई कहूँ अथवा कोई भी कहूँ, ऐसा नहीं है। बातें वही हैं। हमारी विदेश नीति पुरानी ही है, परन्तु परिस्थिति में कुछ बदलाव हो गया है। पुरानी बातें नये ढंग से कहनी पड़ती हैं। आज भारत अनेक राष्ट्रों की सैनिक सरकारों के मुकाबले में खड़ा है। आज डेमोक्रेसी के मूल्य पर पुनः विचार करना जरूरी हो गया है। ब्रह्म देश, थाईलैंड, पूर्व एशिया, इंडोनेशिया तथा पाकिस्तान इन देशों में एक क्रांति हुई है। एशिया के बहुत से देशों ने

अभी-अभी आजादी प्राप्त की है, लेकिन वहाँ लोकशाही शासन संस्था हर न सकी । भारत के लिए यह बड़े खेद की बात है । उससे भी ज्यादा पाकिस्तान के बारे में है, क्योंकि ७ अक्टूबर के पहले से ही हमारे रिश्ते तथा संबंध उस देश से ठीक नहीं थे । सैनिक सरकार के बाद तो वह और भी खराब हो गये हैं । हमारी सीमा और सरहद आक्रमणों से व्यथित हो रही है । इसके लिए हमें डिफेंस पर ज्यादा खर्चा करना पड़ता है । इसी तरह के और भी दूसरे प्रश्न हैं । इसलिए मैं कहूंगा कि पंचशील की प्रगति तथा नीति अधिक उत्साह से स्वीकृत हो जानी चाहिए, क्योंकि कोई भी राष्ट्र हो, हम उस के साथ अपने संबंधों का पालन पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों पर करते हैं । मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से विनती करूंगा कि वे जितना हो सकता है, अधिक राष्ट्रों के साथ पंचशील पैक्ट करें और उसकी शुरुआत अमेरिका से करें ; क्योंकि पाकिस्तान को जो शस्त्रास्त्रों की मदद हो रही है, उससे वह सरकार भारत को तकलीफें दे रही है । यदि अमेरिका दिल में भारत की भलाई सोचता है, यदि अमेरिका का भारत और पाकिस्तान के काश्मीर के झगड़े में वैसेट डेस्ट्रेस्ट नहीं है, तो वह भारत से पंचशील पैक्ट करें और हमारे मन में जो शक का निर्माण हो रहा है, उसको हटा दे । यह है मदद की बात ।

### 3 P.M.

दूसरी पाकिस्तान की बात यह है कि जो पिछले डिबेट में कहा गया था कि भारत पाकिस्तान में एक मित्रता का डेलीगेशन भेजे, वह अमल में लाया जाय । पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों का एक डेलीगेशन पाकिस्तान की जनता को बता दे कि हमारी उनके प्रति कोई भी बुरी इच्छा नहीं है । हम उनके मित्र हैं और उनसे मित्रता की अपेक्षा कर रहे हैं ।

तीसरी बात यह है कि दोनों देशों के डिफेंस मिनिस्टर इकट्ठे मिल कर, दोनों देशों का प्रतिरक्षा पर होने वाला खर्चा कम कैसे हो जाय, इस बात पर विचार करें । पंडित जी १७ तारीख को विनोबा जी से मिलने जा रहे हैं । मेरी आशा है कि वे उनसे इस बात पर विचार करेंगे ।

भारत ने पुराने जमाने में और अभी भी दुनिया को प्रकाश दिखाया है और मैं यकीन करता हूँ कि सैनिक सरकारों को भी भारत पुनश्च लोकशाही मार्ग बतायेगा । यह एक कायमी वस्तु नहीं है । जब सैनिक सरकारें लोकशाही पद्धति के अनुसार चुनाव करायेगी, तब यह पता मिल जायेगा कि लोग शांति से, मित्रता से और भले ढंग से स्वयं शासित बनने की कोशिश करते हैं । हम भारत के लोग शांतिवादी हैं । हमको गैतम बुद्ध और महात्मा गांधी ने जो रास्ता बताया है वही सही है । अभी मैं थाईलैंड की एक जागतिक बौद्ध कांफ्रेंस में गया था । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी बुद्ध देव का पंचशील का आदर्श अपने आगे रख कर राष्ट्रीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं का सामना कर रहे हैं । पंचशील मनुष्य, समाज और राष्ट्र की शांति और सुख का एकमात्र पथप्रदर्शक है । यह मनुष्य जाति को अत्याचार और संकटों से बचाने वाला है । यह हमें सहयोग, शांति और सहवास का संदेश देता है । जब मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह संदेश थाईलैंड की बौद्ध कांफ्रेंस में बताया, तो वहाँ लोगों को बहुत संतोष हुआ । तो उसी आधार से हम पीड़ित देशों को प्रताप देंगे । इसलिए, सैनिक सरकारों से हमको डरने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । पाकिस्तान में जनरल अयूब खां कितनी भी गर्जना करें, लेकिन वह गर्जना लोकशाही की गर्जना नहीं है, वह डिक्टेटर-

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

शिप की गर्जना है। हमारे पास शक्ति है, लेकिन हम प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नेहरू जी के नेतृत्व में पंचशील के आधार पर काम करना चाहते हैं। इसीलिए हम पाकिस्तान के लोगों को ऐसी धमकियाँ देना नहीं चाहते हैं। हम उनके साथ प्रेम से रहना चाहते हैं। पाकिस्तान एक छोटा देश है और वहाँ मिलिटरी राज्य है। वह हमारे देश की विदेश नीति के खिलाफ काम करता है। यह बहुत खराब और खतरनाक चीज है और इसका जवाब आज नहीं तो कल उसको मिलेगा। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को दुनिया को सपोर्ट और दुनिया की सहायता प्राप्त है। यह हमारे देश का सौभाग्य है कि हमें ऐसा नेता मिला है, जो सब जगह शांति फैलाना चाहता है। जो अन्य देश युद्ध करना चाहते हैं, हमारी पालिसी के खिलाफ जो कुछ विदेशी लोग प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, उनको आज नहीं तो कल शांति से हम जवाब देंगे, इतनी मुझे उम्मीद है।

इसके साथ साथ जब तक हम आपस के भेद और भय नष्ट करके इकट्ठे हो कर सरकार के हाथ नहीं मजबूत करते तब तक हमारा भविष्य खतरे में है। इसलिए मैं इस विदेश नीति की प्रशंसा करता हूँ और पंचशील को इस सारी नीति का पहिया मानता हूँ। पाकिस्तान के सैनिक राज्य की पूर्णराष्ट्रता भारत में होना असंभव है, फिर भी हमको जागरूक रहना चाहिये। इसलिए देश में लोगों को जो कुछ प्रश्नों पर अमनोष हो रहा है, उसको नष्ट करना चाहिये और उसके बारे में एक निश्चित स्वरूप का दृष्टिकोण रखना चाहिये। दूसरे मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस देश में जो छोटे छोटे सवाल हैं, जैसे काश्मीर का प्रश्न है, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के निर्माण का प्रश्न है, मंसूर और बम्बई की सीमा का प्रश्न

है, गोआ का प्रश्न है, अनाज का प्रश्न है, उनको जल्दी से जल्दी मिटाने के लिए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कोशिश करेंगे। जो हमको तकलीफ है, जो हमको दुख है, उसके बारे में निश्चित दृष्टिकोण रखना चाहिए, वह सब हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर के दृष्टिकोण में है, लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हमारी तकलीफों को जल्दी से जल्दी दूर किया जाय।

अन्त में जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर की पंचशील की पालिसी है, उसका समर्थन करके मैं अपना भाषण खत्म करता हूँ।

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the Prime Minister in conveying my respectful good wishes to the President on tour. But, Sir, I would like to bring to your notice rather a disturbing news that has appeared in today's Press. I find, Sir, that the Government of India has done a great wrong in advising the President to address a closed session of all Indonesian Army Commanders at Bandung. The report goes on to say that the venue of the conference was changed from Djakarta to Bandung in order to enable Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who is touring the country, to deliver his warning to these Army Commanders. Sir, I do not think it is right for our Head of State to interfere and meddle with the internal affairs of any other country. I could concede, Sir, the Prime Minister associating himself with such conferences...

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I say a few words? I know nothing about this matter. I do not know what has appeared in the Press. Government certainly has not advised the President to do this, and I am reluctant to believe that the President is going to do this.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: It is very correct that the hon. Prime

Minister has clarified the position. But my information is based on today's paper "Hindustan times." This is what has appeared at page 6.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : What appears in the papers is not always correct.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Well, Sir, we are supposed to know only from the Press and from nowhere else. I can pass it on to the Prime Minister who can satisfy himself about what has appeared in the Press, and I am glad that he has not advised the President to do so. But this is what the report says that he has addressed such a conference of military personnel.

Sir, it is very correct that the Prime Minister has drawn our attention to the emergence . . .

DIWAN CHAM AN LALL: Sir, may I interrupt? According to the report that he has given me, the warning was given by Dr. Soekarno.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: You please read the whole report. I cannot waste the time of the House by reading it. You can read it and see.

Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the holding of the All African People's Conference at Accra, which is of great significance. Sir, this Conference marks the beginning of an epoch. As I feel, this has laid the seeds of a Pan-African Commonwealth of free and independent States of Africa.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

We rejoice that the African people have met in this Conference, have deliberated and have chalked out a programme for ridding Africa of foreign domination. It has been reported that in this Conference, there was a debate on the efficacy of the non-violent methods and movements to achieve the political independence of a country. The discussions as re-

ported are reminiscent of our own discussions in this country on the utility and effectiveness of non-violent struggle to achieve our own independence. But it is stated that the Conference demonstrated a lack of understanding of Satyagraha and even amongst some African leaders who have used it as a kind of civil disobedience, non-violence here has frequently been equated with inaction and non-resistance. Sir, we all know that Satyagraha is just the opposite of it. Satyagraha is a weapon wielded by the strong and not by the weak. We have had some experience about this. Now, I feel that Africa would do well to enlarge this concept of non-violent struggle as a means of achieving political independence.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: We should have sent a team of experts from here.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir, I was rather amazed that the Prime Minister spoke rather differently about this Conference— about this African People's Conference.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I said a lot in praise of it. I am sorry my words have not been understood.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Sir, I appreciate that the Prime Minister is full of praise for this Conference and his sympathies are with the African people. I appreciate that. But he has stated also in the other House that India is not very vitally concerned with it. I think India is vitally concerned with the happiness of the African people.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is a pure African Conference to which India has not been invited and therefore, India cannot push itself in. No country has been invited except African countries.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I agree that India has not

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] been invited. But was it not possible to send some of our observers there?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is neither possible nor desirable. We do not push in ourselves where we are not wanted. No country has sent them.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a People's Conference.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I know.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We have got our representatives in Accra to report to us. We have got our Mission in Accra.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I am sure the Prime Minister must have kept himself informed of the Conference. But as far as my information goes, there were some observers from other countries to this Conference. This is what at least the Press reports say.

Sir, the whole difficulty is this that in India, we get always second-hand news. We have not got our independent news agencies through which we could get more objective news about other countries. The Prime Minister is, of course, in a better position because he is getting news directly from our own Missions abroad. But will it not be in the fitness of things, that the Prime Minister shares at least with Members of Parliament all these objective news and information that he receives? We get all kinds of reports and intelligence from every Ministry barring the Ministry of External Affairs. We get all this news from foreign commentators or news agencies whose vision is coloured. We do not get objective news, which places us rather in a difficult situation to have a correct appraisal of the happenings in the world.

I am very happy that India has played its part in helping the Algerians to achieve their independence.

And I am happy also to note the way in which the Prime Minister spoke today about the Algerian question. But I fail to understand, in view of our sympathies for the Algerians and their cause to achieve independence, why the Government of India has not recognised the Provisional Government of Algeria. Sir, I am told that since 1956, the Algerian Army of Liberation has been holding two-thirds of the territory of Algeria and controlling it. I am also told that the Provisional Government has approached the Government of India for recognition. It is a known fact that many sovereign States in the World have recognised the Algerian Government. I think the Government of India will help the cause of the Algerians to regain power and to eradicate the entire influence of France from Algeria if this Provisional Government is recognised.

Sir, I would like to congratulate the United Nations on the decision that they have taken to hold a special Assembly of the United Nations in February, 1959, to consider the African question and I am looking forward that many countries in Africa will gain independence as a result of the deliberations of the 13th Session of the United Nations.

Sir, I would like to ask the Prime Minister what progress has been made about the implementation of the resolutions of the Bandung Conference. I feel that the Government of India should develop an Afro-Asian mentality. And it is important that the Afro-Asian group of nations should co-operate together in the economic field. There is much that could be achieved by such a co-operation for mutual benefit, and to raise the standard of living of the people in this area. Sir, we could evolve some pattern of co-operation like the Colombo Plan. Then, Sir, we should also investigate the possibility of creating a common market for this Afro-Asian region. Sir, we know that there are certain other trading arran-

gements like the one I am proposing, | in the Commonwealth trading area, In the continent of the two Americas, in the U.S.S.R. and eastern Europe and now, the prospects for a common European market are being ex-plored. I wish that some such market for this region were investigated into. I am glad, Sir, that a beginning has been made at the trade and commercial' level by | holding an Afro-Asian economic conference at Cairo. Sir, an extension of this at the Government level, in my opinion, may result in good.

Sir, now coming nearer home, I would like to draw the attention of | the Prime Minister to the border disputes on the borders of East Pakistan with those of West Bengal and Assam areas. Sir, the Prime Minister himself has referred to this question this morning and has also referred to the speeches and other utterances of the President of Pakistan in this connection. Sir, the President of Pakistan regards these border disputes as pinpricks, which will not serve any purpose and he goes on to say, Sir, there are certain limits to such incidents and 'we' shall see that they do not go beyond these limits.

Sir, I feel that these border disputes are being kept up with a set purpose, to divert public opinion of Pakistan to these external events. Sir, now that the ordinary checks and balances of a parliamentary Government functioning in Pakistan are removed and everything now depends upon the mood of one man, it is dangerous to adopt a complacent attitude towards these incidents—there may be a flare-up at any moment . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: India Of which is not afraid.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Quite right: India may not be afraid but what I feel, because of this imminent danger, on the other side of the border, is that the Indian army should be kept in a state of alert-

ness so that there is no surprise attack on India anywhere.

Sir, referring to the border disputes I would like to point out that my esteemed friend, Mr? Bose, who comes from these border areas put a question to the Government some time ago— before the Nehru-Noon Agreement-regarding the position of Tukergram, and Government replied that Tukergram was part of Indian territory and there was no dispute about it. He put another question after conclusion of this Nehru-Noon Agreement, and he was told that this area of Tukergram was a disputed territory.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): This was clarified later on in a statement.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Well, I would like the Deputy Minister to correct whatever statement . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The statement was corrected and placed on the Table of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has already been corrected. This is what she has been saying. It was corrected and placed on the Table.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Whatever it be, the point remains that the border disputes | should bfe sternly dealt with. It is the responsibility of any Government to protect its nationals whether outside the border or inside the border from aggression from abroad. That is the primary and preliminary duty of any Government, and when aggression is rampant against our national? on the border areas, Government cannot adopt a complacent attitude and an attitude of helplessness. Sir, I would like that this approach of helplessness of the Government of India should come to an end as early as possible and full protection must be given to all our nationals living ori the borders. Thank you, Sir.



SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I should like to say that the broad lines of our foreign policy have the support of the entire country. It is a policy which, as the Prime Minister said the other day in a memorable address to the Convocation of the Delhi University, both our traditions as a peace-loving country and our enlightened self interest dictate.

We have no history of animosity or ! controversy with either of the two great giants and it is common sense that it is in our interest and for that matter of the world, to be friendly with both these powers. We have to traverse centuries in years. We have to make up for lost time. Our people are hungry, ill-fed, badly clothed, badly housed. They need food, shelter and employment. We want a sane world, and that is why we are insistent on peace. We were ourselves at one time the victims of a colonial power. Our sympathy naturally goes out to the poor and the oppressed in all lands. We are in favour of an enlargement of freedom everywhere. It is heartening to find therefore that the U.N. Resolution on Algeria though defeated, was defeated only by one vote; it failed to secure a two-thirds majority by only one vote. The voting shows that France's policy is not supported by a majority of the United Nations. General De Gaulle's task, ■ hard as it was when he came to power, has been made more difficult by the j rightist victory in France. The way he deals with the Algerian problem will be a test of his greatness as the leader of the French people. I do hope he will have the wisdom and the strength to deal with that problem in the right way. That right way is the recognition of Algerian personality; that right way is the recognition of the right of the Algerian people to determine their destiny. The fact that there is a French minority in Algeria cannot be adduced for denying the Algerian people the right

of self-determination. This Algerian war has been a horrible affair. France is a great nation. She made great sacrifices for human freedom at one time of Tiistory. She has shown vision in her attitude towards Guinea. I hope that wisdom will dawn upon Gen. De Gaulle and he will have the strength and the courage to do the right thing by the Algerian people.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have watched with great concern certain recent developments on the South Asian frontier. We have had Thailand, Iran, Pakistan, Iraq and also Burma in a way going the military way. Now, Sir, in Iraq, the revolution had some ideological background. The military leaders there were able to get rid of a bad regime. We are not very much interested in the other countries, but we have some interest in what happens in Pakistan, because it is our immediate neighbour. And I do not accept the view that this military *coup* in Pakistan was due to the failure of democracy in that country. In fact, democracy had never had any chance in that country. During her independence period of 11 or 12 years there had been no general election at all. And only when the election day was coming near President Mirza discovered that there was nepotism, corruption, blackmarketing and profiteering. The election was to be held in April, and only a few months before that, it was decided that Pakistan should have a military revolution. Of course, it is for Pakistan to determine any Constitution that it likes for itself. We have no desire to interfere with its right to do so. But I think some legitimate inference can be drawn from the way this revolution has taken place. President Mirza and President Ayub Khan, who has now replaced President Mirza, were afraid of facing the Pakistani people at a general election. Maulana Bhasani and Mr. Syed were described as very dangerous men by President Mirza and President Ayub Khan because they felt that possibly the

people of Pakistan or of certain parts in Pakistan were behind them. Well, it is a strange commentary on the character of the Commonwealth that we have today a military State as one of the members of the Commonwealth. The dictatorship in Pakistan is not a party dictatorship. It is worse than the dictatorship of Mussolini and Hitler. Mussolini and Hitler came into power by other methods and they had at least some organised parties behind them. Gen. Ayub Khan has no organised political party behind him, and yet it is strange that some papers describe this military coup in Pakistan as a coup which holds out a new hope for Pakistan. I read an article, the other day, by Prof. Rushbrook Williams. It was something like 'Fresh Start in Pakistan'. It was really a nauseating article. And what is that hope? The hope that this revolution holds out is the hope of suppressing liberties of trade unions, of all political parties, of free speech and of free association. Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are having these border raids. I suppose they represent a symptom. They are symptomatic of certain trends in the political life of Pakistan. We have no ill-will against the people of Pakistan. We want the people of Pakistan to be a progressive people. We do not want to impose our own ideology upon Pakistan. But I think we have a certain duty towards the people of Pakistan, or for that matter, of other countries which have dictatorships. And I think our Ministry of Information and Broadcasting should play, in this matter, a positive role. Our All India Radio should, from time to time, correct the impression which the Pakistan Radio creates about our country in that country. It should speak to them frankly about the way in which we look at their affairs, and it should talk to them in a friendly way about their problems and about our problems.

Passing on, Mr. Deputy Chairman, from Pakistan. I would like to say one or two words about Kashmir. I

I have never had any doubts about the righteousness of our stand in regard to Kashmir. But I must say that I have some real concern for civil liberties, and I think the people of Kashmir are as much entitled to civil liberties as we in other parts of the country are. Now, Sir, I do not say that the people of Kashmir are not enjoying civil liberties. That is not my point at all. But we must at least see that justice has not only been done, but it must also appear to have been done. Therefore, Sir, I would say that some gentle persuasion is needed on our part to make the Kashmir Government realise the importance of accepting the jurisdiction of our Election Commission and the full jurisdiction of our Supreme Court in regard to Kashmir matters. I think that in accepting the jurisdiction of our Election Commission and full jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the people of Kashmir will not be in any way, limiting their autonomy.

I would like, before I conclude, to say one word about the European free market and GATT and the recent GATT conference. Between foreign policy and economic policy there is an intimate connection. We don't want a shrinkage of our export markets. The underdeveloped countries of the world may find themselves exploited by this European free market community and it will be a problem for us to maintain our exports at the proper ratio. I therefore hope that in future when we discuss these questions of foreign policy, some attention will be paid to certain trends in international trade. I don't see why we should be completely dependent upon one bloc or the other for our ordinary requirements. We have the whole world to make our purchases from and\* it is not necessary for us to integrate our defence with one bloc or the other. I don't think that we are doing that but we should be careful in this matter. Our policy should be such as to make it clear that we are not in any manner tied to one bloc or the other. As long as the Prime

[Shri P. N. Saprū.] Minister is there, we may be certain that this principle will be borne in mind. It is not the Prime Minister but it is certain trends in the country which makes one a little worried. Thank you.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, a great deal has happened in the world since foreign affairs was last discussed in this House. In several countries military rule has been established and at least in three of them democracy has had to give way to military dictatorship. The countries that I am referring to are Pakistan, Burma, Sudan and Iraq. It is in the first three that dictatorship was substituted for democratic Governments. In Iraq itself although\* the Government was in form democratic, hardly any vestige of democracy existed there and the revolution in Iraq should be held therefore to have been anti-monarchical and anti-feudal. It was anti-monarchical because it was supposed that the Palace was the source of the power enjoyed by Nuri Said and that it was the centre of those intrigues that were carried on from time to time among the various parties. We are concerned more with Pakistan and Burma than with any other country. The remarks that General Ayub Khan made with regard to India the other day have been referred to by the Prime Minister and by some other speakers. I should like to refer only to one remark of his which I think deserves a reply. He accused India of trying to carry on an organised and centrally-controlled campaign against Pakistan. He asserted that it was trying to be made out that the present regime in Pakistan was a naked dictatorship and had therefore lost all rights to be a member of the Commonwealth and so on. It is quite true that the present rulers of Pakistan have said more than once that their rule would only be temporary and that it was their intention, as soon as a new constitution had been framed, to restore democracy. This might

have been said in all good faith but we have to consider this situation in the other countries where military dictatorship has been established and there is a common pattern of policy that has been followed in all these countries. The *coups* were everywhere almost bloodless and the man in the street seemed to be unaffected. Again in all these countries it was said that the change had been made in the former Government in order to stop corruption which was widespread in public life, and a proclamation was issued, outlining the policy and programme of the new Government.

Lastly, everywhere with the exception of Burma, political parties were dissolved and the constitution abrogated. We accept the argument of Pakistan. We must accept the arguments of all the other countries and believe that democracy would be restored in all of them very soon. But the situation is such that even those who are the dictators of these countries can hardly find it possible after what they have done to restore the old form of Government. In Egypt too it was said that parliamentary rule would be restored after a new constitution had been framed. Elections were held and parliamentary rule was restored in form but I don't think that we can call the Government of Egypt a democratic Government. If the same kind of thing happens in Pakistan and in other countries we cannot possibly regard the Governments as really democratic. Again General Ayub Khan, the new President of Pakistan, may suspect the motives of India but India has never tried so far to push her out of the Commonwealth. An opinion was expressed with regard to the character of the Commonwealth by Mr. Gaitskell in an article on the New Commonwealth in the "Socialist Commentary" of March 1958 which deserves to be read carefully by General Ayub Khan. Discussing the position of the Commonwealth and the reasons why the various countries

that were in the Commonwealth continued to work together, he said:

"In general one can hardly doubt the attachment in all Commonwealth countries to the practice of parliamentary democracy . . . This is not to say that there will just-be one single pattern. It is for the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa to evolve their own forms of democracy. But if in any Commonwealth country there were to emerge a ruthless dictatorship, a police State based on terror or a monolithic single party, it is hard to see how this could be reconciled with genuine membership in the Commonwealth."

It is clear, Sir, from the opinions that have been expressed in England and elsewhere, with regard to the change in the form of government in Pakistan, that Pakistan will continue, for the present at least to be a member of the Commonwealth. But if military dictatorship continues there for any length of time, hardly anyone can doubt that a problem will be posed for the Commonwealth.

Just one word more, Sir, about Pakistan before I refer to Burma. It is reported that Gen. Ayub Khan told pressmen the other day that it was not for him to tell the people of India what form of government they should have and that they were intelligent enough to understand where their interests lay. Well, there are many things in India that have to be corrected, many things that give rise to anxiety. But there are, I think, two differences between India and Pakistan which Gen. Ayub Khan seems to have lost sight of. While in Pakistan political parties were hardly in touch with the masses, most of the parties in India, practically every party here which enjoys any esteem among the people is directly in touch with the masses and is trying to increase its contact with the common man so that it might be able to voice the needs and aspirations of the people and thus be

'35 USD.-6.

identified with them. Again, while in Pakistan there was hardly an economic policy worth the name, a policy whose object was to raise the standard of life of the people, in India serious efforts are being made to make the life of the common man easier by developing the economic resources of the country, and by providing him with all those opportunities that preserve one's self-respect and dignity, and as long as we continue to tread this path, whatever other dangers may beset us, I think it can hardly be said that we run the risk of having to follow in the footsteps of Pakistan.

Now, I should like to say a word about Burma, because that is just as near a neighbour of ours as Pakistan. The Prime Minister, I believe, said to pressmen soon after the transfer of power by U Nu of Burma to Gen. U Win, the Commander-in-Chief of the Burmese Army, that the transfer of power from civil to military hands was a voluntary one. In form it was so. But when we consider the fact that the transfer was made in order that the internal peace might be secure, and that free and fair elections might be held, it seems that the civil authority was compelled to abdicate by the circumstances, being unable to maintain law and order which is the primary duty of any government and had transferred power into military hands. It is true again that the Commander-in-Chief in Burma whom every political party in Burma or rather the two principal political parties in Burma and the masses in general have great faith in, has said repeatedly that he does not want to keep power long in his hands and that he means to hold elections within six months. But who can prophesy? Can even Gen. U Win prophesy at the present time that peace and order will be fully restored in Burma, say, by the end of March, 1959? Again, Sir, it is a significant fact that while U Nu when transferring power to Gen. U Win said that his task would be to hold free and fair elections, to secure internal peace, Gen. U Win in

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] his pronouncements has always referred first to the establishment of internal security and mentioned the necessity for holding free and fair elections only after that. Moreover, Sir, I understand it is recognised in Burma by all political parties that the future of democracy there is bound up with the success or failure of Gen. U Win.- It seems to me, therefore, that the internal circumstances in Burma were such as to compel its civil rulers to come to the conclusion that it would be better for them and for the country that military rule should be established than that democratic government as it was known till the time of transfer should be continued. They may well have hoped that the transfer would prove to be only temporary. But in the present circumstances, hardly anyone can say how things will shape themselves and when free democratic parliamentary government would function again in Burma. We wish Burma well. We want parliamentary government to be restored there and we hope that Gen. U Win will be fully successful. But we have to be vigilant and we should realise that what is happening in a neighbouring country may not, in the end, prove to be in our interest, that we cannot really separate ourselves from our neighbours, however efficient and honest our Government might be.

4 P.M.

Now, Sir, I should like to refer for a moment to those wider considerations on which the peace of the world depends. The Prime Minister has referred to the two conferences that are being held at Geneva for the temporary, cessation of nuclear tests and the prevention of surprise attacks. We are glad to learn that agreement has been reached on three articles in the Conference concerned with the suspension of nuclear tests. The object of these conferences was to relieve tension and to remove the fear of war from the minds of men but at the very time when at least one

, conference was at work and there was some hope that its work might be crowned with success, the Berlin question was raised. Now, if the object at least was to prevent tension from growing, how is it that the Berlin question was raised at this very time? Four powers are concerned in its-future. I can well understand the deep interest of Russia in the permanent settlement of the position of Berlin. West Berlin is inside Communist territory and again, its economic and political systems are in sharp contrast with the systems prevailing in the Communist controlled sector of Berlin. The contrast is so great that during the last few years, two-million Germans have left East Berlin for West Berlin, that is, the sectors controlled by the democratic powers, and even now the drift westwards continues. Every week, I understand, about 4,000 people migrate from East to West Berlin.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There would be nothing left there.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It has taken, place; that means, a little over two million people have left East Berlin up to now. What is more serious, Sir, is that I understand that it is the skilled workers of all kinds and professional men who are leaving East Berlin. Now, such a position cannot but cause anxiety to Russia, but we have to settle it in such a way that the peace of the world may not be disturbed. Just as the question of nuclear warfare and disarmament can be settled only when the countries most concerned with these questions feel assured that any agreement would not alter the present balance of power, it must also be realised that hardly any change can be made in the status of Berlin unless the alteration is brought about in such a way as not to disturb the present equilibrium or the balance of power if one prefers to call it. I should, therefore, like to know, if Government has any information about it, as to what the causes are that have impelled the Russian Government to raise the Berlin question at this time when it should be-

the desire of all of us to see that the conferences concerned with disarmament and the suspension of nuclear tests should achieve full success.

Sir, if you will allow me. I will just refer to one more question before I sit down and that is this. The only suitable solution in regard to Germany seems to be either unification of both the Germanys or at least a federation or confederation so that they might continue to work together. We cannot achieve stability in Germany and thus establish peace in Europe at least on a secure basis unless the German question is satisfactorily settled.

Now, the last question to which I want to refer is the question of Africa. We have had three conferences in Africa. A conference was held some months ago in Accra which was attended by the representatives of the Governments of the Free African States. The present conference is being attended, if I may say so, by the non-official representatives of the whole of Africa; the representatives of all political parties and trade unions have been invited. There was another conference, Sir, which either preceded or followed the first Accra conference which concerned the States of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco and questions relating to the formation of the federation of these three States, popularly known as the Maghreb, were discussed at this conference. The Algerian representatives were really the representatives of the National Liberation Front and although the federation had been in the air for some time, I think it was for the first time that an agreement was arrived at at this conference by the representatives of these three countries with regard to the desirability of establishing a federation as soon as Algeria became free. Now Sir, the most important fact about the recent developments in Africa is that in the first Accra conference it was shown that no political barriers divided the Negro Africa from Muslim Africa. It was generally thought that there

was a great deal of difference between Mediterranean Africa and Africa south of the Sahara but the **first** African conference had made it absolutely clear that instead of there being any political barriers between the North and the South, their interests were common in many respects and that in certain respects there was more agreement between certain Negro States and certain Arab States than between the Arab States themselves or between the Negro States themselves. I hope, Sir, that now that Ghana has assumed the leadership of the Negro people, when Nigeria becomes free, as it will in 1960, the position of the Negro States will become even stronger though there may be rivalry for leadership between Ghana and Nigeria. If the two countries work together for the common advantage of the African continent, I have no doubt that they will be able to exert a great deal of pressure on the colonial powers to do justice to the African people. If a federation is achieved—it is desirable in theory but it may not be so well practicable—the pressure on East Africa, Central and South Africa and even on French West Africa will be such that the colonial powers will hardly be able to resist it. I cannot speak with any confidence about what will happen in South Africa, but as regards the British Government one can say that it should take note of the feeling that is developing all over Africa and try to develop East Africa in such a way as to create contentment in the African community there. Again, it is its responsibility to see that the Central African Federation which has been established by it and which has given place to a great deal of power in the hands of the Europeans is not allowed to gain such an accession of power as to be able to treat its African population in the same way as South Africa does at the present time. What is happening today in Africa shows that Africa is the coming continent. And if the present day events are to be a warning to the imperialist powers, they ought to conduct the affairs of their colonies in Africa in such a way from

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] now onwards that it may be in their own interest and in the interests of the whole continent that the people of Africa may gain freedom in such a way as to develop, as to be a source of benefit to their own people and to the whole world.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the last great war created many problems, some of them insoluble and some of them soluble. And one of the soluble problems was, to my mind, that the Asiatic countries won their independence. Out of evil cometh good. The war resulted in great havoc, a great deal of calamity and distress to the world, but Asia and the Asiatic countries became free. The problems of Asia itself have begun since then, after the achievement of freedom. We have been talking in the House of a relapse to military rule, of a retreat, going back from democracy. I consider this not a correct reading of the situation. There has been no retreat from democracy, because there was no democracy. There has been no democracy. In most of these States, there were feudal rules which obstructed any change, any advance. These have been replaced and for the good. In other States there was the situation of law and order and the State breaking up. Possibly that was the situation in Pakistan; possibly that was also the situation in Burma. They had to hold together and to hold together they had to bring in military rule. There has been no retreat, to my mind, of democracy there. But there is a great demand for economic development. There is an urge for rapid economic development. To my mind, if countries like Egypt, Iraq and Syria, resorted to military rule, it had the support of the people, because the people believe that only by such rule can there be rapid economic development. Here is a great warning to India.

I have heard of references to Kashmir, that in Kashmir also perhaps

there is a retreat of democracy. I believe that Kashmir may be having democracy a shade lighter, weaker than we have; and I do not think that our shade is very strong or deep either. But I do believe that Kashmir has made rapid economic development as very few Suites in India have made. I would go even so far as to say that Kashmir has a kind of economic democracy—and I use the words 'economic democracy' deliberately—which we have not achieved in India. I mean that in the villages they have panchayats. They have co-operative societies; they have schools, well integrated in such a way that, I think, no other State has got them in India. It is economic democracy of a kind of which at least I am proud. It is possible that it may make hereafter an advance to a democracy which may be a shade deeper than our own democracy. After all, do not forget it, the other day there was the Dogra Maharaja, followed by another Maharaja, Raja Abdullah, and now by Bakshi. It is, I think, good enough and we should be satisfied with the change and improvement . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: There is economic democracy but there is no political democracy there.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I am saying that from economic democracy may arise political democracy. In some of these countries . . .

*(Interruption.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Malkani, your time is limited. Please go on.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: No interruptions; and I am not very controversial either. Here comes, to my mind, the challenge to India. If in India our economic development is not fast enough, if the pace is slow—today the pace\* is slow—we would have the parallel of military rule, or if not military rule, bureaucratic rule. And I personally think the danger in India would be bureaucratic rule, not the

military rule, and the danger is there. It is not that Pakistan is a peril to us. Our economic development is a peril to us, if it is not fast enough.

But the real peril to democracy is not in India, it is not in Asia. It is in Europe. It is in Europe that democracy is on the retreat. There is a hasty retreat. It is in France that democracy is in debacle. It is in a morass. And France was the leader of enlightenment, of democracy. It taught us all about democracy and today France almost is fascist, is almost imperialist, and France is not only a problem for us, but problem for Europe and problem for the world for the matter of that. It is France that has retreated from democracy. May I say, in all humility, that it is also America? I remember how America's reputation was at its peak in 1945 when we were fighting for our own independence. The Americans who were in India used to be very friendly, very nice to us, very good to us, very helpful to us. They wanted everybody to be free. To all colonial people America was at that time a great defender, a great protector, holding aloft the torch of democracy. And what is happening to America? Where is America now after the lapse of about ten years? It may be very strong so far as its army is concerned, its navy is concerned. Its army and navy and so-called bombs are always on show everywhere. Today in Quemoy, tomorrow in the Indian Ocean, the third day in the Mediterranean, the fourth day somewhere else. It is parading all over the world. Its military force is obvious, but nothing else. Where is its moral prestige, and where is the free world? One would think that its maxim was peace with all princes and war against all people. I could give you a number of instances roundabout east and west where all the princes, all the feudal rulers look up to America and all the democracies have to sit quiet. As a matter of fact, America helps those people more who shout about communism. The more a country can say, 'I am afraid of communism', the more help it gives to that country. To my

mmd, America must revise its own policy, must get outside the cold war mould. It is a congealed cold war ! mould. Russia has retraced its steps. It does not make a show of force, but builds it up quietly and firmly. And today perhaps its force is not inferior to that of America. Russia has retraced its steps since the death of Stalin. Today it believes in the rouble, diplomacy. Today it believes in economic and other political activities. It does not believe in military force alone. It is only America which believes in that.

Sir, there is another thing to which I wish to draw your attention. Just as there has been the resurgence of Asia for Asiatic countries, there is the great awakening in Africa. I personally feel that this is the greatest event of the century or perhaps of the half century or the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the awakening of Africa. Even the greatest countries of the world have got to take note of this great awakening.

Sir, we have all been talking just now of the People's Conference there, of the Conference of States also there, but the tone of the Conference is firm and strong and confident and as that tone is carried to us, and there is a throb in our heart that something great is happening in Africa. Just as in Asia, Sir, Nasser became a kind of a symbol, so here we have got Nkrumah becoming a great symbol for the freedom of Africa. Just as there was a slogan in Asia "Advance Asia", so there is a slogan there in Africa "Free Africa". They have created a fund for freedom. They have created an organisation for freedom. They have a Freedom Day, just as we have got an Independence Day. I think they celebrate it on the 15th of April every year. They have a regular secretariat, as we used to have a congress secretariat in those good old days. Just as in 1947 we had an Asian Conference called by our Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, followed later on by the official Bandung Conference in 1955, today on the same lines I feel that Nkrumah has called a similar African Conference. (*Time*)



[Shri N. R. Malkani.] bell rings.) . . .  
Sir, I want at least fifteen minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please close at 4.25.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I have hardly spoken for eight minutes. I want only fifteen minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have got to give a chance to fifteen more speakers. Please close at 4.25.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, how can I do it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: i am sorry I cannot help it.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Just as you please, Sir. It is not my fault. I gave my name six days back. I thought I would be called much earlier.

Sir, I was saying that just as a conference was called in Asia by our Prime Minister, followed later on by the Bandung Conference on an official basis, similarly we find in Africa a movement for a People's Conference called by Nkrumah. I am sure it will be followed soon after by an official conference of the representatives of the States in Africa.

Sir, the question now is, what can we do? What is the part that we are expected to play? To my mind we too can play our part in the freedom struggle of Africa. There are two issues which have been raised in Africa, and both issues are a challenge to us. There is an issue whether the Africans should fight for their human rights as human beings or whether they should fight literally against racialism. Shall they stand as human beings and say "we must receive equal treatment from the world", or shall they fight racialism as it is so rampant there in Africa? There is another challenge, and that is whether they win in human rights or whether they abolish racialism, shall they fight it by violent means or

shall they fight it by non-violent means? It appears to me today that the movement is at a stage where they wish to fight for human rights in which all of us can join, all of us can help and give support. It is quite likely that we may not help them or even if we help, they may feel that the help is not enough, and they may fight racialism in a very bitter manner and hatreds may be released as they have never before been released on the face of the globe. It is possible that the challenge may be to the world, but the challenge to India also stands. Is India able to take up that challenge? Is India able to give a trial; give help, give guidance, send some friends from India there to see that Africa also leads the struggle in the same way in which we led the struggle of non-violence and achieve its great independence by methods and measures which we adopted in India? To my mind it is a great challenge, and for India it is a great opportunity. It is up to us to rise to that great opportunity.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I share the feelings of the Prime Minister and agree with him with regard to the references he made about the Africans and their struggle for independence. But I do sincerely hope that the Africans' struggle for their independence will not be like the struggle of our country, will not be for the kind of independence which we are enjoying today. I wish the Africans, all success and prosperity and I hope they will come of their own and will, in all glory, carry on a campaign for their economic betterment, in the best interests of themselves.

Now, Sir, coming nearer home, we are talking about the aggression of Pakistan, and various speeches and pronouncements are made by the authorities of our Government, excluding our Prime Minister, that the border incidents are a prelude to something more. But the Prime Minister will not say so. He has used words like "petty pinpricks", "little aggression", "some cause for anxiety",

and so on and so forth, regarding the incidents on the eastern border and other areas. And what do these words convey to the people and the nation? I can only imagine that these are warnings given to the Indian nation that we must be prepared for a war. There is every likelihood of Pakistan crossing into our territory and declaring a war. How are we to meet that challenge is a problem which baffles the present statesmen. But the difficulty with regard to ourselves is that we are suffering under a hallucination, a feeling that the Pakistanis will not invade our country. If that were so, these prinpricks need not have come. There is a possibility of living in amity and peace. But that possibility is not there. Why? The C<sup>5</sup> is there—C into C into C. that is, •Cashmere, Canal Waters and Corridor to East Pakistan. When these things are taken into account you will understand the trouble underlying the fight of Pakistan. But that is not the trouble here. The trouble in this country is that India, that is Bharat, got divided between the Americans and the British. The Americans took charge of Pakistan and started equipping the Pakistan Army with the most modern weapons, and the British occupied India, nominally controlled by the Congress party, is still having the old junks left out and cast away out of the previous war with the military for our defence. How is it possible to defend this country in the face of such a threat? You may have an army numerically three times that of theirs, but that number will not count. If something has to be done, we have got to have weapons. You may be Gandhiji's followers, you may be peaceful and non-violent. Your weapons are used for offensive purposes when Indians start agitating for something. But against the Pakistanis these weapons will not help. They are equipped with the most modern weapons, and whenever border incidents are taking place either in Bengal or in Assam or in East Punjab, when they once come into our territory and squat there, your army is unable to chuck them out. I want to know why? The reason is, our boys

are not cowardly, though Mr. Morarji Desai made a reference about our being weak. We are not weak. We are very strong. We have got enough capacity to resist aggression. But without weapons what can we do?

I am reminded of an old story that, when the Moghul hordes invaded Maharashtra, the poor Baji Rao II, who was then the Minister there, said: "Look, the Muslim hordes have come. The Muslims have invaded our country. What shall we do?" When he was asked by the commander of the military forces about the course of action Baji Rao said "*pede se maro*; what does that matter?" He has understood only milk and plenty as flowing in the country. Baji Rao said that. "Peda" means a stuff made out of milk and sugar.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your authority?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: My authority is history. Our Dr. Barlingay is here, and he will corroborate me. Therefore, those who have studied history will understand the implications of a statement of that nature. The result was, the Muslim hordes got into Maharashtra and occupied it for 150 years. In the same way, my difficulty and my problem will be . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should be more serious, Mr. Rajah.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It is all historical facts which cannot be controverted by anybody.

i  
In the same way, my problem is to defend my country. If this country is to grow up economically and politically, I should be strong. How can I be strong? That is the problem that agitates me. You may be a weak nation; you may be having power; you may have three times the army which the Pakistanis are having. But one man is enough to destroy ten people if those ten people are not properly armed. Therefore, my advice to the Government will be, see a little bit of reason. Do not waste

[Shri H. D. Rajah.] away two hundred crores to the British people. They have been looting this country for two hundred years. Now you have been buying junks from them. Instead of that, utilise part of that money in equipping our army. Wherever you get the most modern weapons of warfare, buy them and have the borders—both eastern and western—well protected. That is enough for me. You need not equip your army all over India. When once you protect the borders—both, east and west—the internal security is a matter for ourselves and we shall take care of it ourselves. I do not want these hordes to come and talk about a corridor or talk about coming into this country and settling their disputes by force of arms.

There is some meaning in the talk of Diwan Chaman Lall. He said that there must be a confederation of Pakistan and India. Well, it is a thought that he has given out. But I may ask Diwan Chaman Lall, before that can fructify, what about a federation of ourselves? We must think about decentralising power ourselves and bring about a federation and then talk about a confederation. What has to be done in this country is the main point that we have to take into 'account. Before you talk of a confederation, you must talk of a federation with Indians, with complete autonomy and responsibility to every State coming together and with a joint defence for our purposes. That is the way in which you must progress and do your work.

The declarations of Gen. Ayub Khan were more or less a menacing thing. Now, Prime Minister Nehru categorically says, what is the form of government there? We are not worried. As to what they should do; it is their affair. And see this statement in contrast with what Gen. Ayub Khan has declared yesterday or rather a few days back. What does he say? He says, "The conditions in India are similar to Pakistan and I expect a military dictatorship to come

in India sooner or later." How is he competent to talk about us? He must have had the longue in his cheek, and he must keep quiet. So far, there has been no protest from this Government and what is the fundamental mistake this Government has done with regard to Pakistan? Sir, when Gen. Iskander Mirza suspended the Constitution—he did not suspend it; he abrogated it—that means he kicked the ladder through which he came up. When there is no Constitution in Pakistan, was it proper for this Government to still continue to have diplomatic relations with Pakistan, the moment that concept of a democratic government was given up, when even the pretence of it was given up? It -was something like batches of warriors going from the North-West Frontier with swords and occupying the constituted Government in Afganistan. A military junta which Gen. Iskander Mirza, just to sustain—not even sus-tan . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not use such words. You should not use such words.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: What words? 'Military junta' I said. Sir, let me now make it clear that the word 'junta' is parliamentary. If you give a ruling, I will bow; otherwise, I will not. 'Military junta.' 'J-u-n-t-a.\* When they usurped the functions of the Government and when the Constitution was abrogated, it was—proper and right for our Government to have severed diplomatic connections with Pakistan. But how was it possible? Where is the Commonwealth, a great fascination for our country to get itself attached to? And what is it? The history of the Commonwealth is the history of imperialism, exploitation, loot, plunder and trade monopoly. They are not concerned about the existence of other nations as free and independent nations. They were concerned only with a matter by which this kind of dictatorship came into existence. Do-

you mean to say (that without the active support of the Americans and the Britishers there, this military dictatorship would have come into existence? It is not possible. Therefore, the basic problem for us is the problem of the Commonwealth. If you want to be really following a decent, independent policy, you must get out of this wretched Commonwealth. There is nothing in common there and you still have a vestige of that because you were obliged to them for putting you into power. That concept must go forthwith..

Then, Sir, let us take Ceylon. We are not worried how West Germany misconducts itself or some other people misconduct themselves. In Ceylon, our own nationals are beaten to death. Revolutions take place only in the interests of the local citizens. The Indians there are the legacy of the British indentured labour system. The tea plantations of Ceylon are full of Indians today because the Britishers booked them on an indentured labour basis and their progeny and followers are today in Ceylon. They number about fifteen lakhs, disenfranchised, disinherited, owned by nobody and suffering the worst humiliation there and the perpetual struggle between the local population and these Indians takes place. You are complacent about that. I charge the Government of India with being complacent, not taking charge of a decent percentage of our population who has gone and settled there and whose progeny is suffering. Not only are they suffering. The latest riots killed about 1200 Indians in that country and what steps you took, I do not know. It is your paramount duty as Government to protect the Indian citizens wherever they are. If you cannot do that and call it a 'dynamic neutralism', I must say that you are unfit to govern. I cannot say anything more than that.

Now, I come to Goa. The Prime Minister has forgotten about Goa. He was very active, eloquent about the Government of India's policy. About a hundred of our patriots in the most non-violent way went there and faced

the bullets and died there. There was a hasty retreat of our struggle because you could not do that by force. You are Panchsheel men and Goa, you declare, is part of India and Salazar ignores you just as we ignore a mosquito. Then what happens? Salazar is supreme; Goa is forgotten and it is not part of our Indian territory today and you start opening avenues. Look at the stupid way in which our Government is behaving in regard to the passage to be given to these people and the Hague Court. . .

DR. W. S. BARLING AY (Bombay): Is it parliamentary? Is the word 'stupid' parliamentary?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I am not able to say anything now with regard to ..this. v

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If it is unparliamentary, I will expunge it. You should 'not use such words.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: It is quite parliamentary. I would like you to read the proceedings of the House of ) Commons which are your guide and May's Parliamentary Practice declaring which word is parliamentary and which is unparliamentary. Please go through May's Parliamentary Practice. I know something of these things and I will not use a word without responsibility. Take it from me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is better you do not use such words.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Why 'better'? I agree, but then you can't say it is-unparliamentary.

In the heat of our talk, we forget these things.

Now, that is the position with regard to Goa. We started to fight for freedom. We have ended with a complacent outlook—the *status quo*—with regard to Goa. Well, it is not Goa. The point is the British have got a treaty. .... (Time bell rings). Then,, I need not speak at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minui

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I am obliged for the small mercy.

Now, there is one story which must be known to this House and that is ..apartheid. What about apartheid in this country? Have you ever noticed the British people enjoying the sole privilege of not allowing within one mile of the circumference of their building any one single Indian? Have you seen or read in this country that these people enjoy the privilege of having a swimming club in Bombay and allowing there not a single person born in India? You are talking of *apartheid* in South Africa. Are you not a citizen? Have you got any sovereignty in this country? Can we, allow any foreigner in this country to establish himself in such a privilege? Sir, I am reminded of the China which was under Chiang-Kai-shek and I shall just read these two sentences from Sardar Panikkar's book:

"On the *bund* itself was situated the Shanghai Club, which was reputed to have the longest bar in the world, where at lunch time stream in the great ones of British business. The country clubs, English, French and Italian, with extensive grounds and luxurious apartments in the commercial heart of China, proclaim the importance of the different European communities."

■ They were enjoying extra-territorial privileges including their right to put up boards, 'Chinese and dogs not permitted'.

Today you are in a similar situation in this country and before you talk of foreign affairs and survey the world, you survey your internal hearts and find out whether you have nationality, whether you are nationals and you have selfrespect, to yourself.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I welcome this

opportunity to participate in mis debate. It gives us a chance to review the world situation but more than that, it gives us the chance to express our opinion about the current topic—I shall confine myself only to two or three.

First about the Commonwealth. I am sure we all recall that both in literature concerning the composition and the character of the Commonwealth and also in many of the speeches which are made at the conferences of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, two things have always been stressed, namely, the spiritual unity of the free people—formerly it was allegiance to the Crown, but that has not been made requisite; that is no longer necessary—but the 'parliamentary institutions' is stressed over and over again. It may take one form in one country; it may take another in the other, but I cannot get reconciled to the idea that within the Commonwealth you can have dictatorship whose policies are very repugnant to the whole system of parliamentary democracy which rests upon the rule of law, tolerance, freedom and all the rest that goes with it. Now we may not ask any member at this stage to get out of the Commonwealth; we may not even consider that we should no longer associate with it, but I do submit, Sir, that sooner or later the very basis of this association within the Commonwealth of nations will have to be re-examined and re-examined very carefully. This is just a very passing observation.

Now, Sir, turning to Africa, a great deal has been said about the emergence of free independent African countries, about the significance of the various conferences that have been held in Africa, but I would like to draw the attention of this House to two or three of the very sinister and pernicious tendencies in some section of the western press to undermine these new forces. Originally they tried to discredit Nasser in the eyes of the Arab people because he symbolized Arab unity. They did not

succeed. I notice in the press reports today that references have been made to the Accra Conference as counteracting forces against the Afro-Asian conference that was held last year in Cairo. I say it is a deliberately mischievous move because, if you read the resolutions of the Cairo Conference, you will find that they are absolutely identical with the resolutions that have recently been passed both by the official Accra conference and the unofficial. Certainly it was made abundantly clear by the speakers that these People's Conference does not have any organic or constitutional link with the Afro-Asian Solidarity Association. That is perfectly true, but they do have a link which I prefer to call a 'common spiritual link'; they all stand for the abolition of imperialism, for the abrogation of racial discrimination, for the freedom of all countries. I therefore suggest, Sir, that we should be on our guard against such attempts. Unfortunately,—I will not say 'deliberately', perhaps unwittingly—certain section of our press and more deplorably, some of our own officials, have even fallen into the habit of looking upon these Afro-Asian Conferences as being dominated by the communists. I speak with some personal knowledge because I have had active association with them—I am not passing any judgment about the merits or demerits of communism—and I can say that never in any of these conferences you find more than five or six per cent, of the delegates \*who are communists, and I think it is paying undue compliment to the communists to say that five per cent, have ever been able to dominate the rest 95 per cent. We should guard ourselves against these tendencies.

One word about Algeria, Sir. I have no doubt that our Ministry of External Affairs and our Prime Minister are fully aware of the problem. They are fully aware of the fact that the African people, and the Algerian people particularly, do expect recognition from this Government. I do not suggest that whenever any national Government emerges on

I another soil, our Government should J rush and immediately recognise it, ' but I do want to convey to this House the feeling of most of the African people—of the few that I met—that they always expect much more from India than from any other country. I am not suggesting that the Algerian National Government should be recognised immediately—and I am sure our Prime Minister is fully aware of the feelings of those people,—but I do want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that so much is expected of us, and if we don't come up to their expectation, the disappointment is naturally and inevitably proportionate. Some of us who go out and participate in these conferences find to our embarrassment that we are usually pushed into places of responsibility and prominence, merely because we come from India; not for any other meritorious personal accomplishments, but because you come from India they think that you might be in a position to give wiser counsel. This is a very great responsibility and I therefore feel that once the pros and cons have been carefully examined, our Government will not hesitate for a moment to accord recognition to the newly formed Government.

One word about the Berlin issue Sir. The Prime Minister has said on many occasions that it is a very complicated issue. There is no doubt about it. But there are people, Sir, who feel that the idea of reunification of Germany under free elections is no longer possible or feasible. Even' a man like Walter Lippman, a very eminent and highly respected columnist in America, who certainly does not have much love for the Russian policy, in his recent article has said that the time has come when we are going to be compelled to be more realistic; we may have to recognise the existence of two Ger-manys, East and West.

I am not suggesting any solution, Sir; nobody knows the solution, but having recently been in German^ 'n both the parts, I came away with the feeling that some of the high officials,

[Dr. Anup Singh.] some of the journalists and professors felt that our Government perhaps did not fully understand and appreciate the patent political reality of the existence of two Germanys. I am not saying whether our Government does or not, but there is the general feeling there. One of them went so far as to say that our Government may have to think that the two Koreas can no longer be united under one free democratically elected Government, that is the case with Viet-Nam and that the case of Germany is the same. I am bringing this point merely to suggest that there is a growing feeling both in America and in some circles in Europe, particularly in Germany, that unless we recognise the existence of two Germanys, no immediate and no enduring solution of the German situation is possible.

I thank you.

**श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय** (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा नाम आखिर में आया, तो भी आपने याद कर लिया इसके लिए धन्यवाद है। आज प्रातःकाल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो भाषण दिया था और अपनी जो नीति बतलाई उसका मैं पूर्ण समर्थन करता हूँ। एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स की मिनिस्ट्री का कर्तव्य जैसा कि होता है कि हर जगह अपने नागरिकों का बाहर के देशों में रक्षा करना, अपने ट्रेड की उन्नति करना या कोई अन्य कल्चरल संबंध स्थापित करना या स्टूडेंट्स वगैरा का आपस में विनिमय करना, तो ये सब कार्य हमारी मिनिस्ट्री करती रहती है और अपने देश की प्रगति और उन्नति के लिए दूसरे देशों में जो कुछ करना आवश्यक होता है वह करती है। इस बारे में हमारे इम्बेसीज, हमारे राजदूतावास दूसरे देशों में हैं और दूसरे डिप्लोमेटिक अधिकारी लोग हैं जो इन कार्यों को देख रहे हैं। मेरा खयाल है कि जैसा कि

हम अपने अन्य महकमों में कुछ किफायत-शारी वगैरा का ध्यान रखने हैं वैसे ही हमारी इस मिनिस्ट्री में भी खुद प्रधान मंत्री जी अपने उन अधिकारियों पर काफी नियंत्रण और किफायत रखने का ध्यान रखते ही होंगे और यह एक दृष्टिकोण भी बहुत जरूरी है जो कि हमारे सामने रहना चाहिये। बहरहाल, हमारी इस मिनिस्ट्री का यह सम्पूर्ण संगठन आज बहुत अच्छे ढंग से काम कर रहा है और उसकी नीतियों के विषय में स देश में पूर्ण संतोष है और इसका मुख्य कारण यह भी है कि स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी जो कि हमारे देश की नीतियों के बहुत कुछ उत्पादक हैं और उनके प्रारम्भ करने वाले हैं। वे ही उसका संचालन कर रहे हैं।

अभी विरोधी पार्टी के नेता श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने कहा था कि हमको ईस्ट जर्मनी, अल्जीरिया वगैरा की गवर्नमेंटों को मान लेना चाहिये, उनको मान्यता प्रदान करनी चाहिये, मेरा खयाल है कि इस मामले में सावधानी की जरूरत है और जिस ढंग से प्रधान मंत्री जी शिथिल और सावधानी बरत रहे हैं वह मुनासिब ही है क्योंकि जैसा अल्जीरिया में, एकदम उस गवर्नमेंट को जो कि अपने देश में नहीं रह रही हैं बल्कि बाहर के देशों में फंक्शन कर रही है। इसी तरह से अन्य नई गवर्नमेंटों को इतनी जल्दी मान्यता नहीं दी जा सकती है। एक बात अवश्य है कि हमारे देश में वैदेशिक नीति के संबंध में सर्वमान्यता है। उसको ज्यादा व्यापक बनाने और राष्ट्रीय आधार पर प्रोत्साहन देने की आवश्यकता है। जैसे कि हम फूड या अनाज के संबंध में तथा दूसरे मामलों में सब पार्टियों का सहयोग लेते हैं, मेरे खयाल से यह बहुत जरूरी है कि भारत

की जो सामान्यता राष्ट्रीय वैदेशिक नीति है जिसके बारे में कोई पार्टी मतभेद नहीं रखती है उसको ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन देना और उसका ज्यादा प्रोपगैंडा और प्रचार होना चाहिये। मेरे खयाल में इस विषय में कोई विशेष योजना बनाई जाय जिससे हमारी जो सर्वमान्य नीतियां हैं उनमें किसी तरह की गलतफहमी न हो। उनके बारे में हम जितना अच्छी तरह से प्रचार करेंगे उतना देश के लिए हितकारी होगा।

अफ्रीका के विषय में आज नेहरू जी ने जो सद्भावनाएं प्रकट की वे बिल्कुल मुनासिब हैं। यह एक नया महादेश है, एक नया महाखंड है जो कि अब बढ़ रहा है और आगे आ रहा है। मेरे खयाल से यह एक बड़ी भारी शक्ति होगी। इसमें खतरा यही है कि यहां पर कुछ ऐसी गवर्नमेंटें हैं जो जातिवाद की नीति पर काली जातियों के खिलाफ अपना रवैया रखती हैं। अगर सफेद जातियों ने इन सफेद गवर्नमेंटों का साथ दिया और जितनी काली जातियां हैं नीग्रोज हैं, उन्होंने अपना संगठन किया और उनमें अगर कहीं कोई वाइलेंस या हिंसा आई तो एक महायुद्ध होने की संभावना है। तो इस विषय में भी हमारे मंत्री जी ने दूसरे राष्ट्रों को जो सलाह दी है—वे अपनी नीतियों को इस तरह से बरतें जो उठते हुए अफ्रीका की इन जातियों के विरुद्ध न पड़ें तो ठीक होगा। इस विषय में यू० एन० ओ० में, जो रिजोल्यूशन पास हुआ है वह बहुत मुनासिब है। यू० एन० ओ० के रिजोल्यूशन में कहा गया है कि साउथ अफ्रीका की सरकार ने जो नीति अस्तित्व की हुई है उसके खिलाफ वह रिजोल्यूशन है, उसे अपनी पालिसी को दुरुस्त करने को कहा गया है।

पाकिस्तान के बारे में हमको सावधान रहने की आवश्यकता है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उनके प्रति बहुत अच्छी सद्भावना व्यक्त की है और साथ ही यह भी आगाह कर दिया है कि हम किसी भी हमले को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे चाहे वह हमला काश्मीर की भूमि पर हो या भारत के किसी हिस्से पर। मेरे खयाल में इस विषय में हमारी सरकार सावधानी बरत ही रही है और यह ठीक भी है। हमले की कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है, सम्भावना नहीं है किन्तु हमको पूरा होशियार रहने की जरूरत है। इस हाउस में अधिकांश सदस्यों ने गवर्नमेंट से यह प्रार्थना की है और सलाह दी है कि हमको होशियार रहने की आवश्यकता है। पाकिस्तान किसी वक्त हमला कर दे क्योंकि वहां पर एक डिक्टेटरशिप है। डिक्टेटरशिप की प्रवृत्ति यह होती है कि अपने राज्य में जब कि वह अपनी समस्याओं को हल नहीं कर पाता है तो कोई न कोई अपनी शक्तियों को बाहर इस्तेमाल करने का जरिया निकाल लेता है। मेरा अपना खयाल है कि हमको इस संबंध में बहुत सावधान रहने की जरूरत है और इस विषय में जो कुछ किया जा सकता है उसको किया जाना चाहिये। इसके अतिरिक्त इस संबंध में और कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता है और न आवश्यकता ही है। पाकिस्तान को अमेरिका जो मदद दे रहा है हम भारतवर्ष के लोग यही अनुभव करते हैं कि जब वे हिन्दुस्तान को भी मदद देते हैं तो पाकिस्तान को फौजी मदद देकर वे दोनों को आपस में लड़ाने का काम करते हैं। ऐसी एक भावना पैदा होती है। इसलिए अमेरिका की गवर्नमेंट को हमें यही कहना चाहिये कि यदि वह सचमुच हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को भलाई चाहता है तो उसको इस तरह की दो तरफा नीति अस्तित्व नहीं करनी चाहिये



[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

कि पाकिस्तान को सैनिक सहायता दी जाय और उसको सैनिक ढंग से तैयार किया जाय। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान का बजट भी बढ़ता जा रहा है। इस तरह की मदद से हिन्दुस्तान के दिल में शंका पैदा होती है। इसलिए अमेरिका हिन्दुस्तान को जो इमदाद दे रहा है वह एक तरह से बेकार हो जाती है। यू० एस० ए० को गवर्नमेंट से इस बारे में अपील करनी चाहिये कि वे इस तरह की नीति अख्तियार न करें ताकि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में कोई विरोध पैदा हो।

बर्लिन के विषय में हमारे अन्य मित्रों ने सदन में काफी रोशनी डाली है और विशेषकर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने काफी कहा है। यह एक ऐसा सवाल है जो कोल्ड वार को भड़का रहा है। यद्यपि दुनिया के दूसरे हिस्सों में जैसे ताइवान कम्युनीय, जॉर्डन है और लेबनान में कुछ शान्ति हुई थी लेकिन श्री क्लुश्चेव ने यह एक नया बर्लिन का शूफा खोल दिया है। जबकि जेनेवा में दुनिया की शान्ति के लिए कांफ्रेंस हो रही है उसी वक्त श्री क्लुश्चेव ने बर्लिन का सवाल उठा दिया। अगर वे बर्लिन के सवाल को कुछ समय बाद उठाते तो शायद उसका दूसरा असर होता। शायद वे यह सोचते हैं कि इससे दुनिया में शान्ति के पक्ष को बल मिलेगा। मगर इसका असर यह होता है कि शान्ति के बजाय अशांति बढ़ती है। अगर वे सचमुच शान्ति के इच्छुक हैं तो उन्हें ऐसे समय बर्लिन के सवाल को नहीं उठाना चाहिये था।

(Time bell rings.)

अभी तो कुछ टाइम है। मैं एक दो बातें और कह दूँ। आपने मुझे आखिर में बोलने का वक्त दिया है।

श्री उपसभापति : पूरा कीजिये।

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : तो मैं इतना कह कर इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

5 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I think we can continue a little more. There are some more speakers. I hope the Prime Minister also would be agreeable to prolonging this debate a little. He can reply tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the House does not insist on the Prime Minister being here, I am prepared to extend by half-an-hour.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : आपने तो मुझे अपना भाषण समाप्त करने के लिए कहा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will sit till 5-30. Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Pakistan and the military dictatorship that has sprung up with all the attendant risks naturally absorbs our attention. World issues like that of Berlin are of concern to us. So it is right and proper that emphasis should have been laid on those issues by the speakers here and from this side of the House, those issues have been dealt with by the Leader of our group.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair]

But to my mind a most pleasant and heartening feature of this debate has been that for the first time Africa and African affairs have figured so much in our debate. The Prime Minister referred to the emergence of the African personality and he laid stress on the significance of this development. After all it is a positive aspect of our foreign policy that freedom, must be increased and enlarged in that part of the world which is largely colonial even today. Now I have, no time to refer to the Accra Con-

ference, the proceedings of this conference, though that conference by itself is a big event because delegates from about 29 countries representing the whole of Africa participated there. I have no time to refer to the discussions there and I have not the time even to refer to the big heroic struggles going on through that continent in almost all territories—in Madagascar, in Uganda, in Tanganyika in Somaliland, in Nigeria and even in the Portuguese territories of Mozambique and the Cameroons—but in the limited time I just want to refer to two or three points which have in a way, created certain misgivings in the minds of these people. After all the Bandung spirit has sprouted and it is up to us to nurse it. Some of these territories especially the Cameroons and Somaliland are Trust territories and our representative is sitting there on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. Specially in regard to some of these problems, I shall specially, refer to the French and British Cameroons, the problem is not only one of independence, it is one of unification and on those points, there is a feeling of disappointment among the people that our representative on the Trusteeship Council is not taking a really positive attitude. What is happening there? We have our experience in Goa. Goa is an integral part of Portugal and under that cover they say that it is their internal affair and the other major powers also accept that position. The position in Africa in regard to dependent territories is— not only in regard to Portuguese possessions but in regard to French Cameroons—that they are declared to be integral parts of the Trust. If it is a trusteeship territory, if the U.N. is responsible for seeing that they are granted self-government and all that, all these issues are raised and naturally, the representatives of the African people look to India for more positive help, for more positive guidance. I am not sure what exactly has happened in the Trusteeship Council but those are issues in which the people of India are also vitally interested because

after all, in that continent, which I have suited many to call 'dark', all these forces of freedom are rising up.

Another point is in regard to the attitude of Indian settlers there. Of course, they are of Indian descent. They are not our nationals. We have no direct control over them and they can have their own attitude in regard to these problems but there is a feeling in regard to people of Indian descent, especially in East Africa and other places that their attitude towards these surging moves, these democratic movements, towards this fight against colonial rule is not quite a happy thing. I am not suggesting that we can do anything direct to have any change of attitude in them but a positive statement from the Prime Minister of India to our people as to how they should identify themselves with those people, the real masters of the country, the native population, will go a long way.

I have no time but I will just refer to Korea. The hon. Prime Minister in his opening speech stated that to be associated with peace has been the great privilege of India and along with this privilege it has cast an obligation also. Conscious of that obligation, when there was struggle there, our Government and the Prime Minister took a positive role and it produced results. Now after 5 years, what do we find? I find that from one part of Korea the Chinese volunteers have withdrawn but the other portion continues to be developed as a war base. After all for the time being it may not be giving trouble but after 5 years or after the armistice, the thing is there. Our Government can take a little more positive attitude in regard to this and some initiative for the unification of these people. After all it was there in the agreement arrived at earlier there. Even in regard to the stalemate in Viet-Nam, millions of people there look to India to break this stalemate. I would like to know what positive approach India brings to bear on these issues. For the time being Korea and Viet-Nam

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.] seem to be forgotten. We can ignore them only at our peril.

One more point in regard to Pondicherry. Reference has been made to *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry to India. Now the position has been aggravated in this way that even the Assembly has been dissolved there. My own information is that under certain forgotten laws, even liberties are crushed. We read in the papers that Special Envoy of De Gaulle visited India and had occasion to meet the Prime Minister. This question of *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry has been hanging fire for so long. It would be good if the Prime Minister could tell us exactly what the position is and if any progress has been made in regard to the transfer of Pondicherry to us, specially now that the internal position there is causing a lot of concern to the people there. I don't want to refer to other points. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : Shah Mohamad Umair. Five minutes.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar): 'Sir, I don't know how to thank you for giving me at least this opportunity of five minutes at the eleventh hour.

The foreign policy of our country is being discussed for the last 10 years -and we are proud to say that the policy which we are discussing today we have had the privilege of discussing, the same policy, without any alteration or change in that policy, for the last 10 years consistently. The great pride and the great beauty of the foreign policy can be explained in a simple way. Other countries who also have got their foreign policies had to make certain alterations ' and changes under certain direct and indirect pressures, sometimes today, sometimes tomorrow or the day after. But the firm strength and beauty of our foreign policy is that it has remained the same for the last ten years and no direct or indirect pressure could bring any change in it.

This foreign policy of ours has got its various aspects. Its many-sided aspects can be briefly described as friendly relations with all the countries in the international field. Its basic background is world peace and friendly relations with all, with Pakistan also, and co-existence with other nations. This has been the background of our foreign policy for the last ten years and this is the policy that we have been following under the great personality and leadership of our Prime Minister.

Many things have been said about it, but since I have only five minutes, it will not be possible for me to speak out all that is in my mind on this subject. But I will tell the House that the military dictatorship in Pakistan has been spoken of in so many words here. I do not understand why this military dictatorship in Pakistan is being referred to so often, for after all, it is not a new thing. Dictatorship of almost some sort has been in Pakistan for the last ten years. May be it was a civil dictatorship and it is now a military dictatorship. There has never been democracy. There has never been any elections there. There has never been any democratic spirit in the Constitution of that country. So why should we speak with some surprise and amazement and say that democracy has disappeared from there? where was democracy there? Democracy did not exist in Pakistan.

At the same time, this dictatorship, this military dictatorship is not something new which is there today. The foundation stone of this military dictatorship, let me tell you, was laid some four years back under the U.S.-Pakistan military alliance. The U.S.-Pakistan military alliance was the real background and that was the planned and organized background for the present military dictatorship that is there today before us, and it was laid some four years back, which was interpreted in terms of military alliance between Pakistan and the U.S.A. Therefore it is something which was contemplated

four years back by many, and it has come into force today in 1958. Sir, let me tell you that I agree with Shri Bhupesh Gupta that we should find out the real clue, the real spirit that is behind all this mischief, all these developments that are taking place in Pakistan and elsewhere. The clue lies somewhere else. It is not in the Pakistani people. They are not in a position, they do not have the capacity to enforce such a tremendous military rule or this military dictatorship overnight. That was not possible. This has been imported from somewhere else. So we must be very cautious, for many other things may come out after this development. They should be checked. We should not be complacent about these things, thinking that we are very strong. What has happened in Pakistan overnight must be watched by many other countries. We should see what were the agencies, the forces and the circumstances which made Pakistan a country with a military dictatorship today. These circumstances, whether they be at a long distance or at a short distance, they are there, and circumstances may create situations and may put us in difficulty. Why should they again and again show their red eyes to India in the name of Kashmir or anything else? It is not the simple words that are uttered, but these words have got tremendous significance and we have to look deep into that significance and see that with what strength behind him Gen. Ayub Khan utters such strong words and shows such angry red eyes to India. These have got some significance which we must find out. I agree with Shri Bhunesh Gupta that we should not forget that we are placed in such circumstances that though we are thinking of friendship and alliances on the one hand with European powers, on the other hand we are daily experiencing lots of difficulties in various ways. Assurances will not help us in the circumstances in which Pakistan is now placed. Pakistan in its madness, in its fury and in its anger or under the dictatorship may be prompted by other foreign powers to do something some

95 RSD.—7.

day for which we may not be fully prepared.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : I do not want to interfere, but will the hon. Member please now bring his remarks to a close? His time is up.

SHRI MOHAMAD UMAIR: Sir, I reached this point only just now. Anyway I am closing my remarks just now. I must tell the House that we must be fully prepared and we must be fully armed and we should be very cautious. We should not be complacently thinking that Pakistan will show some gentleness. Much goodness has been shown to Pakistan. What more gentle attitude and generous attitude could have been shown to Pakistan than what has been already shown by the Prime Minister of India, by giving them all sorts of assurances by showing them all sorts of courtesies, by showing them all sorts of friendly relations, in spite of the difficulties which we have been experiencing? And how has Pakistan responded? Pakistan has responded in the same spirit in which the first makers of Pakistan did. And those makers of Pakistan are still there. There may also be some in India even now. So the attitude and the spirit of Pakistan is the same as it was ten years back when Pakistan was formed. So I say we must be on our guard. We must be seriously on our guard.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : Please bring your remarks to a close.

*(Time bell rings.)*

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: These incidents on the border are the warnings. Let us take them seriously. We speak of Kashmir. In Kashmir also we have to be watchful. Civil liberties should be seriously watched and safeguarded. We should bring it under the jurisdiction of our Supreme Court, and the jurisdiction of the Election Commission should be extended to Kashmir, especially because Pakistan has such military designs.

[Shah Mohamad Umair.]

Our foreign policy is praised because it has not changed. It is the foreign policy which we have followed for the past ten years and this has not been done by many other countries. Let me conclude with the slogan of "Indo-Pak reunion" wherein lies the final solution.

1

**श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) :** उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव हमारे आदरणीय नेता पं० जवाहरलाल जी ने रखा है कि वर्तमान अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति तथा तत्सम्बन्धी भारत सरकार की नीति पर विचार किया जाय यह बहुत ही उपयुक्त है। प्रस्तावक महोदय ने जिस दृष्टि से वह प्रस्ताव रखा उस दृष्टि से तो वह परिपूर्ण है, इसमें शुबहा नहीं लेकिन हाउस की दृष्टि में उसमें कुछ न्यूनता थी, कमी थी और उस न्यूनता को हमारे मि. चमनलाल जी ने पूरा कर दिया। जिस तरह से अब हमारे सामने प्रस्ताव है वह बहुत ही सुन्दर रूप में और बहुत ही अच्छे तरीके पर है। मैं इस प्रस्ताव का हार्दिक स्वागत और समर्थन करता हूँ।

मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यह प्रस्ताव हमारे मौजूदा हालात और समयानुसार जो नीति होती है, उस पर ही आधारित हो यह बात नहीं है बल्कि यह विदेश नीति का प्रस्ताव हमारी प्राचीन, संस्कृति, प्राचीन पद्धति हमारे मूल सिद्धान्त, सबके समर्थन पर आधारित है, और हम जिन प्राचीन सिद्धान्तों के मानने वाले हैं उनके बिलकुल अनुरूप है। अभी हमारे मित्र मिर्जा साहब ने, जो इस समय चले गये हैं, यह प्रश्न किया था—जब कि पार्टेशन का जिक्र आया—कि इसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जो सवाल उन्होंने किया, अगर वे थोड़ा सा विचार करते तो उन्हें अच्छी तरह भासूम हो जाता कि वह जो मुसलिम लीगी

जहनियत हमारे भारतवासियों के दिल में पैदा हुई थी उसका ही नतीजा था। तना ही नहीं उनकी धृणा और नफरत पैदा करने की वह नीति भारत तक ही सीमित नहीं रही, वह उस नीति को अपने साथ पाकिस्तान में भी ले गये जो स्वभाविक ही था और उसका खमियाजा उनको खुद को भुगताना पड़ा। उन्होंने खुद देखा कि वहां किस कार भिन्न भिन्न कई पार्टियां उत्पन्न हो गई वह बेतरह बढ़ी और उनका अस्तित्व बहुत थोड़े दिनों में ही विलीन हो गया, साथ ही ससे यह हुआ कि आज हम देखते हैं कि वहां मिलिटरी शासन है। मेरा निवेदन है कि इन सब बातों से हमें थोड़ा सबक लेने की आवश्यकता है। हमारे भारतवर्ष के लोग तो हमेशा से इस सिद्धान्त में विश्वास करते हैं कि “वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्”—सारा संसार हमारा कुटुम्ब है, इसमें विश्वास करते रहे हैं और करते हैं। हमारा विश्वास इसमें है कि “कृष्णतो विश्वमायम्” अर्थात् हमें सारे संसार को श्रेष्ठ बनाना है। यदि हम अपने प्राचीन इतिहास को देखें तो ऐसा नहीं है कि हम इन बातों को, या पंचशील के सिद्धान्तों को, आज ही कहते हों। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने खुद ही पंचशील के जिन सिद्धान्तों को अपनाया है और दूसरे देशों से मनवाने का यत्न किया है और मनवा रहे हैं। वे ऐसे सिद्धान्त हैं कि जो सारी दुनिया की भलाई के लिये हैं। वे इस सिद्धान्त को मानने वाले हैं कि जीओ और जीने दो। यह हमारे प्राचीन सिद्धान्त है। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि हमारे पाकिस्तानी भाई, जितना ही हम उनकी तरफ मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ाएँ उनकी तरफ से हमेशा इस प्रकार की बात कही जाती है जो बिलकुल असत्य होती है और ने दरअसल आज दुनिया को धोखा देने की कोशिश करते हैं। वे दरअसल स्वयं अपने को तथा अपने पाकिस्तानी

भाइयों को ही धोखा दे रहे हैं जब वह यह कह रहे हैं कि हमको भारतवर्ष से खतरा है या भारतवर्ष से हमारी कोई दुश्मनी है। ऐसा वे महज अपनी व्यक्तिगत मनोकामना पूरी करने के लिए और अपना शासन चलाने की दृष्टि से कहते हैं और इस प्रकार की बातें लोगों के मन में भरा करते हैं जो नितान्त असत्य हैं। मेरा यह निवेदन है....

**श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू):** कृपया समाप्त कीजिए, अब खत्म कीजिए।

**श्री राम सहाय :** एक दो, मिनट में समाप्त करता हूँ।

**श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू):** अभी श्री याजी को भी बोलना है।

**श्री राम सहाय :** इस प्रकार का जो मिलिटरी शासन वहाँ चला है उससे बहुत कुछ सबक सभी को सीखने की आवश्यकता है।

काश्मीर के बारे में पाकिस्तान हर वक्त चर्चा किया करता है। जिन हमारे इन पाकिस्तानी भाइयों से अपना घर नहीं संभल रहा है, जिन्होंने स्वयं ने अपने साथियों पर, अपने देश के नेताओं पर खास कर भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप, खुद्गर्जों के आरोप लगाए हैं, वे किस मुंह से काश्मीर की बात करते हैं यह समझ में नहीं आता। इसलिए यह निवेदन है कि स प्रकार के जितने भी प्रचार या प्रोपेगंडा की बातें वे करें लेकिन वे भी दुनिया की आंखों में धूल नहीं झाँक सकेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ, हमारे पाकिस्तानी भाई भी अपने लोगों की इस किस्म की बातों को ध्यान में रख कर सचेत होंगे। हो सकता है एक समय ऐसा भी आये जब उनकी इससे और बुरी हालत हो। इसलिये आवश्यक है कि वे चेतन की कोशिश करें।

**SHRI SHKEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar):** I will request you to give me time tomorrow.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** There are 5 minutes. Start today and you can continue tomorrow.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU):** No other speeches. You can not continue tomorrow. We will adjourn at 5-30. You have to make up your mind whether to speak or not.

**श्री राम सहाय :** मैं अपनी स्पीच खत्म नहीं करना चाहता था और श्री याजी को बोलने का अवसर देने के लिए बैठ गया था।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, अभी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों पर बहस के सिलसिले में हमारे साथी दीवान चमनलाल जी ने मूल प्रस्ताव पर हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को स्वीकार करने के सम्बन्ध में जो संशोधन किया है मैं उसकी तारीफ करता हूँ।

अभी हमारी जो शांतिमय और प्रगति-शील वैदेशिक नीति है, प्रायः हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी पार्टियाँ हैं, और जितने लोग हैं वे इसको स्वीकार करते हैं और साथ ही साथ दुनिया के लोग भी। यद्यपि हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ ऐसी भी पार्टियाँ हैं जो अपने को समाजवादी पार्टी कहती हैं, वे रूस और चीन को भी बराबर गाली देती हैं और हंगरी के मामले को लेकर बड़ी बड़ी बातें उठाती हैं, लेकिन बड़े-बड़े नेता यहाँ तक कि जयप्रकाश नारायण जी की टाइप के लोग जो समझते थे कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को दुनिया नहीं मानती है जब वे बाहर के देशों की यात्रा कर आए, तो उन्होंने भी कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान की वैदेशिक नीति को सारी दुनिया मानती है और इसके वे कायल हैं। आज सिर्फ इंग्लैंड और अमेरिका को छोड़िये, संसार

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

के और जो २६ बड़े-बड़े देश हैं, जिनकी करीब पीने तीन अरब की आबादी में दो अरब लोग हैं जो कि दुनिया की जन-संख्या के दो तिहाई हैं, वे हमारी वैदेशिक नीति को मानते हैं। लेकिन इस हाउस में वैदेशिक नीति पर बोलते बोलते श्री एच० डी० राजा ने हमारी जो सैनिक शक्ति है उसको छोटा दिखाने की कोशिश की जोकि मुल्क की बहुवृद्धि के खयाल से अच्छी बात नहीं है। वे कामनवेल्थ के बारे में भी बहुत सी नापसंद बातें बोल गए हैं। हमारे कुछ और साथी भी बोलत हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान को कामनवेल्थ में नहीं रहना चाहिए। मैं भी पहले इस खयाल का था लेकिन जब कामरेड चाउ एन लाइ हिन्दुस्तान में आए, उन्होंने यहां इस प्रकार का बयान दिया कि राष्ट्रमंडल, 'कामनवेल्थ' में बैठकर जब नेहरू जी और देशों की अपनी वैदेशिक नीति की तरफ लाते हैं तब उसको कामनवेल्थ में रहना चाहिए, जब उन्होंने भी सिकारिश की तो मेरा खयाल बदल गया। जब इतने महापुरुष लोग कामनवेल्थ में रहने की बात करते हैं तब एच० डी० राजा न जाने क्या समझते हैं कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। अभी परसों की बात है जब पुराने क्रांतिकारियों की कांफरेन्स हुई थी तब उसमें बोलते हुए राजा महेन्द्रप्रताप सिंह ने कहा था कि जब तक हिन्दुस्तान कामनवेल्थ में है तब तक हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई समाप्त नहीं है, हम अभी तक गुलाम हैं और इसलिए हमें आजादी की लड़ाई को जारी रखना है। ऐसे ऐसे सनकी लोग हैं जो इस तरह की पागलपन की बातें अभी भी करते हैं। तो यदि हम कामनवेल्थ में रहते हैं तो भी हमारी नीतियों पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ता है, चाहे वह गोआ का मामला हो, चाहे क्यूमीय, मत्सू या बेस्ट ईरियन का मामला हो। आज गोआ के मामले में इस हाउस में बहस के वक्त यह भी कहा गया कि क्यों नहीं वहां सैनिक शक्ति का प्रयोग किया गया।

जिस प्रश्न के सम्बन्ध में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी बार-बार सफाई दे चुके हैं, उस पर भी इस तरह की बातें चलती हैं, यह समझ में नहीं आता।

अभी हमारे साथी राजा जी ने अमेरिका की जो नीति है उसका जिक्र किया। अमेरिका की नीति शुरू से ही यह है कि गिलगिट से लेकर कराची तक एक लाइन पाकिस्तान को दे दी जाय

(Time bell rings.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): It is half past five now.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : इसीलिए मैं बोल नहीं रहा था। पांच मिनट में वैदेशिक नीति पर क्या बोल सकता हूं ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Five minutes.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : समाजवाद में समता का भाव होना चाहिए। किसी को एक घंटा बोलने के लिये दिया, किसी को आध घंटा। मैंने कभी फारन अफेयर्स पर नहीं बोला इसीलिए मैंने कह दिया था कि तीन मिनट में क्या बोल पाऊंगा।

तो हमारी यह जो वैदेशिक नीति है, यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि हमारे कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता जो हमारी गृह नीति पर कभी-कभी चिल्लाया करते हैं वे भी उस नीति को कबूल कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने जो बातें कही हैं, उनमें से कुछेक बहुत अच्छी कही हैं। शुरू में ही मैंने कहा था कि जब हमारे कामरेड चाउ एन लाइ, बुलगानिन तथा साम्यवादी व समाजवादी पार्टियों के कितने ही ठेकेदार (कस्टोडियन) हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की, पंचशील की प्रशंसा करते हैं तो कामरेड भूपेश गुप्ता न करें तो

उनके लिये शोभनीय बात नहीं है। पाकिस्तान को यदि अमेरिका सैनिक सहायता दे रहा है तो अपनी गर्ज से दे रहा है क्योंकि उस रूस पर और चीन पर कूदना है और गिलगिट से लेकर कराचा तक एक लाइन बनानी है, यह उनकी साजिश है। अयूब खां ने जो यह इशारा किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान में एक मिलिटरी डिक्टेटरशिप हो, तो इस तरह की बातें यहां नहीं होने वाली हैं और यह महज अयूब खां की शरारत भरी बात है। लेकिन "बंदर के हाथ में नारियल"—अगर जनरल अयूब को हथियार मिलता है तो—बंदर एक रोज क्या करेगा, इस बात के

लिए हमें सावधान होकर तैयार रहना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं साथी दिवान चमनलाल के संशोधन की तार्ईद करता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The Prime Minister will reply tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Tuesday, December 16, 1958.

The House then adjourned at thirty-one minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 16th December 1958.