

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Prime Minister.

MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—*continued.*

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Chairman, I do not quite know to what I should render a reply. Some information I was asked for I shall gladly give. In the main, in spite of seeming criticism of our policy, there appeared to be a very wide appreciation of it from all sides of the House. Some hon. Members like Mr. Rajah perhaps did not wholly agree. It seemed to me that Mr. Rajah, like Peter Pan, refuses to grow up. I have a recollection of his having said much of what he said, yesterday, thirty years ago in Madras when he and I were associated in a republican league—I forget the exact name . . .

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Independence for India League—struggle against imperialists.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We stood for a republic then and while we had realised that goal many years ago, he still thinks that we are gradually working up to it and much has to be done in that connection. It may even be possible sometimes physically to push a person, but intellectually to push him is much more difficult. Now, he seems to think that our association with the British Commonwealth somehow takes away from the fact that we are a Republic, and some hon. Members, too, have a vague idea to that effect. Some hon. Members opposite, not the exact Members, but the predecessors of those seats or perhaps the same persons did not realise, I think, for about

two to four years after the independence of India, that India was independent. They actually went on saying right up to 1950 or thereabout that India was not independent, and when we celebrated Independence day on the 15th August, they proclaimed that this was a bogus Independence day, India was not independent. Now, I find it a little difficult to deal with that mental approach to these problems. Gradually, after a few years they realised and they realised not so much with the help of facts in India but with the help of statements made in other countries that India was independent. Now, Mr. Rajah referred with some—if I may use the word—heat about a certain short notice question he had put and said I refused to answer it. It is true. I had not refused to answer the question, but I had said, "I see no reason why I should answer a short notice question of that type when there was neither any urgency nor, in my opinion, any importance." But if he had put an ordinary question, of course, I would have answered it. There is no secrecy about it. The fact of the matter so far as that question is concerned was this: The question was whether Government's attention has been drawn to a report in which Miss Patricia Hornsby-Smith, Parliamentary Secretary to the Home Office, was reported to have referred in the House of Commons to emigrants to Great Britain from India as British subjects? This was the question. Now, the actual facts are, I found out, that a question was raised in the British House of Commons and she was asked how many coloured people are emigrating to Britain from the British Commonwealth. And it was stated, I believe, that about 40,000 a year are going there. Then, it was stated after some discussion in reply to a debate that 25,000 of these persons came from the West Indies, Jamaica, etc. and 12,000 from India and Pakistan, both together. They did not give the exact figure for India. I imagine it is probably less than half that, maybe five or six thousand, probably much less. Then, thereupon she went on to say that the British Government welcomed British subjects to that country, but

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] could not ignore the rising potential of this emigration and the very great burden it might put on the country in future. That is, she referred in a broad way, welcoming British subjects. She was not correct, of course, if she referred to India. Obviously so. But in dealing with that, most of these people who go there, as the figures will show, are from Jamaica, West Indies, and other places. It is true she did not use precise enough language to say that. But it was not a matter for us, because the Parliamentary Secretary had used vague language in connection with another issue, to make a song and dance of it and object to it and call upon the lady Parliamentary Secretary to correct or vary it. It made no difference to us even if somebody had made a more positive statement. It would not affect facts. But if he had done so, we would have drawn his attention to his error. So, I submit that so far as this question is concerned, the matter to which Mr. Rajah drew attention really has no relevance to our situation. Nobody in the wide world who has any knowledge of the facts considers any Indian as a British subject. Of course, he is not. I have never heard anybody saying that. This kind of vague statement about emigrants, in which they were largely Jamaicans, does not alter that fact.

Now, Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta stoutly denied that he stood for India changing its foreign policy in the sense of lining up with any particular group of nations, because some hon. Member had, I think, probably hinted that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta wanted that done. He stoutly denied that. I am very glad to have his denial and I hope he will act up to it in the future.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):
What we say we always act up to that.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: That may be true occasionally, but then,] sometimes the ordinary dictionary meanings of words are not attached by | Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Some other |

meanings are attached. Therefore, there may be a difference of opinion as to whether you have understood the matter in the same way. However, the point I was venturing to say is this. Hon. Members here, specially in the opposition, accuse us sometimes of rushing in where angels fear to tread, sometimes of remaining silent when we ought to be shouting, and different charges are made why we have not protested immediately when, let us say, the United States Navy is moving about in the Indian Ocean and, some of them have landed at Singapore, why we have not raised our voice in protest. Another group in the opposition wants to know why we have not protested against Russia's campaign against Yugoslavia, why we have not protested against the presence of Soviet troops in some East European countries and so on. We are accused of not protesting against this or that happening elsewhere in other parts of the world. Then, one hon. Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh, says that we have a habit—even though he might have toned down later—of jumping always to the forefront of a crisis and throwing our weight about. Well, these of course are contradictory statements and accusations; they cannot all be true.

The fact of the matter is that it is our definite and deliberate policy not to go about accusing nations even though we disapprove of their activities, unless an occasion arises when we have to express our opinion in the United Nations or elsewhere or unless some deep crisis arises when we feel that such an expression of opinion will be helpful; that is to say, we express our opinions when we feel that such an expression will be helpful in some way or other, not merely to unburden ourselves of feelings of indignation or anger. There is much happening in the world which we do not approve of. But we feel that while in our own country we can take liberties in the expression of opinion, on other countries we have to be more cautious

because it is very easy to criticise others, it is much more difficult to criticise oneself. If we criticise others, we invite criticisms from others, by people who do not know facts in India, and we do not presume to be experts in the knowledge of everything that happens in other countries. Even though we may know some facts which we like or dislike, we do not know the full context of them, and in any event if we are asked to convince them in any way, it is not by way of condemnation that we can convince anybody. We will simply make the situation probably a little worse. That is why in our general policy, when we say, as we have said, that foreign forces should not stay on in the Middle Eastern countries, we have always said, laid stress, repeated the broad principle that foreign forces should not go to any country, Middle Eastern country or other, although I limited this once in the other House. The hon. Member, Acharya Kripaiani, asked me, "Is that a fixed rule that it should never happen?" I said, I could not say that. There may be conceivably occasions when at the invitation of a country perhaps they may go; I cannot for the moment conceive it, but it might happen. I cannot lay that down as a fixed rule. Broadly speaking, it is not right or desirable for foreign forces to occupy another country, whatever the foreign forces may be and whatever the other country might be.

Then, one hon. Member, Shri Jaswant Singh, said why not apply Panchsheel to the home front, and why only use it for international affairs? It was not quite clear to me what he meant by that. Certainly it should be applied to the bomb front, indeed to our domestic affairs, to our home life, I would say. But then an example he gave of where it should be applied was apparently in Ahmedabad where at the present moment some agitation is going on about the planting of a memorial in the crossroads, in the middle of the road, and he referred also to the firing etc. there. I do not quite know the relevance of

all this to this matter. I would gladly of course deal with this question if occasion arises, but I mention this just to indicate the confusion in the mind of the hon. Member who brought in this thing. It is very difficult to think straight or clear if you mix up everything, but I entirely accept his suggestion that the ideal of Panchsheel should be applied to the home front, and I carry it further to the family front, to the husband and wife front, everywhere.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is no firing in that front.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Another remarkable statement which Mr. Jaswant Singh made was to the effect that I had offended against the ideal of Panchsheel by supporting the Punjab Chief Minister on some occasion or other. I am afraid my mind is not agile enough to follow this extension of Panchsheel. Why I should not, if I think it right, support the Punjab Chief Minister on an occasion when I think he is acting rightly and support him to the hilt. I propose to do so always when a person acts rightly. I do not know how that ideal of Panchsheel is offended.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Even after the incident at Ferozepur.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Even after that incident, because the incident, if the hon. Member knows anything about the fact, has nothing to do with the Chief Minister. Because people misbehave in jail and are punished for it, therefore the Chief Minister is to blame for it—I am not aware of this.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The enquiry report reveals that it was done purposely, and therefore the Chief Minister as head of the Government is responsible for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are wrong.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am afraid the hon. Member is absolutely and completely incorrect in what he says. There is a difficulty. If a person does not keep his thinking right, he is likely to go hopelessly wrong. If you go hopelessly wrong in a small matter, it does not matter. But if you go hopelessly wrong in international affairs, it might lead to more far-reaching results.

There was the question again of Algeria and Gen De Gaulle. While I am not in a position to say much about as to what is going to happen in Algeria or in France, the situation, as everyone knows, has undergone a great change in France and France is, at the present moment, considering or going to consider a new Constitution and probably vote upon it. I do not know how the French people will vote and there is not much point in my expressing views to the French people as to how to vote and how not to vote. That would be presumption, whatever it might be or might not be on the subject. Everyone knows that we stand for the full freedom and independence of Algeria and we have stood for it. We have expressed ourselves quite clearly. That does not mean that we should go about condemning in a loud voice the French Government of the day. It may be that we express our views positively about the freedom of Algeria, not negatively, in condemnation of other countries except that we have to criticise them in a moderate language in the United Nations or elsewhere.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Will the integration of Pondicherry be complete before the new Constitution is brought into effect in France?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I cannot say. So far as we are concerned, we have done everything. We do not control the French parliamentary system or the French National Assembly as to when it can do it and we cannot act, as an hon. Member in the other House suggested, "Why

don't you act unilaterally?" What exactly you do unilaterally, I do not know. We are in possession of Pondicherry. There, we are functioning. Nobody is interfering; nobody can interfere. But some parliamentary process has to be gone through by the French National Assembly. We cannot do it. And if we tell them, we do not care to your doing or not doing, it does not make any difference to us. It does not give more possession than we have got. The fact of the matter is that, during the last two or three years, ever since the *de jacto* transfer of Pondicherry took place and indeed before that, there have been a succession of Governments in France and a great deal of ferment and trouble politically. We may not like it, we may not approve of this delay as we do not. But the reason for the delay is obvious because Governments have not lasted long enough to do enough positively and there had been different Governments. Now, the latest information given to me on behalf of the French Government is that, first of all, they stand by their past commitments and they will certainly go ahead with this matter of *de jure* transfer. They cannot do so except when the National Assembly meets. Under their law, they cannot do it so.

Recently, certain very wide transfer of powers was made in favour of Gen. De Gaulle, the Prime Minister. But that transfer of power did not include the right to ratify a treaty of this kind. So, although he would have no objection to doing so, he is legally and constitutionally unable to do so till the French National Assembly meets next and it may take it up. That is not likely to meet, I think, for another six months from the time these powers were given. Probably, it may be in another month or so. But we have been assured by the present authorities in France that they stand by their old commitments and they want to give effect to them as soon as they can. That is the position.

Some hon. Member asked why we have not been more strenuous in our

advocacy of the People's Republic of China being admitted to the United Nations. Well, I do not know what more is required of us. Year after year, we have brought this matter in the United Nations. Year after year, we have spoken there about it and not only there, but elsewhere also and even this year we are bringing it forward.

Then there is the question of disarmament. It is a very vital and important issue in the world today. But every approach to it somehow has foundered because of the suspicions of the Major Powers concerned. I may mention here that I am happy that the United States and the United Kingdom have decided and proclaimed that they will stop nuclear tests for a year from the end of October. One may ask, why have this rather long period of two months? To have more tests? Yes, that is so. The less we have the better, because it has been shown by a very responsible body of scientists appointed by the United Nations that these tests—every single one of them—are harmful to some extent. But to what extent, of course, opinion may differ and the piling of tests is really and ultimately a crime against the future and against humanity. So, we are happy—as we were happy when the Soviet Union stopped their tests—that the United States and the United Kingdom have also stopped their nuclear tests, and I hope that the stoppage by all these countries is for good and no other country will undertake them, because we are really on the verge of other countries also developing the power to manufacture atom bombs and if atomic and nuclear weapons are spread out among a number of countries, it will become almost physically impossible then to have any system of control. Therefore, unless this suspension leads to some actual solid achievements in regard to disarmament, the position will remain insecure and rather dangerous.

One hon. Member—I think it was probably Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—talked about the last Commission in Indo-

46 RSD—3.

China. We have had a great deal of j difficulty in these Commissions because, as always, we were trying to j achieve something, not merely to j oppose and denounce. It is quite easy ; to oppose and express one's opinions ; strongly about things one dislikes. But where you are trying to hold a thing together which tends to crack up, where you are trying to convince people not to take up extreme attitudes, it is always a difficult position. I think that the record of the last few years, whatever the policy has been of these various Commissions, in Indo-China, has been a good one. All the Commissions, I say, not India alone, but all the Commissions generally and more particularly the record of India has been certainly, I think, a creditable one and one which has avoided crises repeatedly. So far as the last Commission is concerned and so far as any Commission there is concerned, we have been of opinion that they are connected together in a • sense by the agreement in Geneva and that they should continue till they are all wound up simultaneously having finished their work. They may continue at the lower scale, if you like, just formally, but they cannot be wound up. That is our interpretation of the agreement made at Geneva.

Now in Cambodia, the work of the Commission is very largely over. In Laos it was also largely over and we wanted, therefore, to reduce these Commissions to the" very minimum. Some people however were of opinion that the Laos Commission should be wound up. Ultimately we arrived at a compromise decision that the Commission should be postponed or should adjourn indefinitely. That is, we withdraw all our people from there but it can be summoned afterwards and meanwhile, for form's sake, one of our officers in the neighbouring countries may represent us even in Laos if necessity arises.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I ask whether it means that the functions of the Commission have completely ceased and it has no function till it is reconvened under the agreement that has been reached?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Naturally, if it is, not there it is not functioning. It is obvious. I don't think it is a 100 per cent desirable decision but I do think broadly it meets the situation because their functions had almost, not quite 100 per cent, but almost, ended, and in theory, therefore, their functions continue though not in practice. Of course they are not there but they can go back and take them up if necessity arises so that the letter of the law has been followed and in practice, no harm done, though I would have liked of course for someone to be there even in a small way. The real difficulty of course, as everyone knows, is in regard to Viet-Nam Commission. Laos and Cambodia offered difficulties, offered problems—true—but not that type of more intractable problems which North and South Viet-Nam offered and I don't know when this Viet-Nam problem will be nearer solution.

The hon. Member Dr. Kunzru asked questions about Indonesia. Well, broadly speaking, one may say that most of the rebel areas in Indonesia are under the control of the Government. There may be small pockets here and there. A great deal was said about the foreign interference in Indonesia. There was interference but we have no indication, no proof, that the interference was what might be called official or Governmental. There was interference by certain freelancers, American free-lancers, who have their headquarters in Formosa, specially some air men of note, who have been carrying on some kind of traffic, legitimate and maybe sometimes illegitimate, in the air. They have got air-companies stationed there and some American airmen certainly lent their services or were hired by the Rebels in Indonesia and they did some damage in Indonesia against the Government. It was a bad thing and in fact one of them was actually captured by the Indonesian Government and many of these facts came out then because it is very difficult to find out unless you capture the man, as to

who is bombing you from the air. It was only when the plane crashed and he was captured, then of course it was known that he was so and so, belonging to this private air company functioning from Formosa. But apart from this we have had no evidence of the U.S. Government interfering in any way in this civil war.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA (Jammu and Kashmir): When Mr. Dulles said in a statement that the U.S. Government was considering the recognition of the Rebels' Government, did it not constitute an encouragement to the Rebels and an indirect interference in the affairs of Indonesia?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have no recollection of that statement having been made by Mr. Dulles. What may have encouraged the rebels was, some favourable press comments in the U.S. Certain newspapers had for some time encouraged the rebels or wrote encouragingly about them but I have absolutely no recollection of Mr. Dulles having made that remark. I cannot say . . .

(Interruptions.)

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): He is a free-lancer . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Dulles said that the Government was considering the question of recognition of the Government of the Rebels—the so-called Rebel Government—that had come into existence.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am unable to say anything about it. I am merely saying what the facts I possessed are and if Mr. Dulles had said that, Mr. Dulles must have been considering that. That is all that I can say. Anyhow for some time past, the U.S. policy has been definitely favourable to the Indonesian Government and in fact they have actually been carrying out some old contract decisions about supplying them or selling them some arms, etc.

About the movement of the U.S. Fleet in the Indian Ocean, naturally a movement of this major type attracts attention and may be considered possibly, *prima facie*, as some kind of hostile move, potentially hostile, but so far as we know, this is one of their normal cruising. It is a very big fleet and wherever it goes, it attracts attention. The mere fact of its presence in the Indian Ocean may be objected to by some countries as some kind of threat. That is a different matter. But there it is. The fact of its going to Singapore, as far as I know, has no particular significance because it moves about. If the fleet is there, it has to move about from time to time and sometimes land people and take them away later.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The *Washington Post* says something quite different.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Some hon. Members asked us, why did we delay the recognition of the Republic of Iraq. I don't know what is meant by delay. We function with a certain dignity. We don't rush in upsetting all rules and regulations and even decorous procedure. The revolution occurred on the 14th July. Immediately from that day onwards, we were in touch informally through our representative there with what was happening there, even with the new revolutionist regime in Iraq. From the very next day we were in touch with them informally. So far as formal recognition goes, we waited for a formal approach to us, for that recognition. The formal approach came to us exactly a week after, that is, on the 21st July. It is not surprising. No doubt the people were busy there and as I said, actually we were dealing with them through our people and were in touch with them. The formal approach came on the 21st July and we took the necessary steps involved in recognition which means some formal steps, formal consideration or reference to our President. His agreement to these is formal but it has to be taken and on the 23rd,

that is two days after the approach was made to us, we sent them our reply containing our recognition and on the 24th, I think this was published. So I don't see where the delay comes in.

So far as I can remember, I have dealt with the various points raised. In finishing up, I would again like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that many of our phrases, many of our postures, whether of defiance or whether even in terms of peaceful approaches, get out of date very soon. Our thinking gets out of date and if I may say so with all respect, our speeches also get out of date in a rapidly changing situation. Nothing is more obvious today than that the world is different, very different, from what it was, let us say, even ten years ago; and it changes rapidly. And because of that change, all the old poses and postures that we adopted somehow are out of place. It is amazingly difficult today to keep pace with the changing times, whether it is in the international field or, if I may say so, even in the national or economic fields. And therefore, positive assertions as to what must be done and what must not be done become rather out of place, more especially with regard to foreign countries. With regard to our own country, we have to carry the burden and we have to decide this way or that way, and we have to criticise wherever necessary. But one has to be cautious in these circumstances, and when the world is in such a state of flux of mind and other conditions, for us to go about running down and condemning other countries easily, that does not help the process of reconciliation that we aim at.

Yesterday, I said something about my meeting with the Prime Minister of Pakistan next month. Probably hon. Members have seen in the newspapers that a cease-fire has been proclaimed on the eastern front, if I may use the word.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: And again they started firing. I read it in the papers.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It was really about five days ago, before I left Delhi—I was going south—that I sent a note, I think, on the 22nd, to the Prime Minister of Pakistan, saying that it was bad enough to have this intermittent firing taking place on both sides of the border; but it was even worse that this should continue after we had agreed to meet. Therefore, I suggested that this should stop and we should, both countries, order the stoppage of this and I hoped that when we met we would be able to decide this problem more effectively and permanently. He sent his reply, but unfortunately I was not here and I came back a day later, and ultimately we agreed to the cease-fire at 12 o'clock yesterday, mid-day. The hon. Member reminds me and it appears from the papers that after the cease-fire there was some firing. I do not think we need attach importance to that, that is to say, from the point of view of a breach of the cease-fire. In fact, we got a message from our High Commissioner in Karachi to say that the Pakistan Government had informed him that owing to various difficulties in communications and difference in times, etc., between the two countries, there might be here and there perhaps, somebody firing—but they will stop that. That was not intentional but because of these difficulties. So we need not attach much importance to this incidental firing here and there. I hope that at least in these relatively minor matters, my meeting with the Prime Minister of Pakistan will yield good results. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to ask the Prime Minister how he views statements such as this which appeared in the American papers with regard to the appearance of these troops in the Indian Ocean. Here it is stated:

"Serious consideration is being given within the Naval Department, to the creation of an Indian Ocean fleet"

and so on. And then the object is given thus:

"Such a force would go a long way towards filling the power vacuum that exists in the Indian Ocean and be able to go to the aid of any of America's allies or friends who may want assistance against direct or indirect aggression."

And this has been stated concurrently with the appearance of the U.S.A. war-ships. I do not think, Sir, that these marines are on a holiday cruise on the Indian Ocean; it does not look as if they are.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Just a word, Sir. First of all, the hon. Member read an extract from an American newspaper and I cannot speak in terms of newspapers or journalists; I have to speak with a little more responsibility and on facts as I know them. It is open to anybody in America or in India to draw up theories as to what might happen and there are any number of possibilities open. But I cannot function in this hypothetical way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But this is a communication from the Naval Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about your amendment?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, after what the Prime Minister has said, I think this amendment should be acceptable to him. There should be a little compromise with us also, sometimes. How do you think, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to press your amendment or do you want to withdraw it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am always in favour of a compromise, but if a compromise is denied, then necessarily I have to press it.